UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

64 Parliamentary Papers
Reference only.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

620120

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_january-06-31-1881_257

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

44° VICTORIÆ, 1881.

VOL. CCLVII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE SIXTH DAY OF JANUARY 1881,

TO

THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF JANUARY 1881.

First Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1881.

8995

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCLVII.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 6. *Page*

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT.

The Session of PARLIAMENT was opened by Commission.

The LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered*

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech 3

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Second Session of the Twenty-second Parliament of the United Kingdom.

NEW PEER—

The Right Honourable Edward Robert Lytton Lord Lytton, G.C.B., created Viscount Knebworth of Knebworth in the county of Hertford, and Earl of Lytton in the county of Derby.

SAT FIRST—

The Lord Clifford, after the death of his father.

Select Vestries—

Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—

The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been *reported* by The LORD CHANCELLOR;—An Address to Her Majesty thereon *moved* by *The Lord Carrington*—(The Motion being *seconded* by *The Earl of Yarborough*) .. 8

After long debate, Address *agreed to*, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES — The Earl of REDESDALE appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES—*appointed.*

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS—*appointed.*

APPEAL COMMITTEE—*appointed.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 6.

Page

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—The House went;—and having returned;—

NEW WRITS DURING THE RECESS 71

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS — CITY OF WORCESTER — EVESHAM — BERWICK UPON TWEED—WALLINGFORD—
Judges' Certificates and Reports 71

EVESHAM ELECTION 73

NEW MEMBERS SWORN 75

PRIVILEGES—*Ordered*, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

Outlawries Bill—

Bill "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries" read the first time; to be read a second time.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—

The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been *reported* by Mr. SPEAKER;—An humble Address thereon *moved* by *Mr. Stuart Rendel*—(The Motion being *seconded* by *Mr. Slagg*) 75

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

LORDS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 7.

Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) Bill—

Bill to remove doubts as to the operation and effect of so much of the Burial Laws Amendment Act, 1880, as relates to the Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1874—*presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 2) 153

Judicial Committee Bill—

Bill to further improve the Administration of Justice in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—*presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 3) 153

SOUTH AFRICA (MISSIONARIES IN BASUTOLAND)—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Moved for, "An Address to the Crown praying that a Copy of the Memorial addressed to Her Majesty's Ministers by the Committee of the Paris Evangelical Alliance on the present position of the native churches in Basutoland and the missionaries sent out by the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society be laid on the Table,"—(*The Earl of Belmore*) 154

Motion *agreed to.*

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 7.

BOROUGH OF EVESHAM—

Return amended by substituting the name of Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland for that of Frederick Lehmann as the Member returned for the said Borough 156

QUESTIONS.

ARMY—ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND—REPORT OF 1879—APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE — Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Mr. Childers 156

CROWN RENTS, TITHE RENT CHARGES, AND INCOME TAX, &c. (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Tottenham; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish .. 157

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*January* 7.] Page

MINES ACTS—REPORTS OF INSPECTORS OF MINES—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 157

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT—CONTRACTS—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Attorney General 157

AFGHANISTAN (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—REWARDS FOR SERVICES—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 158

ARMY—THE VOLUNTEERS—SPEECH OF LORD LYTTON—Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Childers 159

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE—Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, Mr. Mundella 159

ARMY—THE VOLUNTEERS—CUSTODY OF ARMS—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Childers 161

CONSTITUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 161

STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATION OF MEETINGS AT BROOKBOROUGH—ORDER—QUESTIONS—MOVING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 162

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. O'Kelly*:)—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 38, Noes 301; Majority 263.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATION OF "DISTURBED" COUNTIES—Questions, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 187

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—THE PROHIBITED MEETING AT DROGHEDA—Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 189

AFGHANISTAN AND TURKEY—THE PAPERS—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 190

SOUTH AFRICA—THE WAR IN BASUTOLAND—THE INSTRUCTIONS TO SIR HERCULES ROBINSON — Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 190

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE—Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 191

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January]:—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 192

Amendment proposed,

At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people,"—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Shaw*:) Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *Monday*.

MOTIONS.

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) 265

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill for the better prevention of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Solicitor General*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 1.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*January* 7.]

Page

Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill—
Motion for Leave (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) 272
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill to amend and make perpetual "The Ballot Act," *ordered* (*Sir Charles Dilke, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Attorney General*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 2.]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—
Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stevenson*) 273
After short debate, Motion *postponed.*

Public Houses (Closing on Sunday) Bill—
Motion for Leave (*Mr. Pease*).. 274
After short debate, Motion *postponed.*

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—Motion for a Committee (*Lord Kensington*) 275
After short debate, Motion *postponed.*

STANDING ORDERS—Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee .. 275

SELECTION—Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 275

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Wales) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Roberts, Mr. Richard, Mr. Samuel Holland, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Mr. Rathbone*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 3] 275

Industrial Schools and Reformatories (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Callan, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Martin*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 4] 275

Newspapers (Law of Libel) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Edward Leatham, Mr. Samuel Morley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 5] .. 276

Free Education (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Mr. Ernest Noel, Mr. Peddie, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Mackintosh*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 6] 276

Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. William Fowler, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Joseph Cowen*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 7] .. 276

Removal Terms (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James Stewart, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Patrick, Mr. Mackintosh*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 8] 276

Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1877) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Walter James, Mr. Bryce*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 9] 276

Agricultural Tenants' Compensation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. James Cowan, Mr. J. C. Lawrance, Mr. Birkbeck*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 10] .. 276

Clerical Disabilities Act Repeal Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Gabriel Goldney, Mr. Thorold Rogers*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 11] 276

Volunteer Corps (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Patrick Martin*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 12] 277

London City (Parochial Charities) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Davey*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 13] 277

Church Boards Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Edward Howard, Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Marriott, Mr. Pulley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 14] .. 277

Patents for Inventions Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Hinde Palmer, Mr. Broadhurst*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 15] 277

Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Monk, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Fry, Mr. Barran*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 16] 277

[*January* 7.]

Page

Corn Returns Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Barne, General Burnaby*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 17] .. 277

Reformatory Institutions (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gabbett, Mr. Gray*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 18] .. 277

Limitation of Costs (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Errington, Mr. Blennerhassett*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 19] .. 277

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Leamy, Mr. Gray, Mr. Dawson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 20] 278

Burial Fees Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Brinton*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 21] .. 278

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hardcastle, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Dr. Farquharson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 22] .. 278

Marriage Law Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Blennerhassett, Mr. Monk, Mr. Otway*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 23] .. 278

Thames Steam Navigation Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Charles M'Laren, Mr. Otway, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 24] .. 278

Municipal Corporation Act (1859) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Fowler, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Henry H. Fowler*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 25] .. 278

Markets Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Warton, Captain Aylmer*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 26] .. 278

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Pease, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Dr. Cameron*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 27] .. 278

Irish Railways Purchase Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, Colonel Colthurst*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 28] .. 279

Tithe (Extraordinary Charge) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Inderwick, Mr. Howard, Sir Edmund Filmer, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Arthur Vivian, Mr. Thorold Rogers*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 29] .. 279

Church Patronage Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 30] .. 279

Agricultural Tenants Compensation (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Thomas Acland, Mr. Evans, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Lord Moreton, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Rodwell, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Story-Maskelyne*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 31] .. 279

Poor Law Guardians Election (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Edmond Gray, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Errington, Mr. O'Connor Power*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 32] .. 279

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Litton, Mr. Errington, Mr. Broadhurst*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 33] .. 279

County Courts Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Benjamin T. Williams, Sir Eardley Wilmot*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 34] .. 279

River Floods Prevention Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Magniac, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Biddulph, Sir Charles Reed*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 35] .. 279

Parliamentary Elections (Expenses) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Ashton Dilke, Mr. Barran, Mr. Burt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 36] .. 280

Parliamentary Elections Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Cohen*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 37] .. 280

Highways Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Estcourt, Mr. Yorke, Mr. Master*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 38] .. 280

[*January* 7.] Page

Boiler Explosions Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. Burt, Mr. Henry Lee, Mr. Broadhurst*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 39] 280

Infectious Diseases Notification (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Edmond Gray, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Dawson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 40] 280

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Litton, Mr. James Richardson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 41] 280

Teachers' Registration Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Playfair, Mr. Balfour*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 42] 280

Free Libraries Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Lord George Hamilton, Sir Charles Reed*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 43] 280

Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Monk, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Barran*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 44] 281

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Sir David Wedderburn*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 45] .. 281

Banking Laws Amendment Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Charles M'Laren*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 46] 281

Churchwardens Admission Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Monk, Sir Gabriel Goldney*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 47] 281

Judgments (Inferior Courts) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Litton, Mr. Monk, Mr. Reid, Mr. Serjeant Simon*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 48] 281

Salmon and Fresh Water Fisheries Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Joseph Bailey, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Howard*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 49] .. 281

LORDS, MONDAY, JANUARY 10.

Roll of the Lords—The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: the same was ordered to be printed (No. 4.)

Army—Insertion of Army Advertisements in the Press—Question, The Earl of Bradford; Answer, The Earl of Morley 282

South Africa—The Cape Colony—The Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson — Question, Observations, Earl Cadogan; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley.. 282

Afghanistan (Occupation of Candahar) — Observations, The Earl of Lytton:—Debate thereon 284

Limitation of Actions Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Cairns*); read 1ª (No. 5) .. 322

Settled Land Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Cairns*); read 1ª (No. 6) .. 322

Conveyancing and Law of Property Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Cairns*); read 1ª (No. 7) 322

Solicitors' Remuneration Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Cairns*); read 1ª (No. 8).. 322

Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 9) 322

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JANUARY 10.

Page

State of Ireland—Reported Collision at Claremorris—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 323

State of Ireland—Proclamations for the Suppression of Meetings—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 324

Army—Major Nolan—Questions, Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Childers 324

State of Ireland—The Prohibited Meeting at Kanturk—Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 325

Sir Henry Layard, Late H.M. Ambassador at Constantinople—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Rylands; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 325

State of Ireland—Meetings in Queen's County—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 326

Ireland—Evictions—Case of Arthur Kavanagh—Question, Mr. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 326

State of Ireland—The Prohibited Meeting at Clondalkin—Question, Mr. Gill; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 327

South Africa—The Transvaal Republic—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Courtney 327

Army (India)—The Bengal Staff Corps—Captain J. B. Chatterton—Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 328

Agricultural Lectures at South Kensington—Question, Mr. O'Shea; Answer, Mr. Mundella 329

The Census (Scotland)—The Gaelic Population—Question, Mr. Fraser Mackintosh; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 329

Army—Alleged Sale of Arms by the Late Government—Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Childers 330

The Licensing System—Legislation—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lwsaon; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 330

Inland Revenue—Income Tax in Ireland—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 331

State of Ireland—Prohibited Meeting at Cullohill—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 331

State of Ireland—Prohibited Meeting at Drogheda, &c.—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 331

State of Ireland—Prosecution of Land Leaguers at Tralee—Questions, Mr. Parnell, The O'Donoghue; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 332

Traction Engines—Question, Captain Aylmer; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 335

Borough Franchise (Ireland)—Legislation—Question, Mr. Blennerhassett; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 335

South Africa—The Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 335

Navy—Loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta"—Report of the Committee—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 336

Law of Settlement—Legislation—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Dodson 336

State of Ireland—Land League Placards—Questions, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 336

Noxious Gases—Legislation—Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Dodson 337

State of Ireland—Land Meetings in County Down—Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 337

Corn Returns Amendment Bill—Legislation—Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 338

South Africa—The Disaster in the Transvaal—The 94th Regiment—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 338

State of Ireland—The Prohibited Meeting at Magherafelt—Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 339

[*January* 10.]

Page

STATE OF IRELAND—GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS—THE LAND LEAGUE—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Gladstone .. 340

TURKEY AND GREECE—THE GREEK FRONTIER—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 341

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 341

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January]:—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 342

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Mitchell Henry*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

Naval Discipline Act Amendment Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Trevelyan*) 422

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill to amend "The Naval Discipline Act, 1866," with a view to abolish corporal punishment; and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* (*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Brassey*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 52.]

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE—

Moved, "That a Standing Committee be appointed to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms, in the department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House,"—(*Lord Kensington*) 423

Motion *agreed to*:—List of the Committee 425

Married Women's Property Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hinde Palmer, Sir Gabriel Goldney, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Horace Davey*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 50] .. 425

Agricultural Holdings (Warnings to Remove) (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Barclay*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 51] 426

Local Inquiries (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Fay, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Dr. Cameron*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 53] .. . 426

Barristers' Admission (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Callan, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gray*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 54] 426

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Birley, Mr. William M'Arthur, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 55] 426

Lunacy Law Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dillwyn, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Benjamin T. Williams*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 56] 426

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 11.

Page

Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address *reported* .. 426

Land League Meetings and Agrarian Crime (Ireland)—Motion for Returns (*Lord Dunsany*) 427
After short debate, on Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

South Africa—The Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers—Questions, Observations, Lord Brabourne, Viscount Bury; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley 435

Navy—Loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta"—Report and Evidence of the Committee—Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook 438

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 11.

QUESTIONS.

Ireland—The Port of Dublin—Dues on Rough Timber—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 439

Ireland—Presentment Sessions—Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 439

Highways Acts—Accounts of Surveyors of Highways—Question, Mr. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. Dodson 440

State of Ireland—The Orange Association—Question, Mr. Bellingham; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 440

The French Marriage Law—Question, Mr. Lewis Fry; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 440

Endowed Schools—Dulwich College—Question, Mr. Charles Roundell; Answer, Mr. Mundella 441

Law and Police—Case of Thomas Titley—Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 441

Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Chief Baron—Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 444

National Education (Ireland)—Parsonstown Model School—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 444

Treaty of Washington—The Halifax Fishery Commission—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 445

State of Ireland—Imprisonment of Land Leaguers in Tralee Gaol—Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 445

Post Office (Ireland)—The Telegraph Department—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 447

South Africa—The Transvaal—The Orange Free State—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 447

Ireland—The State Trials in Dublin—Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Pease; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker 448

MOTION.

Parliament—Order of Business—
Moved, "That the Notices of Motions be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) 449
After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—Adjourned Debate. [Fourth Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January]: — Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 451

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Blennerhassett*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

State of Ireland—Motion for a Select Committee—

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into alleged outrages in Ireland, and the effect of distress, and the system of Land Tenure thereon, the present state of the law for the prevention of such outrages, and the manner in which the said law has been administered,"—(*Mr. Parnell*) 547

After short debate, Motion *postponed.*

Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Parnell*) 549

After short debate, Motion *postponed.*

Landed Proprietors (Ireland) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. P. J. Smyth*) 550

After short debate, Motion *postponed.*

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12.

QUESTION.

Ireland—Protection of Captain Boycott—Question, Mr. Bellingham; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 550

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill [Bill 45]—

Order for Second Reading read 551

Moved, "That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow,"—(*Mr. Anderson*:)—After debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Gill*:)—After further debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Original Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 230, Noes 33; Majority 197.—(Div. List, No. 2.)

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—Adjourned Debate. [Fifth Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 589

After long debate, it being a quarter before Six of the clock, Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

[*January* 12.]

Page

MOTIONS,

PUBLIC PETITIONS—
Motion for a Select Committee (*Sir Charles Forster*) 616
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—List of the Committee .. 617

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (NUMBER OF ELECTORS)—MOTION FOR A RETURN—
Moved for "A Return, showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in Force,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) 617
After short debate, Motion *postponed*.

Municipal Franchise (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Cameron, Colonel Alexander, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Mr. M'Laren*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 57] .. 618

Elections (Closing of Public Houses) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Carbutt, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. Caine*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 58] .. 619

LORDS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 13.

Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment Bill (No. 9)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 619
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

NAVY—ENTRY OF NAVAL CADETS, AND STOPPAGES OF PAY—Questions, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook .. 620

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 13.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS—Questions, Mr. E. W. Harcourt; Answers, Mr. Fawcett 624
PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—APPLICATION OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT—Question, Mr. D. Grant; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 626
TREATY OF BERLIN—THE NAVAL DEMONSTRATION—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 627
TREATY OF BERLIN—THE MONTENEGRIN FRONTIER—Questions, Mr. Bourke; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 628
TURKEY AND THE POWERS—THE MONTENEGRIN FRONTIER—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 629
LAW AND JUSTICE—THE MAGISTRACY (SCOTLAND)—MR. STOPFORD BLAIR—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir William Harcourt; Questions, Mr. O'Connor Power, Mr. Parnell [No answer was given to these Questions] 629
AFGHANISTAN—THE PAPERS—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 630
INDIA—LAND LAWS OF BENGAL—REPORT OF THE COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 631
THE INDIAN ARMY COMMISSION—THE REPORT—Question, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 631
SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON—Questions, Sir Hardinge Giffard, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, The Attorney General 632

[*January* 13.]

Page

IRELAND—FLOGGING FOR POLITICAL OFFENCES—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 633

IRELAND—THE MAGISTRACY—LANGUAGE OF AN IRISH MAGISTRATE—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 634

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION (IRELAND)—THE REPORT—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 634

IRELAND—DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE—THE ACCOUNTS—Question, Mr. Gill; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 634

IRELAND—APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES—Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 635

NAVY—ABOLITION OF FLOGGING—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 636

LOCAL TAXATION AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, Mr. Dodson 636

TURKEY—DEPORTATION OF BULGARIANS FROM MACEDONIA—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 637

NAVY—SEAMEN IN HER MAJESTY'S FLEET — Question, Mr. R. W. Duff; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 637

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—AGRICULTURE IN VILLAGE SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, Mr. Mundella 638

STATE OF IRELAND—RETURNS OF EVICTIONS AND OUTRAGES—Questions, Mr. Parnell, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 639

SOUTH AFRICA—THE CAPE COLONY—DESPATCH OF ARMS—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Childers 640

STATE OF IRELAND—LAND LEAGUE MEETINGS—DOMICILIARY VISITS—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 640

IRELAND—THE STATE TRIALS—Question, Mr. W. Corbet; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 641

PREVENTION OF FLOODS—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Mr. Dodson 642

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—THE MAGISTRATES—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 642

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE — Questions, The O'Donoghue, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 643

INDIA—CONSPIRACY AT KOLAPORE — Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 645

IRELAND — OUTBREAK OF FEVER — Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 646

AFGHANISTAN (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—THE "DISASTER" AT MAIWAND—Question, Sir Henry Havelock-Allen; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 646

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE —Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 647

AFGHANISTAN (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—"ABANDONMENT" OF CANDAHAR—Question, Captain Aylmer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 648

IRELAND—MR. DAVITT—Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Callan, Colonel Makins; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 649

STATE OF IRELAND—ALLEGED ANARCHY—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Lord Randolph Churchill 652

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SIXTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January]:—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 65

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Synan*:)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill [Bill 45]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Anderson*) .. 706

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Healy*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee,"—(*Mr. Anderson*):—After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Callan*:)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *committed* to a Select Committee.

Married Women's Property Bill [Bill 50]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Hinde Palmer*) 714

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee,"—(*Mr. Hinde Palmer*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *committed* to a Select Committee.

MOTIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (NUMBER OF ELECTORS)—Motion for a Return, Sir Charles W. Dilke 715

Sligo Borough Re-Enfranchisement Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sexton, Mr. D. M. O'Connor, Major Nolan, Dr. Commins, Mr. T. P. O'Connor*) 715

Medical Appointments Qualifications Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Errington, Mr. Arthur Moore*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 60] 715

Maintenance of Children Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Thomasson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 59] 715

LORDS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 14.

ARMY—ARMY RETIREMENT—LORD MORLEY'S COMMITTEE—Question, Earl Beauchamp; Answer, The Earl of Morley 716

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION—Notice of Question, Earl Fortescue 716

IRELAND—LETTER OF H.H. THE POPE TO THE IRISH EPISCOPATE—Observations, Question, Lord Braye; Reply, Earl Granville .. 717

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 14.

Page

QUESTIONS.

Mines—Explosions in Mines—Appropriation of Relief Funds—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 718

Parochial Charities of the City of London—Legislation—Question Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 719

South Africa—Delagoa Bay—Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 719

Post Office—The Mails in Argyllshire—Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 720

Magistracy (Ireland) — Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 721

State of Ireland—Police Constable Quinn—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 721

State of Ireland—The Land League—Arrest of Members at Tralee—Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 722

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—The Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, Mr. Mundella 722

Navy—Murder of Lieutenant Bower and His Boat's Crew—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 722

Inspectors of Fisheries—Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 724

State of Ireland—Representations of Foreign Powers—Question, Mr. Biggar; Observations, Mr. Speaker 724

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—Adjourned Debate. [Seventh Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January]:—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 725

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 57, Noes 435; Majority 378.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 803

Original Question again proposed.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

Agrarian Offences (Ireland)—Motion for a Return, Mr. Sexton .. 807

Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Mundella*) 807

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill to revise the constitution of Endowed Schools and Hospitals in Scotland, *ordered* (*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 61.]

[*January* 14.] Page

OUTRAGES OTHER THAN AGRARIAN (IRELAND)—MOTION FOR A RETURN—
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return in continuation of Return [C. 2756], classifying the Outrages other than Agrarian Outrages enumerated in said Return, in the same way as Agrarian Outrages are classified in said Return,"—(*Mr. Parnell*) 809
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

OFFENCES OTHER THAN AGRARIAN (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 813

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (NUMBER OF ELECTORS)—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in force,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) .. 813
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—
Select Committee *appointed*, "to inquire into the Contagious Diseases Acts, 1866—1869, their Administration, Operation, and Effect:"—List of the Committee .. 814

Landed Proprietors (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Patrick Martin, Mr. Fay, Mr. Litton*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 63] 815

LORDS, MONDAY, JANUARY 17.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND)—THE GOVERNMENT BILLS—Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, Earl Granville:—Short debate thereon 815

Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord President*); read 1ª (No. 15) 831

COMMONS, MONDAY, JANUARY 17.

QUESTIONS.

AGRARIAN CRIME (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 832
SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—INSURRECTION OF THE BOERS—Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 832
MOROCCO—OUTRAGE AT TANGIERS—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 833
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 834
STATE OF IRELAND—AGRARIAN CRIME—Questions, Mr. Healy, Mr. Barry; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 834
TREATY OF BERLIN, ARTICLE 24—GREECE AND TURKEY—CIRCULAR OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 837
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—POWERS OF IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES—Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 838
STATE OF IRELAND—THE PROHIBITED MEETINGS OF THE LAND LEAGUE—Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Lalor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 838
INLAND REVENUE ACT, 1880—DRAWBACK ON MALT—Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 839

[*January* 17.] Pag

Brazil—Claims of British Subjects—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 84
State of Ireland—Prohibited Meeting in Westmeath—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 84
State of Ireland—Prohibited Meeting in Galway—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 84
Agrarian Crime (Ireland)—The Returns—Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 84
Prince Edward's Island—The Land Question—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 84
South Africa—The Zulu War—The Loyal Boers—Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 84
Parliamentary Procedure—Questions—Moving the Adjournment of the House — Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 84
State of Ireland—The Land League—Arrest of Members at Tralee —Question, Observations, Mr. Parnell; Reply, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 84
State of Ireland—Land League Meetings—Domiciliary Visits—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 846
State of Ireland — Threatening Letters — Questions, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 846
Turkey—Macedonia—The Albanian League—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 847
Merchant Shipping—The Statutes—Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 848
Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878—Question, Colonel Walrond; Answer, Mr. Dodson 848
State of Ireland—County of Donegal—Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 849
The Judicature Acts Commission—Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, The Attorney General 849
National Schools (Ireland) — Agriculture—Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 850
Law of Bail and Sheriff Courts (Scotland)—Legislation—Question, Mr. Henderson; Answer, The Solicitor General for Scotland .. 850
Egypt (Finance)—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 851
Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Municipal Elections—Question, Mr. A. Morley; Answer, The Attorney General 851
British Museum—Admission of the Public—Question, Mr. D. Grant; Answer, Mr. Walpole 852
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland)—Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 852
State of Ireland—Representation by Foreign Powers—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Question, Mr. O'Connor Power [No reply was given to this Question] 853
Law and Police—Case of Thomas Titley—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Courtney 854
Crime—Explosion at Salford Barracks—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Childers 854
Parliament — Public Business—Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 855
State of Ireland—Outrages in Cavan—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 855
Ireland—The State Trials—Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 856
The Rebecca Riots—Question, Mr. Lalor; Answer, Mr. Courtney .. 856

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [EIGHTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January]: —Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 857

Amendment proposed,

At the end thereof, to add the words "and humbly to pray Her Majesty to refrain from using the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in enforcing ejectments for non-payment of rent in Ireland, until the measures proposed to be submitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament,"—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Lalor:*) —After further short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 40, Noes 223; Majority 183.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—*Moved,* "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Molloy:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—MOTIONS ON THE PAPER—ABSENCE OF MEMBERS WHEN CALLED—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Speaker .. 933

Public Houses (Closing on Sunday) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Pease, Viscount Castlereagh*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 26] 933

LORDS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 18.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 18.

QUESTIONS.

TREATY OF BERLIN—MOBILIZATION OF THE GREEK ARMY—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff [No reply was given] 934

CHINA—THE CHEFOO CONVENTION—THE OPIUM TAX—Question, Mr. J. W. Pease; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 934

WATER SUPPLY (METROPOLIS)—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 935

STATE OF IRELAND—THE IRISH CONSTABULARY—Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 935

SOUTH AFRICA—CETEWAYO, LATE KING OF THE ZULUS—Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 937

IRELAND—THE SEEDS ACT, 1880—REPAYMENT OF SPECIAL RATES—Questions, Lord Claud Hamilton, Major Nolan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 938

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 939

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT, 1880—LOCK OUT OF MINERS—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Dodson 939

THE NAVY—ADMISSION OF BOYS FROM REFORMATORIES—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 940

[*January* 18.] Page

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—OFFICERS OF VOLUNTEERS—Question, Mr. Maclver; Answer, Mr. Childers 941
LAW AND POLICE—DETECTION OF CRIME—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 941
ARMY—OFFICERS OFF DUTY — UNIFORMS—Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Childers 942
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1880—LABOUR CERTIFICATES—Question, Mr. Rankin; Answer, Mr. Mundella 943
SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON—Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 943
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE (SCOTLAND)—Questions, Mr. Cochrane-Patrick, Mr. Pell; Answers, Mr. Mundella 944
COLLECTION OF CROWN RENTS—INCOME TAX, &c. (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Tottenham; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 945

MOTION.

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS—ORDERS OF THE DAY—
Moved, "That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty have precedence of Notices of Motions this day, and of the Orders of the Day appointed for To-morrow,"—(*The Marquess of Hartington*) 945
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [NINTH NIGHT]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January]:—Question again proposed, "That those words be there added:"—Debate *resumed* 947
After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 37, Noes 201; Majority 164.—(Div. List, No. 5.)
Original Question again proposed:—*Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Dawson:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

MOTIONS.

Universities (Scotland) (Voting) Bill—
Motion for Leave (*Mr. Lyon Playfair*) 993
Motion *agreed to:*—Bill to amend the manner of Voting in the Election of Members of Parliament for the Universities of Scotland, *ordered* (*Mr. Playfair, Mr. James Campbell, Mr. Orr Ewing, Sir David Wedderburn*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 69.]

Educational Endowments (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 65] .. 994

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19.

TREATY OF BERLIN—MOBILIZATION OF THE GREEK ARMY—Explanation of Answer Jan. 18, Sir Charles W. Dilke 994

[*January* 19.] Page

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [TENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January]: Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 995

Amendment proposed,

At the end thereof, to add the words "That we humbly pray Her Majesty to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session,"—(*Mr. Dawson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

Local Government Boundaries Bill—*Ordered* (*Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Pell, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Yorke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 70] .. 1023

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Peddie, Mr. O'Connor Power*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 71] 1023

LORDS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20.

QUESTIONS.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) ACT—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1024
IRELAND—THE CONSTABULARY—ARREST OF CHILDREN AT CASTLECOMER—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1024
CRIMINAL LAW—ASSAULTS UPON WOMEN AND CHILDREN—LEGISLATION—Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1025
LAW AND POLICE—FIRE AT THE CUSTOM HOUSE—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1025
COUNTY LUNATIC ASYLUMS—JOINT COUNTIES ASYLUM AT ABERGAVENNY—Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1026
POST OFFICE—THE NEW MONEY ORDERS—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1026
POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—TELEGRAPH CLERKS—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1028
NAVY—ADMISSION OF BOYS FROM WORKHOUSES—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1028
MEDICAL REFORM—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Mundella .. 1030
ARMY ORGANIZATION—REPORT OF LORD AIREY'S COMMITTEE—Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Mr. Childers 1030
CYPRUS—FLOODS AT LIMASSOL—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1031
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—GIPSY CHILDREN—Question, Mr. T. C. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1032
POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—TELEGRAPH CLERKS AT LIVERPOOL—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1032

[*January* 20.] *Page*

THE ALKALI ACTS—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Dodson 1033
POST OFFICE—RE-DIRECTED LETTERS—Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1033
SOUTH AFRICA—MILITARY OPERATIONS IN BASUTOLAND—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1034
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AMENDMENTS TO THE ADDRESS—Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Wilfrid Lawson 1034
INDIA—COMMITTEE ON MILITARY ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES—Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1036
TREATY OF BERLIN—TURKEY AND GREECE—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1037
AFGHANISTAN—THE BLUE BOOK—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1037
REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Dr. Lyons; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish .. 1038

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [ELEVENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January] 1038
After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "And we humbly assure Her Majesty that, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session,"—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 36, Noes 274; Majority 238.—(Div. List, No. 6.)

Original Question again proposed.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "and we humbly pray Her Majesty to guarantee to the people of Ireland their constitutional rights of public meeting,"—(*Mr. O'Kelly.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 34, Noes 173; Majority 139.—(Div. List, No. 7.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution:—List of the Committee 1061

Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) Bill [*Lords*]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Osborne Morgan*) 1062
Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

Judicial Committee Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 67]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 1062
Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

Augmentation of Benefices Acts Amendment Bill [*Lords*]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 1063
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

The Address in Answer to the Queen's Speech—Report—
Report of Address *brought up*, and read 1064
Moved, "That the Address be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Stuart Rendel.*)
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Address read a second time.

South Africa—Basutoland—Resolution—Amendment proposed,
At the end of the said Address, to add the words "And we humbly pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps, either by communication with the Government of Cape Colony, or by proposing mediation between the contending parties, to prevent further destruction of life and property in Basutoland,"—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) .. 1065
Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.
Address *agreed to*:—To be presented by Privy Councillors.

MOTIONS.

Supply—*Resolved*, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Ways and Means—*Resolved*, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Coroners (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Healy, Mr. Gray, Mr. Barry*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 73] 1090

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Macliver, Mr. Morley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 72] 1090

Printing—
Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the Printing executed by Order of this House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for Printing, Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of Motions made by Members of this House:—List of the Committee 1090

LORDS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21.

Ireland—Protection of Person and Property—Legislation—Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, Earl Granville 1091

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21.

QUESTIONS.

Criminal Law—Punishment of Whipping—Question, Mr. Pennington; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1096
State of Ireland—Public Meetings—Limerick Central Land League—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 1097
Board of Works (Ireland)—Killala Harbour—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1099

[*January* 21.] Page

NAVY—LIFEBOATS—THE HARWICH LIFEBOAT—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1099
POST OFFICE—FEE FOR "LATE POST"—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1100
MEXICO—DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1101
STATE OF IRELAND—COUNTY CLARE—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1101
STATE OF IRELAND—PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES—Questions, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gladstone .. 1102
INDIA—THE DISTURBANCES AT KOLAPORE—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1103
SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1103
LIFEBOATS—THE "ABRAHAM THOMAS"—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1104
IRELAND—DISTRESS—Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1105
CRIMINAL LAW—THE FIRE AT THE CUSTOM HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1106
POLICE ACT (METROPOLIS)—REMOVAL OF SNOW—Questions, Mr. H. Edwards, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 1106
STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATION OF COUNTY SLIGO—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1107
SUMMARY JURISDICTION ACT, 1879—RECOVERY OF SMALL DEBTS—Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1107
STATE OF IRELAND—PUBLIC MEETINGS—THE LIMERICK CENTRAL LAND LEAGUE—Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1108
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—NOTICE—Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1109

ORDER OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

SOUTH AFRICA—ANNEXATION OF THE TRANSVAAL—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is of opinion that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjustifiable, and would view with regret any measures taken by Her Majesty's Government with the object of enforcing British supremacy over the people of the Transvaal, who rightfully claim their national independence,"—(*Mr. Rylands*,)—instead thereof 1109

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 129, Noes 33; Majority 96.—(Div. List, No. 8.)

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Supply Committee upon *Monday* next.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE—Postponement of Resolution, Mr. Parnell 1172

TREATY OF BERLIN—ABANDONMENT OF CANDAHAR—Postponement of Resolution, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett 1173

Distress for Rent Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rendel, Mr. Gurdon*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 74] 1173

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, MONDAY, JANUARY 24.

Page

RIVERS CONSERVANCY AND FLOODS PREVENTION BILL—Questions, Earl Spencer, The Earl of Redesdale; Answers, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon, Earl Spencer 1173

ENDOWED INSTITUTIONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—BURNETT'S LITERARY FUND —THE PROVISIONAL ORDER—MOTION—
Moved to resolve, That this House doth disapprove of the Provisional Order made by the Secretary of State relating to Burnett's Literary Fund,—(*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) 1174
After short debate, on Question ? *agreed to*.

IRELAND (GRASS LANDS, &c.)—MOTION FOR A RETURN—
Moved for, "A Return showing the total areas of 'Grass Lands,' including Meadows and Pastures, and the total area of Tillage Lands, including all kinds of Crops and Fallows, in Ireland, for the years 1850, 1855, 1860, 1865, 1870, 1875, and 1880,"—(*The Lord Cloncurry*) 1183
Motion *agreed to*:—Return ordered to be laid before the House,—(*The Lord Cloncurry*.)

COMMONS, MONDAY, JANUARY 24.

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—THREATENING NOTICES—THE KING'S COUNTY—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1184
FISHING VESSELS (REGULATIONS AS TO LIGHTS)—Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1185
NAVY — H.M.S. "HOTSPUR" — Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1186
IRELAND—GRIFFITH'S VALUATION—Questions, Mr. Metge, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 1186
ENDOWED INSTITUTIONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—SCOTCH ENDOWMENTS—GORDON HOSPITAL PROVISIONAL ORDER—Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1187
EDUCATION (IRELAND)—ATHY MODEL SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Leahy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1187
INDIA—THE STANLEY COVENANTED ENGINEERS—Question, Mr. Litton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1188
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1189
INLAND REVENUE—RESTRICTIONS ON DISTILLING—Question, Mr. J. N. Richardson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1189
STATE OF IRELAND—MARYBOROUGH, QUEEN'S COUNTY—THE LAND LEAGUE —Question, Mr. Lalor; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland .. 1189
RETURN OF ELECTION CHARGES—Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1190
NEW ZEALAND—IMPRISONMENT OF NATIVES—Questions, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, Mr. Grant Duff 1191
STATE OF IRELAND—PROTESTANT MEETING AT DROGHEDA—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1191
STATE OF IRELAND—ARRESTS AT CASTLECOMER, CO. KILDARE—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1194
STATE OF IRELAND—LAW AND JUSTICE—TRIAL BY JUDGE—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1194
OFFICIAL STATISTICS COMMITTEE—THE REPORT—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1195
STATE OF IRELAND—DESTITUTION IN THE COUNTY OF WICKLOW—Question, Mr. W. Corbet; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1195
STATE OF IRELAND — FORCIBLE RE-ENTRY—KILFINANE, CO. LIMERICK—Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 1196

POST OFFICE—THE CITY AND COUNTY OF KILKENNY—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1197

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—SMOKING ROOM OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 1198

POST OFFICE—TRAVELLING POST OFFICES—Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1198

SOUTH AFRICA—INSURRECTION OF THE BOERS—THE 94TH REGIMENT—Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1199

SLAVE TRADE TREATIES WITH TURKEY AND EGYPT—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1199

RIGHT OF PUBLIC MEETING IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND—Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1200

THE LAND BILL (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. P. J. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1201

NAVY—NAVAL TRAINING BRIGS—Question, Mr. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1202

TURKEY AND GREECE—THE FRONTIER QUESTION—THE FRENCH CIRCULAR—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1202

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1203

PRISONS (ENGLAND) ACT, 1877—SCARBOROUGH PRISON—Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1203

PUBLIC MEETINGS (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1204

REMOVAL OF SNOW (METROPOLIS)—Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 1204

STATE OF IRELAND—COUNTY OF SLIGO—PROCLAIMED DISTRICTS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster.. 1205

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND) ACT—REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS—Questions, Mr. Callan, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 1206

ORDER—THE BLUE BOOKS—Question, Sir George Campbell [No reply was given] 1207

AGRICULTURAL DISTRESS—THE COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Spencer Walpole; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1207

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS *reported* .. 1207

MOTIONS.

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—

Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland,"—(*Mr. William Edward Forster*) 1208

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard,"—(*Dr. Lyons*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Labouchere*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

Lunacy Law Assimilation (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Litton, Mr. Findlater, Sir Thomas M'Clure*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 75] 1295

Corn Returns (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Ashley, Mr. Chamberlain*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 76] 1295

LORDS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 25.

Page

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR—LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA—Question, Observations, Lord Inchiquin, Lord Waveney; Reply, Viscount Enfield 1296

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JANUARY 25.

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND — THE POSTAL SERVICE — Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1298

INLAND REVENUE ACT, 1880 — DRAWBACK ON MALT — Question, Mr. Watney; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1299

NAVY — LIFEBOATS — THE HARWICH LIFEBOAT — Question, Mr. Thorold Rogers; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1300

STATE OF IRELAND — GRANARD, CO. LONGFORD—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1301

ADULTERATION OF FOOD ACT—COMPOUNDS RESEMBLING BUTTER—Questions, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain 1301

TREATY OF BERLIN — THE MONTENEGRIN BOUNDARY — Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1302

STATE OF IRELAND—DISTRESS IN LOUGHREA—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1303

ARMY—MEDAL FOR THE ZULU WAR—Question, Mr. O'Shea; Answer, Mr. Childers 1304

IRELAND—THE COLDSTREAM GUARDS—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1304

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR—LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA—Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 1305

TREATY OF WASHINGTON, 1854—THE FORTUNE BAY FISHERY DISPUTE—Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 1306

STATE OF IRELAND—AGRARIAN OFFENCES IN THE COUNTY LEITRIM—Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1307

JOINT STOCK BANKS—Question, Mr. Macliver; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1307

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—THE ORDER IN COUNCIL—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON OF THE EXCHEQUER—Question, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1308

IRELAND—THE DISTRESS IN THE KANTURK UNION—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1309

MINES (COAL) REGULATION ACT, 1872—THE PEN-Y-GRAIG EXPLOSION—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1309

INLAND REVENUE—COLLECTORS OF TAXES—Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1310

POST OFFICE—THE RECENT SNOW STORM—CONVEYANCE OF MAILS—Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1310

SOUTH AFRICA—ZULULAND—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff 1310

STATE OF IRELAND—LAW OF PUBLIC MEETINGS—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1311

AGRICULTURAL LEASES (IRELAND) — FORMS OF LEASES — Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 1312

STATE OF IRELAND—DISTRESS IN LOUGHREA—Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1312

POST OFFICE—RE-DIRECTED LETTERS—Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1312

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE REPORT—Question, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1313

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That the introduction and the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill and the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise order,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) 1313

After debate, Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SPEAKER having called to the attention of the House, that the hon. Member for Cavan had been repeatedly called to Order by him, and nevertheless insisted upon pursuing the same line of argument which Mr. Speaker had several times informed him was out of Order—Named Mr. Biggar as disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question put, "That Mr. Biggar be suspended from the service of the House during the remainder of this day's sitting,"—(*Mr. W. E. Forster*:)—Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 160, Noes 30; Majority 130. [B.M.]

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1349

Mr. SPEAKER then pointed out to Mr. Biggar that, in obedience to the vote of the House, he must now withdraw.

Mr. Biggar withdrew accordingly.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1350

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Healy*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 35, Noes 269; Majority 234.—(Div. List, No. 10.) [B.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1359

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Gray*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 34, Noes 277; Majority 243.—(Div. List, No. 11.) [11.55 B.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1366

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Byrne*:)—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 24, Noes 159; Majority 135.—(Div. List, No. 12.) [4.0 A.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1419

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Dillon*.)

Mr. SPEAKER having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Whereupon Mr. PLAYFAIR, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order. [5.55 A.M.]

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 21, Noes 125; Majority 104.—(Div. List, No. 13.) [9 A.M.]

[*January* 25.] Page

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—RESOLUTION—*continued.*

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1452

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.* [11.55 A.M.]

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed 1460

After debate, Main Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 251, Noes 33; Majority 218. [1.45 P.M. of Wednesday.]

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1485

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. William Ewart Gladstone:*)—Question put, and *agreed to.*

[House adjourned at five minutes after Two o'clock, P.M.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

ARMY—MAJOR NOLAN, R.A., M.P.—Question, The Duke of Montrose; Answer, The Earl of Morley 1487

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—RIOT AT DUNGANNON—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1488

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—ADVANCES FOR DRAINAGE WORKS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1489

CONVICT LABOUR—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1489

THE RECENT SNOW STORM—RAILWAY PASSENGERS—THE LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—Question, Mr. Cohen; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1490

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BOARD FEES—Question, Mr. Pugh; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1491

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — CLERICAL MAGISTRATES — Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1491

TREATY OF BERLIN—BULGARIA—THE VARNA RAILWAY COMPANY—Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 1492

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE 23—EUROPEAN PROVINCES OF TURKEY—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 1493

TURKEY AND GREECE—THE FRONTIER QUESTION—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1494

MINES (COAL) REGULATION ACT, 1872—THE PEN-Y-GRAIG COLLIERY EXPLOSION—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1494

THE ENDOWED SCHOOLS COMMISSIONERS—Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1494

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—ADVANCES FOR DRAINAGE WORKS—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1496

AFFAIRS OF INDIA—A ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1496

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—CASE OF DENIS MURPHY—Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1497

INDIA—THE COVENANTED AND UNCOVENANTED SERVICES OF INDIA—Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1498

[*January* 27.] Page

State of Ireland—Affray at Clareen, Holymount—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1499
Post Office (Ireland)—Telegraph Department—Question, Mr. Maurice Brooks; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1500
City of London—The Temple Bar Memorial—Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 1500
Mercantile Marine—Lifeboat Services—The Steamship "Rochester"—Question, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain .. 1502
State of Ireland—Land League Courts at Limerick—Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1502
Afghanistan—Retention of Candahar—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1503
Science and Art—South Kensington Museum—Question, Mr. Grey; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1504
The Recent Snow Storm—Removal of Snow (Metropolis)—Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1505
State of Ireland—Outrages in County Cork—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1505
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Questions, Mr. Duckham, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Mr. Mundella 1506
Post Office — Telegraphic Communication — Underground Wires—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1506
Post Office—Postal Orders—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. Fawcett 1507
Ireland—The State Trials—Questions, Mr. Greer, Mr. A. M. Sullivan; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1508
Agrarian Crime (Ireland)—The Returns—Questions, Mr. Dillon, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 1508

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—Adjourned Debate. [Second Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [24th January]:—Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed* 1510
After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. William Fowler*:)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.
After further debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Richard Power*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment Bill (*Lords*)—
Postponement of Committee (*Mr. Attorney General*) 1580
Committee *deferred* till *Thursday* next.

River Floods Prevention Bill [Bill 35]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Magniac*) .. 1580
After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Lord Randolph Churchill*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.
Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

Barristers' Admission (Ireland) Bill [Bill 54]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Callan*) .. 1586
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* 24th February.

[*January* 27.] *Page*

COMMONS—Select Committee *appointed:*—List of the Committee .. 1593

Licensing Act Amendment (Justices Disqualification) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Pugh, Sir Edward Reed, Mr. Rendel*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 77] .. 1593

LORDS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—REPULSE OF A BRITISH FORCE AT LAING'S NECK—Question, Earl Cadogan; Answer, The Earl of Kimberley 1594

AFGHANISTAN—CANDAHAR—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—
Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that Candahar with the dependent territory be constituted into an emporium of trade and commerce under British administration and government,—(*The Lord Waveney*) .. 1594
After debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn*.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—THE ORDER IN COUNCIL—THE BAR—OFFICES OF THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON—Petition presented, The Lord Chancellor .. 1622
Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—ANTI-LAND LEAGUE—PLACARD AT GLASGOW—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1622
ARMY—ISSUE OF BUCKSHOT—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Childers 1623
INLAND REVENUE—ILLICIT DISTILLATION (IRELAND)—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish 1623
STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—COMPULSORY SUBSCRIPTION—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster .. 1624
ARMY—SEPARATION OF MILITARY PRISONERS IN CIVIL PRISONS—Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1624
INDIA—RAILWAY TO QUETTA AND CANDAHAR—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1624
POST OFFICE—COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS, &C.—Questions, Mr. Bryce; Answers, Mr. Fawcett 1625
MADAGASCAR—CONFLICTING INTERESTS OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND—Question, Mr. H. Lee; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1626
AFGHANISTAN (SOUTHERN)—REPORTED FAMINE—Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1626
RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) AMENDMENT ACT, 1879—OUT-DOOR RELIEF—Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 1627
EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT, 1880—LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, Mr. Dodson .. 1627
CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ADVANCES—Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 1629
COAL MINES—RIOTS IN LANCASHIRE—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1630
BURIAL ACTS—CLOSE OF CHURCHYARDS—Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1631
STATE OF IRELAND—REFUSAL TO PAY POOR RATES AND PUBLIC CESS—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1631
PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—HOUSE OF COMMONS—MEMBERS' SMOKING ROOM—Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill, Dr. Lyons, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 1632

COMPANIES ACT, 1867—TRINITY COLLEGE, LONDON—Question, Mr. Edward Clarke; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1634

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—REPULSE OF A BRITISH FORCE — Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Ritchie, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Gill, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Childers, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Gladstone 1635

IRELAND—AGRARIAN CRIME—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1638

PRIVATE BILLS—RIVER THAMES BILL—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1638

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE REPORT—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1639

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—THE ORDER IN COUNCIL—OFFICES OF THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON—Statement, Mr. Gladstone 1639

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Protection of Person and Property (**Ireland**) **Bill**—ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [24th January]:—Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed* 1641

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Charles Lewis*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—EXCHEQUER BONDS.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That a sum, not exceeding £2,500,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to pay off and discharge Exchequer Bonds that will become due and payable during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1881.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next:—Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1881, the sum of £2,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next:—Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

Small Debts (**Limitation of Actions**) **Bill**—*Ordered* (*Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Sir Henry Wolff, Mr. Gorst*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 78] 1703

LORDS, MONDAY, JANUARY 31.

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR—MEMORANDUM OF LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA—Observations, Lord Waveney 1703

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—Question, Earl Cadogan; Answer, The Earl of Kimberley 1704

Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention Bill (No. 15)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 1704

After debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, MONDAY, JANUARY 31.

Page

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—"OBSTRUCTION"—Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1725

EDUCATION (IRELAND) — VAUGHAN'S ENDOWED SCHOOL — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1726

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. R. H. NOTTER—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1726

TUNIS—THE ENFIDA CASE—Questions, Mr. Montague Guest, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1727

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—ORDER IN COUNCIL JAN. 4, 1881—IMPORTATION OF IRISH CATTLE—Question, Mr. W. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1728

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS ACT, 1868—THE ELECTION COMMISSIONS—Question, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1729

STATE OF IRELAND—DISTRESS AT CASTLEBAR—Questions, Mr. Nelson, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster 1729

AFGHANISTAN (POLITICAL AFFAIRS)—NATIVE AGENTS AT CABUL—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1730

IRELAND—THE RECENT STATE TRIALS AT DUBLIN—Question, Mr. A. M. Sullivan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland 1731

STATE OF IRELAND—PRIVATE MEETINGS OF THE LAND LEAGUE—DOMICILIARY VISITS OF THE POLICE—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1732

CROWN PROPERTY—SPORTING RIGHTS UNDER CROWN LEASES—Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1733

ARMY—ARMY PAY DEPARTMENT—Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Childers 1733

AGRARIAN OFFENCES (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS — Questions, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Gladstone .. 1734

METROPOLIS—THE VESTRIES AND LOCAL BOARDS—REMOVAL OF THE SNOW—Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1734

TURKEY AND GREECE—REPRESENTATION OF THE POWERS AT THE PORTE—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1735

SCIENCE AND ART—THE ROBINSON COLLECTION AT SOUTH KENSINGTON—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1735

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL (MILITARY OPERATIONS) — THE RE-INFORCEMENTS—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Childers .. 1736

SPAIN—COMMERCIAL RELATIONS — THE DIFFERENTIAL DUTIES—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1739

IRELAND—INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS IN CONNEMARA—Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1739

STATE OF IRELAND—ALLEGED "BOYCOTTING" IN CORK—Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster 1739

BOILER EXPLOSIONS — EXPLOSION AT BATLEY — Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1740

COAL MINES—RIOT AT CLYDESLEY—Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1740

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1741

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—DECORATION OF THE CENTRAL HALL—Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1741

SCIENCE AND ART—THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY—Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1742

NAVY—H.M.S. "RUBY"—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1742

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) — PREMATURE CIRCULATION OF THE BILL—Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Speaker 1743

[*January* 31.] Page

Turkey and Greece—Action of Her Majesty's Government—Questions, Mr. Bourke, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1744

Business of the House—Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—An "All-Night Sitting"—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1745

Order—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell—Questions, Mr. A. M. Sullivan; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Parnell 1745

Army—Military Precautions—Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, Mr. Childers 1746

Order—State of Ireland—The Policy of the Government—Public Opinion—Notice of Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster 1747

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—Adjourned Debate [Fourth Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [24th January]:—Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—Debate *resumed* 1748

Tuesday, February 1.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Gabbett*) .. 1809

Mr. Speaker having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Whereupon Mr. Playfair, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order. [4.50 a.m. Tuesday, Feb. 1.]

Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 27, Noes 148; Majority 121. (Div. List, No. 15.) [6.30 a.m. Tuesday, Feb. 1.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1875

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Healy*) .. 1886

Mr. Speaker returned to the House, and resumed the Chair. [1.25 p.m. Tuesday, Feb. 1.]

Question of Privilege—

Objection being taken to the regularity of the Deputy Speaker leaving the Chair, based upon the terms of the Standing Order of the 20th July, 1855,—(*Mr. Parnell*) 1907

Mr. Speaker, under the present circumstances, did not consider that the Standing Order had any application.

Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 21, Noes 225; Majority 204.—(Div. List, No. 16.) [2.50 p.m. Tuesday, Feb. 1.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1915

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Daly:*)—Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 23, Noes 163; Majority 140.—(Div. List, No. 17.) [7.30 p.m. Tuesday, Feb. 1.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1932

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—continued.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Finigan*) .. 1938

Mr. Speaker having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Whereupon Mr. Playfair, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, again took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order. [11.35 P.M. Tuesday, Feb. 1.]

Wednesday, February 2.

Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 22, Noes 197; Majority 175. —(Div. List, No. 18.) [1.35 A.M. Wednesday, Feb. 2.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" 1973

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

After debate,

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present, [9 A.M. Wednesday, Feb. 2.]

At this time, Mr. Speaker returned to the House and resumed the Chair.

Mr. Speaker then informed the House of his intention to decline to call upon any more Members to speak, and at once proceed to put the Question from the Chair.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 164, Noes 19; Majority 145.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 2036

Main Question *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Gladstone, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 79.]

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Gladstone:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Then, after an unbroken Sitting of 41½ hours, House adjourned at half after Nine o'clock in the morning.

TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

LORDS.

NEW PEER.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1881.

The Right Hon. Edward Robert Lytton Lord Lytton, G.C.B., created Viscount Knebworth of Knebworth in the county of Hertford, and Earl of Lytton in the county of Derby.

SAT FIRST.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1881.

The Lord Clifford, after the death of his father.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

DURING RECESS—

For *Carnarvon County*, *v.* Charles James Watkin Williams, esquire, one of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice.

For *Clackmannan and Kinross Counties*, *v.* Right Hon. William Patrick Adam, Governor of the Presidency of Fort St. George, at Madras, in the East Indies.

For *Renfrew County*, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel William Mure, deceased.

For *Reading Borough*, *v.* George John Shaw Lefevre, esquire, First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings.

For *Kendal Borough*, *v.* John Whitwell, esquire, deceased.

For *Wexford Borough*, *v.* William Archer Redmond, esquire, deceased.

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1881.

For *Wigan*, *v.* James Ludovic Lindsay, commonly called Lord Lindsay, now Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, called up to the House of Peers as Baron Wigan.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20.

For *Edinburgh*, *v.* Duncan M'Laren, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

MONDAY, JANUARY 24.

For *New Ross*, *v.* Joseph William Foley, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1881.

Kendal—James Cropper, esquire.
Renfrew—Alexander Crum, esquire.
Reading—Right Hon. George John Shaw Lefevre.
Clackmannan and Kinross—John Blair Balfour, esquire.
Carnarvon County—William Rathbone, esquire.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 7.

Evesham—Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland, esquire.

MONDAY, JANUARY 10.

Wexford Borough—Timothy Michael Healy, esquire.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21.

Wigan—Francis Sharp Powell, esquire.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

Edinburgh City—John M'Laren, Lord Advocate of Scotland.

THE MINISTRY

Of the Right Honourable WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE,

At the Commencement of the Second Session of the 22nd Parliament,

January 6th, 1881.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury	Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Selborne.
President of the Council	Right Hon. Earl Spencer, K.G.
Lord Privy Seal	His Grace the Duke of Argyll, K.T.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. Sir William V. Harcourt.
Secretary of State, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Earl Granville, K.G.
Secretary of State for the Colonies	Right Hon. Earl of Kimberley.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers.
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Marquess of Hartington.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Earl of Northbrook.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	Right Hon. John Bright.
President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.
Chief Secretary for Ireland	Right Hon. W. E. Forster.
President of the Local Government Board	Right Hon. J. G. Dodson.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Postmaster General	Right Hon. Henry Fawcett.
Field Marshal Commanding in Chief	H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.
Chief Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	George John Shaw Lefevre, Esq., M.P.
Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education	Right Hon. A. J. Mundella.
Lords of the Treasury	Sir Arthur D. Hayter. John Holms, Esq. C. C. Cotes, Esq.
Lords of the Admiralty	Admiral Sir Astley Cooper Key, Vice Admiral Lord John Hay, Rear Admiral Anthony Hiley Hoskins, and T. Brassey, Esq, M.P.
Joint Secretaries of the Treasury	Lord F. Cavendish. Lord R. Grosvenor.
Secretary of the Admiralty	George Otto Trevelyan, Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Trade	Hon. Evelyn Ashley.
Secretary to the Local Government Board	John Tomlinson Hibbert, Esq.
Under Secretary, Home Department	Leonard H. Courtney, Esq.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department	Sir Charles W. Dilke.
Under Secretary for Colonies	Right Hon. M. E. Grant Duff.
Under Secretary for War	Earl of Morley.
Under Secretary for India	Right Hon. Viscount Enfield.
Paymaster General	Right Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Judge Advocate	Right Hon. George Osborne Morgan.
Attorney General	Sir Henry James.
Solicitor General	Sir Farrer Herschell.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	J. M'Laren, Esq.
Solicitor General	J. B. Balfour, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl Cowper, K.G.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord O'Hagan.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. W. E. Forster.
Attorney General	Right Hon. Hugh Law.
Solicitor General	W. M. Johnson, Esq.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon Earl Sydney.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl of Kenmare.
Master of the Horse	His Grace the Duke of Westminster.
Treasurer of the Household	Right Hon. Earl of Breadalbane.
Comptroller of the Household	Right Hon. Lord Kensington.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household	Right Hon. Lord Charles Bruce.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms	Right Hon. Earl of Fife.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard	Right Hon. Lord Monson.
Master of the Buckhounds	Right Hon. Earl of Cork.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal	Lord Alfred H. Paget.
Mistress of the Robes	Her Grace the Duchess of Bedford.

ROLL OF THE
LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

In the Second Session of the Twenty-Second Parliament of the
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

44° VICTORIÆ 1881.

Mem.—*According to the Usage of Parliament, when the House appoints a Select Committee, the Lords appointed to serve upon it are named in the Order of their Rank, beginning with the Highest; and so, when the House sends a Committee to a Conference with the Commons, the Lord highest in Rank is called first, and the rest go forth in like Order: But when the Whole House is called over for any Purpose within the House, or for the Purpose of proceeding forth to Westminster Hall, or upon any public Solemnity, the Call begins invariably with the Junior Baron.*

His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales.

His Royal Highness Alfred Ernest Albert Duke of Edinburgh.

His Royal Highness Arthur William Patrick Albert Duke of Connaught and Strathearn.

His Royal Highness George William Frederick Charles Duke of Cambridge.

Archibald Campbell Archbishop of Canterbury.

Roundell Lord Selborne, *Lord High Chancellor.*

William Archbishop of York.

John Poyntz Earl Spencer, *Lord President of the Council.*

George Douglas Lord Sundridge. (*Duke of Argyll.*) *Lord Privy Seal.*

Henry Duke of Norfolk, *Earl Marshal of England.*

Edward Adolphus Duke of Somerset.

Charles Henry Duke of Richmond.

William Henry Duke of Grafton.

Henry Charles Fitzroy Duke of Beaufort.

William Amelius Aubrey de Vere Duke of Saint Albans.

George Godolphin Duke of Leeds.

Francis Charles Hastings Duke of Bedford.

William Duke of Devonshire.

John Winston Duke of Marlborough.

Charles Cecil John Duke of Rutland.

William Alexander Louis Stephen Duke of Brandon. (*Duke of Hamilton.*)

William John Arthur Charles James Duke of Portland.

William Drogo Duke of Manchester.

Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of Newcastle.

Algernon George Duke of Northumberland.

His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale.

Arthur Richard Duke of Wellington.

Richard Plantagenet Campbell Duke of Buckingham and Chandos.

George Granville William Duke of Sutherland.

Harry George Duke of Cleveland.

Hugh Lupus Duke of Westminster.

John Marquess of Winchester.

Henry Charles Keith Marquess of Lansdowne.

John Villiers Stuart Marquess Townshend.

Robert Arthur Talbot Marquess of Salisbury.

John Alexander Marquess of Bath.

James Marquess of Abercorn. (*Duke of Abercorn.*)

Francis Hugh George Marquess of Hertford.

John Patrick Marquess of Bute.

William Alleyne Marquess of Exeter.

William Marquess of Northampton.

John Charles Marquess Camden.

Henry Marquess of Anglesey.

William Henry Hugh Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Ernest Augustus Charles Marquess of Ailesbury.

Frederick William John Marquess of Bristol.

Archibald Marquess of Ailsa.

George Augustus Constantine Marquess of Normanby.

George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon.

William Marquess of Abergavenny.

John Robert Earl Sydney, *Lord Steward of the Household.*

Charles Henry John Earl of Shrewsbury.

Edward Henry Earl of Derby.

Francis Power Plantagenet Earl of Huntingdon.

George Robert Charles Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.

William Reginald Earl of Devon.

Henry Charles Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire.

Rudolph William Basil Earl of Denbigh.

Francis William Henry Earl of Westmorland.

Montague Earl of Lindsey.

George Harry Earl of Stamford and Warrington.

George James Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.

George Philip Earl of Chesterfield.

John William Earl of Sandwich.

Arthur Algernon Earl of Essex.

William George Earl of Carlisle.

Walter Francis Earl of Doncaster. (*Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)

Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury.

———— Earl of Berkeley.

Montagu Earl of Abingdon.

Richard George Earl of Scarbrough.

George Thomas Earl of Albemarle.

George William Earl of Coventry.

Victor Albert George Earl of Jersey.

William Henry Earl Poulett.

Sholto John Earl of Morton. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Walter Henry Earl of Mar and Kellie. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Claude Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

George Earl of Haddington. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

David Graham Drummond Earl of Airlie. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Alexander Earl of Leven and Melville. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Dunbar James Earl of Selkirk. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Thomas Barnes Earl of Dundonald. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Sewallis Edward Earl Ferrers.

William Walter Earl of Dartmouth.

Charles Earl of Tankerville.

Heneage Earl of Aylesford.

Francis Thomas De Grey Earl Cowper.

Arthur Philip Earl Stanhope.

Thomas Augustus Wolstenholme Earl of Macclesfield.

Douglas Beresford Malise Ronald Earl Graham. (*Duke of Montrose.*)

William Frederick Earl Waldegrave.

Bertram Earl of Ashburnham.

Charles Wyndham Earl of Harrington.

Isaac Newton Earl of Portsmouth.

George Guy Earl Brooke and Earl of Warwick.

Augustus Edward Earl of Buckinghamshire.

William Thomas Spencer Earl Fitzwilliam.

Dudley Francis Earl of Guilford.

Charles Philip Earl of Hardwicke.

Henry Edward Earl of Ilchester.

Reginald Windsor Earl De La Warr.

Jacob Earl of Radnor.

John Poyntz Earl Spencer. (*In another Place as Lord President of the Council.*)

Allen Alexander Earl Bathurst.

Arthur Wills John Wellington Blundell Trumbull Earl of Hillsborough. (*Marquess of Downshire.*)

Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon.

William David Earl of Mansfield.

John James Hugh Henry Earl Strange. (*Duke of Atholl.*)

William Henry Earl of Mount Edgcumbe.

Hugh Earl Fortescue.

Henry Howard Molyneux Earl of Carnarvon.

George Henry Earl Cadogan.

James Howard Earl of Malmesbury.

John Vansittart Danvers Earl of Lanesborough. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Stephen Earl of Mount Cashell. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Henry John Reuben Earl of Portarlington. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Hugh Earl of Annesley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Earl of Erne. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Charles Francis Arnold Earl of Wicklow. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Henry Reginald Earl of Clonmell. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
George Charles Earl of Lucan. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Somerset Richard Earl of Belmore. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
James Earl of Caledon. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Francis Robert Earl of Rosslyn.
George Grimston Earl of Craven.
William Hillier Earl of Onslow.
Charles Earl of Romney.
Henry Thomas Earl of Chichester.
Thomas Earl of Wilton.
Edward James Earl of Powis.
Horatio Earl Nelson.
Lawrence Earl of Rosse. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Sydney William Herbert Earl Manvers.
Horatio Earl of Orford.
Henry Earl Grey.
St. George Henry Earl of Lonsdale.
Dudley Earl of Harrowby.
Henry Thynne Earl of Harewood.
William Hugh Earl of Minto.
Alan Frederick Earl Cathcart.
James Walter Earl of Verulam.
Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Earl Brownlow.
William Gordon Cornwallis Earl of Saint Germans.
Albert Edmund Earl of Morley.
Orlando George Charles Earl of Bradford.
Frederick Earl Beauchamp.
William Henry Hare Earl of Bantry. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Earl of Eldon.
Richard William Penn Earl Howe.
Charles Somers Earl Somers.
John Edward Cornwallis Earl of Stradbroke.
George Henry Robert Charles William Earl Vane. (*Marquess of Londonderry.*)
William Pitt Earl Amherst.
John Frederick Vaughan Earl Cawdor.
William George Earl of Munster.
Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of Camperdown.
Thomas George Earl of Lichfield.
John George Earl of Durham.
Granville George Earl Granville.
Henry Earl of Effingham.
Henry John Earl of Ducie.
Charles Alfred Worsley Earl of Yarborough.
James Henry Robert Earl Innes. (*Duke of Roxburghe.*)
Thomas William Earl of Leicester.
William Earl of Lovelace.
Lawrence Earl of Zetland.
Charles George Earl of Gainsborough.
Francis Charles Granville Earl of Ellesmere.
George Stevens Earl of Strafford.
William John Earl of Cottenham.
Henry Richard Charles Earl Cowley.
Archibald William Earl of Winton. (*Earl of Eglintoun.*)
William Earl of Dudley.
John Francis Stanley Earl Russell.
John Earl of Kimberley.
Richard Earl of Dartrey.
William Ernest Earl of Feversham.
Frederick Temple Earl of Dufferin.
John Robert Earl Sydney. (*In another Place as Lord Steward of the Household.*)
Henry George Earl of Ravensworth.
Edward Montagu Stuart Granville Earl of Wharncliffe.
Thomas George Earl of Northbrook.
Benjamin Earl of Beaconsfield.
John Thomas Earl of Redesdale
Hugh Mac Calmont Earl Cairns.
Edward Robert Lytton Earl of Lytton.
Edward Earl of Lathom.
George Watson Earl Sondes.

Robert Viscount Hereford.
William Henry Viscount Strathallan. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
Henry Viscount Bolingbroke and St. John.
Evelyn Viscount Falmouth.
George Viscount Torrington.
Charles William Viscount Leinster. (*Duke of Leinster.*)
Francis Wheler Viscount Hood.
Mervyn Viscount Powerscourt. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Viscount Lifford. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Edward Viscount Bangor. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Hayes Viscount Doneraile. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Cornwallis Viscount Hawarden. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Edward Leveson Viscount St. Vincent.
Robert Viscount Melville.
William Wells Viscount Sidmouth.
George Frederick Viscount Templetown. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Campbell Viscount Gordon. (*Earl of Aberdeen.*)
Edward Fleetwood John Viscount Exmouth.
John Luke George Viscount Hutchinson. (*Earl of Donoughmore.*)
Richard Somerset Viscount Clancarty. (*Earl of Clancarty.*)
Wellington Henry Viscount Combermere.
Henry Charles Viscount Canterbury.
Rowland Clegg Viscount Hill.
Charles Stewart Viscount Hardinge.
George Stephens Viscount Gough.
Charles Viscount Eversley.
Charles Viscount Halifax.
Alexander Nelson Viscount Bridport.
Edward Berkeley Viscount Portman.
Edward Viscount Cardwell.
Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook.
Robert Viscount Sherbrooke.

John Bishop of London.
Joseph Barber Bishop of Durham.
Edward Harold Bishop of Winchester.
Alfred Bishop of Llandaff.
Robert Bishop of Ripon.
John Thomas Bishop of Norwich.
James Colquhoun Bishop of Bangor.
Henry Bishop of Worcester.
Charles John Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
William Bishop of Chester.
Thomas Legh Bishop of St. Albans.
James Bishop of Hereford.
William Connor Bishop of Peterborough.
Christopher Bishop of Lincoln.
George Bishop of Salisbury.
Harvey Bishop of Carlisle.
Frederick Bishop of Exeter
Arthur Charles Bishop of Bath and Wells.
John Fielder Bishop of Oxford.
James Bishop of Manchester.
Richard Bishop of Chichester.
Joshua Bishop of St. Asaph.
James Russell Bishop of Ely.
William Basil Bishop of St. David's.

Valentine Augustus Lord Kenmare. (*Earl of Kenmare*), *Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*
Dudley Charles Lord de Ros.
Alfred Joseph Lord Mowbray.
George Manners Lord Hastings.
Edward Southwell Lord de Clifford.
Thomas Crosby William Lord Dacre.
Charles Henry Rolle Lord Clinton.
Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord Zouche of Haryngworth.
Charles Edward Hastings Lord Botreaux. (*Earl of Loudoun.*)
Thomas Lord Camoys.
Henry Lord Beaumont.
Henry Lord Willoughby de Broke.
Sackville George Lord Conyers.
George Lord Vaux of Harrowden.
Ralph Gordon Lord Wentworth.
Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord Braye.
Robert George Lord Windsor.
St. Andrew Lord St. John of Bletso.
Frederick George Lord Howard de Walden.
William Bernard Lord Petre.
Frederick Benjamin Lord Saye and Sele.
John Francis Lord Arundell of Wardour.
John Stuart Lord Clifton. (*Earl of Darnley.*)
John Baptist Joseph Lord Dormer.
George Henry Lord Teynham.
Henry Valentine Lord Stafford.
George Frederick William Lord Byron.
Lewis Henry Hugh Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.
William Coutts Lord Ashford.
Horace Courtenay Lord Forbes. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
Alexander Lord Saltoun. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
William Buller Fullerton Lord Elphinstone. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
Cunninghame Lord Borthwick. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Charles Lord Blantyre. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
Charles John Lord Colville of Culross. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
Alexander Hugh Lord Balfour of Burley. (*Elected for Scotland.*)
Richard Edmund Saint Lawrence Lord Boyle. (*Earl of Cork and Orrery.*)
George Lord Hay. (*Earl of Kinnoul.*)
Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord Middleton.
William John Lord Monson.
Frederick George Brabazon Lord Ponsonby. (*Earl of Bessborough.*)
Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord Scarsdale.
George Florance Lord Boston.
Charles George Lord Lovel and Holland. (*Earl of Egmont.*)
Augustus Henry Lord Vernon.
Edward St. Vincent Lord Digby.
George Douglas Lord Sundridge. (*Duke of Argyll.*) (*In another Place as Lord Privy Seal.*)
Edward Henry Julius Lord Hawke.
Henry Thomas Lord Foley.
Arthur de Cardonnel Lord Dinevor.
Thomas Lord Walsingham.
William Lord Bagot.
Charles Henry Lord Southampton.
John Richard Brinsley Lord Grantley.
George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord Rodney.
William Lord Berwick.
James Henry Legge Lord Sherborne.
John Henry De La Poer Lord Tyrone. (*Marquess of Waterford.*)
Henry Bentinck Lord Carleton. (*Earl of Shannon.*)
Charles Lord Suffield.
Dudley Wilmot Lord Dorchester.
Lloyd Lord Kenyon.
Charles Cornwallis Lord Braybrooke.
William Archer Lord Amherst.
George Hamilton Lord Fisherwick. (*Marquess of Donegal.*)
Henry Charles Lord Gage. (*Viscount Gage.*)
Thomas John Lord Thurlow.
William George Lord Auckland.
Charles George Lord Lyttelton.
Henry George Lord Mendip. (*Viscount Clifden.*)
George Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart. (*Earl of Moray.*)
Alan Plantagenet Lord Stewart of Garlies. (*Earl of Galloway.*)
James George Henry Lord Saltersford. (*Earl of Courtown.*)
William Lord Brodrick. (*Viscount Midleton.*)
Frederick Henry William Lord Calthorpe.
Peter Robert Lord Gwydir.
Charles Robert Lord Carrington.
William Henry Lord Bolton.
George Lord Northwick.
Thomas Lyttleton Lord Lilford.
Thomas Lord Ribblesdale.
Edward Lord Dunsany. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Theobald Fitz-Walter Lord Dunboyne. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Edward Donough Lord Inchiquin. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Thomas William Lord Massy. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Robert Lord Clonbrock. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Edward Henry Churchill Lord Crofton. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Dayrolles Blakeney Lord Ventry. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Henry Francis Seymour Lord Moore. (*Marquess of Drogheda.*)
John Henry Wellington Graham Lord Loftus. (*Marquess of Ely.*)
William Lord Carysfort. (*Earl of Carysfort.*)
George Ralph Lord Abercromby.
Charles Edmund Lord Ellenborough.
Augustus Frederick Arthur Lord Sandys
Henry North Lord Sheffield. (*Earl of Sheffield.*)
John Cadwallader Lord Erskine.
George John Lord Monteagle. (*Marquess of Sligo.*)
George Arthur Hastings Lord Granard. (*Earl of Granard.*)
Hungerford Lord Crewe.
Alan Legge Lord Gardner.
John Thomas Lord Manners.
John Adrian Louis Lord Hopetoun. (*Earl of Hopetoun.*)
Richard Lord Castlemaine. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Charles Lord Meldrum. (*Marquess of Huntly.*)
George Frederick Lord Ross. (*Earl of Glasgow.*)
William Willoughby Lord Grinstead. (*Earl of Enniskillen.*)
William Hale John Charles Lord Foxford. (*Earl of Limerick.*)
Francis George Lord Churchill.
George Robert Canning Lord Harris.
Reginald Charles Edward Lord Colchester.

Schomberg Henry Lord Ker. (*Marquess of Lothian.*)
George Henry Lord Minster. (*Marquess Conyngham.*)
James Edward William Theobald Lord Ormonde. (*Marquess of Ormonde.*)
Francis Lord Wemyss. (*Earl of Wemyss.*)
John Strange Lord Clanbrassill. (*Earl of Roden.*)
William Lygon Lord Silchester. (*Earl of Longford.*)
Clotworthy John Eyre Lord Oriel. (*Viscount Massereene.*)
Hugh Lord Delamere.
George Cecil Weld Lord Forester.
John William Lord Rayleigh.
Edric Frederic Lord Gifford.
Hubert George Lord Somerhill. (*Marquess of Clanricarde.*)
James Ludovic Lord Wigan. (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.*)
Uchter John Mark Lord Ranfurly. (*Earl of Ranfurly.*)
George Lord De Tabley.
Charles Stuart Aubrey Lord Tenterden.
William Conyngham Lord Plunket.
William Henry Ashe Lord Heytesbury.
Archibald Philip Lord Rosebery. (*Earl of Rosebery.*)
Richard James Lord Clanwilliam. (*Earl of Clanwilliam.*)
William Draper Mortimer Lord Wynford.
William Henry Lord Kilmarnock. (*Earl of Erroll.*)
Arthur James Lord Fingall. (*Earl of Fingall.*)
William Philip Lord Sefton. (*Earl of Sefton.*)
Robert Bermingham Lord Clements. (*Earl of Leitrim.*)
Thomas Lord Kenlis. (*Marquess of Headfort.*)
William Lord Chaworth. (*Earl of Meath.*)
Charles Adolphus Lord Dunmore. (*Earl of Dunmore.*)
Augustus Frederick George Warwick Lord Poltimore.
Edward Mostyn Lord Mostyn.
Henry Spencer Lord Templemore.
Valentine Frederick Lord Cloncurry.
John St. Vincent Lord De Saumarez.
Lucius Bentinck Lord Hunsdon. (*Viscount Falkland.*)
Thomas Lord Denman.
William Frederick Lord Abinger.
Philip Lord De L'Isle and Dudley.
Alexander Hugh Lord Ashburton.
Edward Richard Lord Hatherton.
George Henry Charles Lord Strafford.
Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord Worlingham. (*Earl of Gosford.*)
William Frederick Lord Stratheden.
Geoffrey Dominick Augustus Frederick Lord Oranmore and Browne. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Simon Lord Lovat.
William Bateman Lord Bateman.
James Molyneux Lord Charlemont. (*Earl of Charlemont.*)
Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord Kintore. (*Earl of Kintore.*)
George Ponsonby Lord Lismore. (*Viscount Lismore.*)
Derrick Warner William Lord Rossmore.
Robert Shapland Lord Carew.
Charles Frederick Ashley Cooper Lord De Mauley.
Arthur Lord Wrottesley.
Charles Douglas Richard Lord Sudeley.
Frederick Henry Paul Lord Methuen.
Henry Edward John Lord Stanley of Alderley.
William Henry Lord Leigh.
Beilby Lord Wenlock.
Charles Lord Lurgan.
Thomas Spring Lord Monteagle of Brandon.
James Lord Seaton.
Edward Arthur Wellington Lord Keane.
John Lord Oxenfoord. (*Earl of Stair.*)
Charles Crespigny Lord Vivian.
John Lord Congleton.
Denis St. George Lord Dunsandle and Clanconal. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Victor Alexander Lord Elgin. (*Earl of Elgin and Kincardine.*)
William Henry Forester Lord Londesborough.
Samuel Jones Lord Overstone.
Charles Robert Claude Lord Truro.
Arthur Lord De Freyne.
Edward Burtenshaw Lord Saint Leonards.
Richard Henry Fitz-Roy Lord Raglan.
Gilbert Henry Lord Aveland.
Valentine Augustus Lord Kenmare. (*Earl of Kenmare.*) (*In another Place as Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*)
Richard Bickerton Pemell Lord Lyons

Edward Lord Belper.
James Lord Talbot de Malahide.
Robert Lord Ebury.
Alexander William George Lord Skene. (*Earl Fife.*)
William George Lord Chesham.
Frederic Augustus Lord Chelmsford.
John Lord Churston.
John Charles Lord Strathspey. (*Earl of Seafield.*)
Henry Lord Leconfield.
William Tatton Lord Egerton.
Godfrey Charles Lord Tredegar.
Fitz Patrick Henry Lord Lyveden.
William Lord Brougham and Vaux.
Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord Kinnaird.
Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord Westbury.
Francis William Fitzhardinge Lord Fitzhardinge.
Luke George Lord Annaly.
Richard Monckton Lord Houghton.
William Lord Romilly.
James Lord Barrogill. (*Earl of Caithness.*)
Thomas Lord Clermont.
James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord Meredyth. (*Lord Athlumney.*)
Windham Thomas Lord Kenry. (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Charles Stanley Lord Monck. (*Viscount Monck.*)
John Major Lord Hartismere. (*Lord Henniker.*)
Hedworth Hylton Lord Hylton.
Hugh Henry Lord Strathnairn.
Edward Gordon Lord Penrhyn.
Gustavus Russell Lord Brancepeth. (*Viscount Boyne.*)
John Henry Lord Kesteven.
John Lord Ormathwaite.
William Lord O'Neill.
Robert Cornelis Lord Napier.
Jenico William Joseph Lord Gormanston. (*Viscount Gormanston.*)
William Page Lord Hatherley.
John Hamilton Lord Lawrence.
James Plaisted Lord Penzance.
John Lord Dunning. (*Lord Rollo.*)
James Lord Balinhard. (*Earl of Southesk.*)
William Lord Hare. (*Earl of Listowel.*)
Edward George Lord Howard of Glossop.
John Lord Castletown.
John Emerich Edward Lord Acton.
Thomas James Lord Robartes.
George Grenfell Lord Wolverton.
Fulke Southwell Lord Greville.
Thomas Lord O'Hagan.
William Lord Sandhurst.
Frederic Lord Blachford.
Francis Lord Ettrick. (*Lord Napier.*)
John Lord Hanmer.
Roundell Lord Selborne. (*In another Place as Lord High Chancellor.*)
Gavin Lord Breadalbane. (*Earl of Breadalbane.*)
James Charles Herbert Welbore Ellis Lord Somerton. (*Earl of Normanton.*)
Robert Alexander Shafto Lord Waveney.
Henry Austin Lord Aberdare.
James Lord Moncreiff.
John Duke Lord Coleridge.
William Lord Emly.
Chichester Samuel Lord Carlingford.
Thomas Francis Lord Cottesloe.
Edmund Lord Hammond.
John Slaney Lord Hampton.
John Lord Winmarleigh.
Cospatrick Alexander Lord Douglas. (*Earl of Home.*)
John William Lord Ramsay. (*Earl of Dalhousie.*)
Arthur Edward Holland Grey Lord Grey de Radcliffe.
John Lord Fermanagh. (*In another Place as Earl of Erne.*)
William Richard Lord Harlech.
Henry Gerard Lord Alington.
John Lord Tollemache.
Robert Tolver Lord Gerard.
Mortimer Lord Sackville.
Colin Lord Blackburn. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)
Richard Lord Airey.
Charles Bowyer Lord Norton.
George William Lord Shute. (*Viscount Barrington.*)
William Lord Watson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)
Lawrence Lord Haldon.
Ivor Bertie Lord Wimborne.
Arthur Edward Lord Ardilaun.
Alexander Dundas Ross Lord Lamington.
Charles Frederick Lord Donington.
Arthur Edwin Lord Trevor.
Montagu William Lord Rowton.
William Francis Lord Mount-Temple.
Edward Hugessen Lord Brabourne.

LIST OF THE COMMONS.

THE NAMES OF MEMBERS

Returned to serve in the Twenty-second Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, summoned to meet at Westminster the Twenty-ninth Day of April, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty, as by the several Returns filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery appears: amended to the Opening of the Second Session on the 6th Day of January, 1881.

BEDFORD COUNTY.

James Howard,
Marquess of Tavistock.

BEDFORD.

Samuel Whitbread,
Charles Magniac.

BERKS COUNTY.

Robert James Loyd-Lindsay,
Philip Wroughton,
John Walter.

READING.

George Palmer,
George John Shaw Lefevre.

WINDSOR (NEW).

Robert Richardson Gardner.

WALLINGFORD.

Pandeli Ralli.

ABINGDON.

John Creemer Clarke.

BUCKINGHAM COUNTY.

Sir Robert Bateson Harvey, bt.,
Hon. Thomas Francis Fremantle,
Hon. Rupert Clement George Carington.

AYLESBURY.

Sir Nathaniel Mayer de Rothschild, bt.,
George William Erskine Russell.

BUCKINGHAM.

Sir Harry Verney, bt.

MARLOW (GREAT).

Owen Lewis Cope Williams.

WYCOMBE (CHEPPING).

Hon. William Henry Peregrine Carington.

CAMBRIDGE COUNTY.

Rt. hon. Henry Bouverie William Brand,
Benjamin Bridges Hunter Rodwell,
Edward Hicks.

CAMBRIDGE (UNIVERSITY).

Rt. hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole,
Alexander James Beresford Beresford-Hope.

CAMBRIDGE.

William Fowler,
Hugh Shield.

CHESTER.

(East Cheshire.)

William Cunliffe Brooks,
William John Legh.

(Mid Cheshire.)

Hon. Wilbraham Egerton,
Piers Egerton Warburton.

(West Cheshire.)

Sir Philip de Malpas Grey Egerton, bt.,
Hon. Wilbraham Frederick Tollemache.

MACCLESFIELD.

William Hoare Brocklehurst,
David Chadwick.

STOCKPORT.

Charles Henry Hopwood,
Frederick Pennington.

BIRKENHEAD.

David Mac Iver.

CHESTER.

Rt. hon. John George Dodson,
Hon. Beilby Lawley.

CORNWALL COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)

Hon. Thomas Charles Agar-Robartes,
William Copeland Borlase.

(Western Division.)

Sir John St. Aubyn, bt.,
Arthur Pendarves Vivian.

TRURO.

Sir James Macnaghten M'Garel-Hogg, bt.,
Edward William Brydges Willyams.

PENRYN AND FALMOUTH.

David James Jenkins,
Reginald Baliol Brett.

BODMIN.

Hon. Edward Frederic Leveson-Gower.

LAUNCESTON.

Sir Hardinge Stanley Giffard, knt.

LISKEARD.

Leonard Henry Courtney.

HELSTON.

Walter Napleton Molesworth St. Aubyn.

ST. IVES.

Sir Charles Reed, knt.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)

Sir Richard Courtenay Musgrave, bt.,
Edward Stafford Howard

(Western Division.)

David Ainsworth,
Hon. Percy Scawen Wyndham

CARLISLE.
Robert Ferguson,
Sir Wilfrid Lawson, bt.

COCKERMOUTH.
Edward Waugh.

WHITEHAVEN.
Rt. hon. George Augustus Frederick Cavendish Bentinck.

DERBY COUNTY.

(North Derbyshire.)
Lord Edward Cavendish,
John Frederick Cheetham.

(South Derbyshire.)
Sir Henry Wilmot, bt.,
Thomas William Evans.

(East Derbyshire.)
Alfred Barnes,
Hon. Francis Egerton.

DERBY.
Michael Thomas Bass,
Rt. Hon. Sir William George Grenville Venables Vernon Harcourt.

DEVON COUNTY.

(North Devonshire.)
Rt. hon. Sir Stafford Henry Northcote, bt.,
Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, bt.

(East Devonshire.)
Sir John Henry Kennaway, bt.,
William Hood Walrond.

(South Devonshire.)
Sir Massey Lopes, bt.,
John Carpenter Garnier.

TIVERTON.
Sir John Heathcoat Heathcote-Amory, bt.,
Rt. hon. William Nathaniel Massey.

PLYMOUTH.
Peter Stewart Macliver,
Edward George Clarke.

BARNSTAPLE.
Sir Robert Walter Carden, knt.,
Viscount Lymington.

DEVONPORT.
John Henry Puleston,
George Edward Price.

TAVISTOCK.
Lord Arthur Russell.

EXETER.
Edward Johnson,
Henry Stafford Northcote.

DORSET COUNTY.
Hon. William Henry Berkeley Portman,
John Floyer,
Hon. Edward Henry Trafalgar Digby.

WEYMOUTH AND MELCOMBE REGIS.
Henry Edwards,
Sir Frederick John William Johnstone, bt.

DORCHESTER.
William Ernest Brymer.

BRIDPORT.
Charles Nicholas Warton.

SHAFTESBURY.
Hon. Sidney Carr Glyn.

WAREHAM.
Montague John Guest.

POOLE.
Charles Schreiber.

DURHAM COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)
John Joicey,
Charles Mark Palmer.

(Southern Division.)
Joseph Whitwell Pease,
Hon. Frederick William Lambton.

DURHAM (CITY).
Thomas Charles Thompson,
Sir Farrer Herschell, knt.

SUNDERLAND.
Edward Temperley Gourley,
Sir Henry Marshman Havelock Allan, bt.

GATESHEAD.
Walter Henry James.

SHIELDS (SOUTH).
James Cochran Stevenson.

DARLINGTON.
Theodore Fry.

HARTLEPOOL.
Thomas Richardson.

STOCKTON.
Joseph Dodds.

ESSEX COUNTY.

(West Essex.)
Sir Henry John Selwin-Ibbetson, bt.,
Lord Eustace Cecil.

ESSEX COUNTY—*cont.*

(East Essex.)
James Round,
Samuel Brise Ruggles-Brise.

(South Essex.)
Thomas Charles Baring,
William Thomas Makins.

COLCHESTER.
Richard Knight Causton,
William Willis.

MALDON.
George Courtauld.

HARWICH.
Sir Henry Whatley Tyler, knt.

GLOUCESTER COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)
Rt. hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, bt.,
John Reginald Yorke.

(Western Division.)
Robert Nigel Fitzhardinge Kingscote,
Lord Moreton.

STROUD.
Walter John Stanton,
Henry Robert Brand.

TEWKESBURY.
Richard Biddulph Martin.

CIRENCESTER.
Thomas William Chester Master.

CHELTENHAM.
Charles Conrad Adolphus du Bois de Ferrieres

GLOUCESTER.
Thomas Robinson,
Charles James Monk.

HEREFORD COUNTY.
Sir Joseph Russell Bailey, bt.,
Michael Biddulph,
Thomas Duckham.

HEREFORD.
Joseph Pulley,
Robert Threshie Reid.

LEOMINSTER.
James Rankin.

HERTFORD COUNTY.

Abel Smith,
Hon. Henry Frederick Cowper,
Thomas Frederick Halsey.

HERTFORD.

Arthur James Balfour.

HUNTINGDON COUNTY.

William Henry Fellowes,
Lord Douglas Gordon.

HUNTINGDON.

Viscount Hinchingbrook.

KENT COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)

Aretas Akers Douglas,
Edward Leigh Pemberton.

(West Kent.)

Sir Charles Henry Mills, bt.,
Viscount Lewisham.

(Mid Kent.)

Sir William Hart Dyke, bt.,
Sir Edmund Filmer.

ROCHESTER.

Arthur Otway,
Roger Leigh.

MAIDSTONE.

Alexander Henry Ross,
John Evans Freke Aylmer.

GREENWICH.

Thomas William Boord,
Baron Henry de Worms.

CHATHAM.

John Eldon Gorst.

GRAVESEND.

Sir Sydney Hedley Waterlow, bt.

CANTERBURY.

Hon. Alfred Erskine Gathorne-Hardy,
Robert Peter Laurie.

LANCASTER COUNTY.

(North Lancashire.)

Randle Joseph Feilden,
Rt. Hon. Frederick Arthur Stanley.

(North-east Lancashire.)

Marquess of Hartington,
Frederick William Grafton.

(South-east Lancashire.)

William Agnew,
Robert Leake.

LANCASTER COUNTY—*cont.*

(South-west Lancashire.)

Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Assheton Cross,
John Ireland Blackburn.

LIVERPOOL.

Right hon. Viscount Sandon,
Edward Whitley,
Lord Claud John Hamilton.

MANCHESTER.

John Slagg,
Jacob Bright,
Hugh Birley.

PRESTON.

Edward Hermon,
Sir John Holker, knt.

WIGAN.

Thomas Knowles,
Francis Sharp Powell.

BOLTON.

John Kynaston Cross,
John Pennington Thomasson.

BLACKBURN.

William Edward Briggs,
William Coddington.

OLDHAM.

John Tomlinson Hibbert,
Hon. Edward Lyulph Stanley.

SALFORD.

Benjamin Armitage,
Robert Arthur Arnold.

CLITHEROE.

Lieutenant Richard Fort.

ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE.

Hugh Mason.

BURY.

Robert Needham Philips.

ROCHDALE.

Thomas Bayley Potter.

WARRINGTON.

John Gordon McMinnies.

BURNLEY.

Peter Rylands.

STALEYBRIDGE.

William Summers.

LEICESTER COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

Rt. hon. Lord John Manners,
Edwyn Sherard Burnaby.

(Southern Division.)

Thomas Tertius Paget,
Albert Pell.

LEICESTER.

Peter Alfred Taylor,
Alexander M'Arthur.

LINCOLN COUNTY.

(North Lincolnshire.)

Robert Laycock,
Rowland Winn.

(Mid Lincolnshire.)

Henry Chaplin,
Hon. Edward Stanhope.

(South Lincolnshire.)

John Compton Lawrance,
Sir William Earle Welby-Gregory, bt.

GRANTHAM.

John William Mellor,
Charles Savile Roundell.

BOSTON.

Thomas Garfit,
William James Ingram.

STAMFORD.

Marston Clarke Buszard.

GRIMSBY (GREAT).

Edward Heneage.

LINCOLN.

Charles Seely,
John Hinde Palmer.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY.

Rt. Hon. Lord George Francis Hamilton,
Octavius Edward Coope.

WESTMINSTER.

Sir Charles Russell, bt.,
Rt. Hon. William Henry Smith.

TOWER HAMLETS.

James Bryce,
Charles Thomson Ritchie.

HACKNEY.

Rt. Hon. Henry Fawcett,
John Holms.

FINSBURY.

Sir Andrew Lusk, bt.,
William Torrens M'Cullagh Torrens.

MARYLEBONE.

Sir Thomas Chambers, knt.,
Daniel Grant.

CHELSEA.

Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, bt.,
Joseph Firth Bottomley Firth.

LONDON (UNIVERSITY).

Sir John Lubbock, bt.

LONDON.

William James Richmond Cotton,
Robert Nicholas Fowler,
Rt. hon. John Gellibrand Hubbard,
William Lawrence.

MONMOUTH COUNTY.

Hon. Frederick Courtenay Morgan,
John Allan Rolls.

MONMOUTH.

Edward Hamer Carbutt.

NORFOLK COUNTY.

(West Norfolk.)

William Amhurst Tyssen Amherst,
George William Pierrepont Bentinck.

(North Norfolk.)

Sir Edmund Henry Knowles Lacon, bt.,
Edward Birkbeck.

(South Norfolk.)

Sir Robert Jacob Buxton, bt.
Robert Thornhagh Gurdon.

LYNN REGIS.

Sir William Hovell Browne Ffolkes, bt.,
Hon. Robert Bourke.

NORWICH.

Jeremiah James Colman,
Jacob Henry Tillett.

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

Hon. Charles Robert Spencer,
Lord Burghley.

(Southern Division.)

Sir Rainald Knightley, bt.,
Fairfax William Cartwright.

PETERBOROUGH.

Hon. William John Wentworth Fitzwilliam,
George Hampden Whalley.

NORTHAMPTON.

Henry Labouchere,
Charles Bradlaugh.

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

Rt. hon. Henry George (Percy) Earl Percy,
Sir Matthew White Ridley, bt.

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY—*cont.*

(Southern Division.)

Albert Henry George Grey,
Wentworth Blackett Beaumont.

MORPETH.

Thomas Burt.

TYNEMOUTH.

Thomas Eustace Smith.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Joseph Cowen,
Ashton Wentworth Dilke.

BERWICK-UPON-TWEED.

Sir Dudley Coutts Marjoribanks, bt.,
David Milne Home.

NOTTINGHAM COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

Cecil George Savile Foljambe,
Viscount Galway.

(Southern Division.)

George Storer,
Thomas Blackborne Thoroton Hildyard.

NEWARK-UPON-TRENT.

Thomas Earp,
William Newzam Nicholson.

RETFORD (EAST).

Francis John Savile Foljambe,
Frederick Thorpe Mappin.

NOTTINGHAM.

Charles Seely, jun.,
Arnold Morley.

OXFORD COUNTY.

John Sidney North,
William Cornwallis Cartwright,
Edward William Harcourt.

OXFORD (UNIVERSITY).

Rt. hon. John Robert Mowbray,
John Gilbert Talbot.

OXFORD (CITY).

Joseph William Chitty,
Alexander William Hall.

WOODSTOCK.

Lord Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill.

BANBURY.

Bernhard Samuelson.

RUTLAND COUNTY.

Rt. hon. Gerard James Noel,
George Henry Finch.

SALOP COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

Viscount Newport,
Stanley Leighton.

(Southern Division.)

Sir Baldwyn Leighton, bt.,
John Edmund Severne.

SHREWSBURY.

Charles Cecil Cotes,
Henry Robertson.

WENLOCK.

Alexander Hargreaves Brown,
Cecil Theodore Weld Forester.

LUDLOW.

Hon. George Herbert Windsor Windsor-Clive.

BRIDGNORTH.

William Henry Foster.

SOMERSET COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)

Sir Philip John William Miles, bt.,
Lord Brooke.

(Mid Division.)

Richard Horner Paget,
William Stephen Gore-Langton.

(Western Division.)

Vaughan Hanning Vaughan Lee,
Mordaunt Fenwick Bisset.

BATH.

Sir Arthur Divett Hayter, bt.,
Edmond Robert Wodehouse.

TAUNTON.

Sir William Palliser, knt.,
Sir Henry James, knt.

FROME.

Henry Bernhard Samuelson.

BRISTOL.

Samuel Morley,
Lewis Fry.

SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

William Wither Bramston Beach,
Rt. hon. George Sclater-Booth.

(Southern Division.)

Lord Henry John Montagu-Douglas-Scott,
Francis Compton.

WINCHESTER.

Viscount Baring,
Richard Moss.

PORTSMOUTH.

Hon. Thomas Charles Bruce,
Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, G.C.M.G.

LYMINGTON.

Edmund Hegan Kennard.

ANDOVER.

Francis William Buxton.

CHRISTCHURCH.

Horace Davey.

PETERSFIELD.

William Nicholson.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Henry Lee,
Charles Parker Butt.

STAFFORD COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

William Young Craig,
Harry Tichborne Davenport.

(Western Division.)

Alexander Staveley Hill,
Francis Monckton.

(Eastern Division.)

Michael Arthur Bass,
Henry Wiggin.

STAFFORD.

Charles Benjamin Bright M'Laren,
Alexander Macdonald.

TAMWORTH.

Hamar Alfred Bass,
Jabez Spencer Balfour.

NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME.

Charles Donaldson Hudson,
William Shepherd Allen.

WOLVERHAMPTON.

Rt. hon. Charles Pelham Villiers,
Henry Hartley Fowler.

STOKE-UPON-TRENT.

William Woodall,
Henry Broadhurst.

WALSALL.

Sir Charles Forster, bt.

WEDNESBURY.

Alexander Brogden.

LICHFIELD.

Theophilus John Levett.

SUFFOLK COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)

Frederick St. John Newdegate Barne,
Lord Rendlesham.

(Western Division.)

William Biddell,
Thomas Thornhill.

IPSWICH.

Thomas Clement Cobbold,
Jesse Collings.

BURY ST. EDMUNDS.

Joseph Alfred Hardcastle,
Edward Greene.

EYE.

Ellis Ashmead Bartlett.

SURREY COUNTY.

(East Surrey.)

William Grantham,
James Watney, jun.

(Mid Surrey.)

Sir Henry William Peek, bt.
Sir James John Trevor Lawrence, bt.

(West Surrey.)

Rt. hon. George Cubitt,
Hon. William St. John Fremantle Brodrick.

SOUTHWARK.

Arthur Cohen,
James Edwin Thorold Rogers.

LAMBETH.

Sir James Clarke Lawrence, bt.,
William McArthur.

GUILDFORD.

Denzil Roberts Onslow.

SUSSEX COUNTY.

(Eastern Division.)

George Burrow Gregory,
Montague David Scott.

(Western Division.)

Sir Walter Barttelot Barttelot, bt.,
Earl of March.

SHOREHAM (NEW).

Sir Walter Wyndham Burrell, bt.,
Robert Loder.

BRIGHTHELMSTONE.

John Robert Hollond,
William Thackeray Marriott.

CHICHESTER.

Lord Henry George Charles Gordon Lennox,

LEWES.

William Langham Christie.

HORSHAM.

Sir Henry Fletcher, bt.

MIDHURST.

Sir Henry Thurston Holland, bt.

WARWICK COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

William Bromley Davenport,
Charles Newdigate Newdegate.

(Southern Division.)

Sir John Eardley Eardley Wilmot, bt.,
Hon. Gilbert Henry Chandos Leigh.

BIRMINGHAM.

Philip Henry Muntz,
Rt. hon. John Bright,
Rt. hon. Joseph Chamberlain.

WARWICK.

Arthur Wellesley Peel,
George William John Repton.

COVENTRY.

Sir Henry Mather Jackson, bt.,
William Henry Wills.

WESTMORELAND COUNTY.

Earl of Bective,
Hon. William Lowther.

KENDAL.

James Cropper.

(WIGHT) ISLE OF.

Hon. Anthony Evelyn Melbourne Ashley.

NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT.

Charles Cavendish Clifford.

WILTS COUNTY.

(Northern Division.)

Walter Hume Long,
George Thomas John Sotheron Estcourt.

(Southern Division.)

Rt. hon. Lord Henry Frederick Thynne,
Viscount Folkestone.

NEW SARUM (SALISBURY).

William Henry Grenfell,
John Passmore Edwards.

CRICKLADE.

Mervin Herbert Nevil Story Maskelyne,
Sir Daniel Gooch, bt.

DEVIZES.
Sir Thomas Bateson, bt.
MARLBOROUGH.
Lord Charles Bruce.
CHIPPENHAM.
Gabriel Goldney.
CALNE.
Lord Edmond George Petty Fitzmaurice.
MALMESBURY.
Walter Powell.
WESTBURY.
Charles Nicholas Paul Phipps.
WILTON.
Hon. Sidney Herbert.

WORCESTER COUNTY.

(*Eastern Division.*)
William Henry Gladstone,
George Woodyatt Hastings.
(*Western Division.*)
Sir Edmund Anthoney Harley Lechmere, bt.,
Frederick Winn Knight.
EVESHAM.
Frederick Lehmann.
DROITWICH.
John Corbett.
BEWDLEY.
Enoch Baldwin.
DUDLEY.
Henry Brinsley Sheridan.
KIDDERMINSTER.
John Brinton.
WORCESTER.
Thomas Rowley Hill,
Æneas John McIntyre.

YORK COUNTY.

(*North Riding.*)
Frederick Acclom Milbank,
Viscount Helmsley.
(*East Riding.*)
Christopher Sykes,
William Henry Harrison Broadley.
(*West Riding, Northern Division.*)
Lord Frederick Cavendish,
Sir Matthew Wilson, bt.
(*West Riding, Eastern Division.*)
Sir Andrew Fairbairn, knt.,
Sir John William Ramsden, bt.
(*West Riding, Southern Division.*)
Hon. William Henry Wentworth Fitzwilliam,
William Henry Leatham.

YORK COUNTY—*cont.*
LEEDS.
John Barran,
William Lewis Jackson,
Herbert John Gladstone.
PONTEFRACT.
Rt. hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers,
Sydney Woolf.
SCARBOROUGH.
William Sproston Caine,
Rt. hon. John George Dodson.
SHEFFIELD.
Rt. hon. Anthony John Mundella,
Charles Beilby Stuart Wortley.
BRADFORD.
Rt. hon. William Edward Forster,
Alfred Illingworth.
HALIFAX.
Rt. hon. James Stansfeld,
John Dyson Hutchinson.
KNARESBOROUGH.
Sir Henry Meysey Meysey Thompson, bt.
MALTON.
Hon. Charles William Wentworth-Fitzwilliam.
RICHMOND.
Hon. John Charles Dundas.
RIPON.
Rt. hon. George Joachim Goschen.
NORTHALLERTON.
George William Elliot.
THIRSK.
Hon. Lewis Payn Dawnay.
HUDDERSFIELD.
Edward Aldam Leatham.
WAKEFIELD.
Robert Bownas Mackie.
WHITBY.
Arthur Pease.
MIDDLESBOROUGH.
Isaac Wilson.
DEWSBURY.
John Simon.
YORK CITY.
Ralph Creyke,
Joseph Johnson Leeman.
KINGSTON-UPON-HULL.
Charles Morgan Norwood,
Charles Henry Wilson.

BARONS OF THE CINQUE PORTS.

DOVER.
Charles Kaye Freshfield,
Alexander George Dickson.

BARONS OF THE CINQUE PORTS—*cont.*
HASTINGS.
Charles James Murray,
Thomas Brassey.
SANDWICH.
Henry Arthur Brassey,
Charles Henry Crompton Roberts.
HYTHE.
Sir Edward William Watkin, knt.
RYE.
Frederick Andrew Inderwick.

WALES.

ANGLESEA.

Richard Davies.
BEAUMARIS.
Morgan Lloyd.

BRECKNOCK COUNTY.

William Fuller Maitland.
BRECKNOCK.
Cyril Flower.

CARDIGAN COUNTY.

Lewis Pugh Pugh.
CARDIGAN, &c.
David Davies.

CARMARTHEN COUNTY.

Walter Rice Howell Powell,
Viscount Emlyn.
CARMARTHEN, &c.
Benjamin Thomas Williams.

CARNARVON COUNTY.

William Rathbone.
CARNARVON, &c.
William Bulkeley Hughes.

DENBIGH COUNTY.

Rt. hon. George Osborne Morgan,
Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, bt.
DENBIGH, &c.
Sir Robert Alfred Cunliffe, bt.

FLINT COUNTY.

Hon. Lord Richard Grosvenor.
FLINT, &c.
John Roberts.

GLAMORGAN COUNTY.

Christopher Rice Mansel Talbot,
Henry Hussey Vivian.

Glamorgan County—*cont.*

MERTHYR TYDVIL.
Henry Richard,
Charles Herbert James.

CARDIFF, &c.
Edward James Reed.

SWANSEA, &c.
Lewis Llewellyn Dillwyn.

MERIONETH COUNTY.
Samuel Holland.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY.
Stuart Rendel.

MONTGOMERY, &c.
Hon. Frederick Stephen Archibald Hanbury-Tracy.

PEMBROKE COUNTY.
William Davies.

PEMBROKE, &c.
Henry George Allen.

HAVERFORDWEST.
Rt. hon. Baron Kensington.

RADNOR COUNTY.
Sir Richard Green Price, bt.

NEW RADNOR.
Samuel Charles Evans Williams.

SCOTLAND.

ABERDEENSHIRE.
(*East Aberdeenshire.*)
Hon. Sir Alexander Hamilton Gordon, knt.
(*West Aberdeenshire.*)
Robert Farquharson.

ABERDEEN.
John Webster.

ARGYLE.
Lord Colin Campbell.

AYR.
(*North Ayrshire.*)
Robert William Cochran-Patrick.
(*South Ayrshire.*)
Col. Claud Alexander.

KILMARNOCK, RENFREW, &c.
John Dick-Peddie.

BURGHS OF AYR, &c.
Richard Frederick Fotheringham Campbell.

BANFF.
Robert William Duff.

BERWICK.
Edward Marjoribanks.

BUTE.
Charles Dalrymple.

CAITHNESSSHIRE.
Sir John George Tollemache Sinclair, bt.

WICK, KIRKWALL, &c.
John Pender.

CLACKMANNAN AND KINROSS.
John Blair Balfour.

DUMBARTON.
Archibald Orr Ewing.

DUMFRIESSHIRE.
Robert Jardine.

DUMFRIES, &c.
Ernest Noel.

EDINBURGHSHIRE.
Rt. hon. William Ewart Gladstone.

EDINBURGH.
Duncan McLaren,
James Cowan.

UNIVERSITIES OF EDINBURGH AND ST. ANDREWS.
Rt. hon. Lyon Playfair.

BURGHS OF LEITH, &c.
Andrew Grant.

ELGIN AND NAIRN.
Sir George Macpherson Grant, bt.

BURGHS OF ELGIN, &c.
Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff.

FIFE.
Hon. Robert Preston Bruce.

BURGHS OF ST. ANDREWS.
Stephen Williamson.

KIRKCALDY, DYSART, &c.
Sir George Campbell, knt.

FORFAR.
James William Barclay.

TOWN OF DUNDEE.
George Armitstead,
Frank Henderson.

MONTROSE, &c.
Rt. hon. William Edward Baxter.

HADDINGTON.
Rt. hon. Francis Wemyss Charteris Douglas Lord Elcho.

HADDINGTON BURGHS.
Sir David Wedderburn, bt.

INVERNESS.
Donald Cameron.

INVERNESS, &c.
Charles Fraser Mackintosh.

KINCARDINESHIRE.
Sir George Balfour, knt.

KIRKCUDBRIGHT.
John Heron Maxwell.

LANARK.
(*North Lanarkshire.*)
Sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke, bt.
(*South Lanarkshire.*)
John Glencairn Carter Hamilton.

GLASGOW.
George Anderson,
Charles Cameron, L.L.D.,
Robert Tweedie Middleton.

UNIVERSITIES OF GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN.
James Alexander Campbell, L.L.D.

LINLITHGOW.
Peter McLagan.

ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.
Samuel Laing.

PEEBLES AND SELKIRK.
Charles Tennant.

PERTH.
Donald Currie.

TOWN OF PERTH.
Charles Stuart Parker, M.A.

RENFREWSHIRE.
Alexander Crum.

PAISLEY.
William Holms.

GREENOCK.
James Stewart.

ROSS AND CROMARTY.
Alexander Matheson.

ROXBURGH.
Hon. Arthur Ralph Douglas Elliot.

HAWICK, SELKIRK, &c.
George Otto Trevelyan.

STIRLING.
Joseph Cheney Bolton.

STIRLING, &c.
Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

FALKIRK, &c. BURGHS.
John Ramsay.

SUTHERLAND.
Marquess of Stafford.

WIGTON.
Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, bt.

WIGTON, &c. BURGHS.
Rt. hon. Sir John Charles Dalrymple Hay, bt.

IRELAND.

ANTRIM COUNTY.
James Chaine,
Edward Macnaghten.

BELFAST.
William Ewart,
James Porter Corry.

LISBURN.
Sir Richard Wallace, bt.

CARRICKFERGUS.
Thomas Greer.

ARMAGH COUNTY.
James Nicholson Richardson,
Maxwell Charles Close.

ARMAGH (CITY).
George De La Poer Beresford.

CARLOW COUNTY.
Edmund Dwyer Gray,
Donald Horne Macfarlane.

CARLOW (BOROUGH).
Charles Dawson.

CAVAN COUNTY.
Charles Joseph Fay,
Joseph Gillis Biggar.

CLARE COUNTY.
Col. The O'Gorman Mahon,
William Henry O'Shea.

ENNIS.
James Lysaght Finigan.

CORK COUNTY.
William Shaw,
David Latouche Colthurst.

CORK (CITY).
John Daly,
Charles Stewart Parnell.

YOUGHAL.
Sir Joseph Neale McKenna, knt.

BANDON BRIDGE.
Richard Lane Allman.

KINSALE.
Eugene Collins.

MALLOW.
William Moore Johnson.

DONEGAL COUNTY.
Thomas Lea,
John Kinnear.

DOWN COUNTY.
Lord Arthur William Hill,
Viscount Castlereagh.

NEWRY.
Henry Thomson.

DOWNPATRICK.
John Mulholland.

DUBLIN COUNTY.
Rt. hon. Thomas Edward Taylor,
Ion Trant Hamilton.

DUBLIN (CITY).
Maurice Brooks,
Robert Dyer Lyons.

DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.
Rt. hon. David Robert Plunket,
Rt. hon. Edward Gibson.

FERMANAGH.
William Humphrys Archdale,
Viscount Crichton.

ENNISKILLEN.
Viscount Cole.

GALWAY COUNTY.
Mitchell Henry,
Major John Philip Nolan.

GALWAY (BOROUGH).
John Orell Lever,
Thomas P. O'Connor.

KERRY.
Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, bt.,
Rowland Ponsonby Blennerhassett.

TRALEE.
The O'Donoghue.

KILDARE.
Charles Henry Meldon,
James Leahy.

KILKENNY.
Edward Mulhallen Marum,
Patrick L. Martin.

KILKENNY (CITY).
John Francis Smithwick.

KING'S COUNTY.
Sir Patrick O'Brien, bt.,
Bernard Charles Molloy.

LEITRIM COUNTY.
Arthur Loftus Tottenham,
Francis O'Beirne.

LIMERICK COUNTY.
William Henry O'Sullivan,
Edmund John Synan.

LIMERICK (CITY).
Richard O'Shaughnessy,
Daniel FitzGerald Gabbett.

LONDONDERRY COUNTY.
Rt. hon. Hugh Law,
Sir Thomas M'Clure, bt.

COLERAINE.
Sir Henry Hervey Bruce, bt.

LONDONDERRY (CITY).
Charles Edward Lewis.

LONGFORD COUNTY.
George Errington,
Justin McCarthy.

LOUTH COUNTY.
Philip Callan,
Alan Henry Bellingham.

DUNDALK.
Charles Russell.

DROGHEDA.
Benjamin Whitworth.

MAYO COUNTY.
John O'Connor Power,
Isaac Nelson.

MEATH COUNTY.
Robert Henry Metge,
Alexander Martin Sullivan.

MONAGHAN COUNTY.
John Givan,
William Findlater.

QUEEN'S COUNTY.
Richard Lalor,
Arthur O'Connor.

PORTARLINGTON.
Hon. Bernard Edward Burnaby Fitzpatrick.

ROSCOMMON COUNTY.
Andrew Commins,
James O'Kelly.

SLIGO COUNTY.
Thomas Sexton,
Denis Maurice O'Conor.

TIPPERARY COUNTY.
Patrick James Smyth,
John Dillon.

CLONMEL.
Arthur Moore.

TYRONE COUNTY.
John William Ellison Macartney,
Edward Falconer Litton.

DUNGANNON.
James Dickson.

WATERFORD COUNTY.
Henry Villiers Stuart, of Dromana,
John Aloysius Blake.

DUNGARVAN.
Frank Hugh O'Donnell.

WATERFORD (CITY).
Richard Power,
Edmond Leamy.

WESTMEATH COUNTY.
Timothy Daniel Sullivan,
Henry Joseph Gill.

ATHLONE.
Sir John Ennis, bt.

WEXFORD COUNTY.
John Barry,
Garrett Michael Byrne.

WEXFORD (BOROUGH).
Timothy Michael Healy.

NEW ROSS.
Joseph William Foley.

WICKLOW COUNTY.
William Joseph Corbett,
James Carlisle M'Coan.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Second Session of the *Twenty-Second Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
appointed to meet 29 April, 1880, in the Forty-third
Year of the Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1881.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 6th January, 1881.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been Prorogued from the 7th September to the 24th November, was further Prorogued by Proclamation, as follows:—

"*BY THE QUEEN—A PROCLAMATION.*

"Victoria R.

"Whereas Our Parliament stands prorogued to the Twenty-fourth Day of *November* instant: We, by and with the Advice of Our Privy Council, hereby issue Our Royal Proclamation, and publish and declare, that the said Parliament be further prorogued to *Thursday* the Second Day of *December* One thousand eight hundred and eighty.

"Given at Our Court at *Balmoral*, this Twentieth day of *November*, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty, and in the Forty-fourth Year of Our Reign.

"God save the Queen."

was again further Prorogued by Proclamation, as follows:—

"*BY THE QUEEN—A PROCLAMATION.*

"Victoria R.

"Whereas Our Parliament stands prorogued to *Thursday* the Second Day of *December* next: We, by and with the Advice of Our Privy Council, hereby issue Our Royal Proclamation, and publish and declare, that the said Parliament be further prorogued to *Thursday* the Sixth Day of *January* One thousand eight hundred and eighty-one; and We do hereby further, with the Advice aforesaid, declare Our Royal Will and Pleasure that the said Parliament shall, on the said *Thursday* the Sixth Day of *January* One thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, assemble and be holden for the Despatch of divers urgent and important Affairs; And the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, and the Commissioners for Shires and Burghs of the House of Commons, are hereby required and commanded to give their Attendance accordingly, at *Westminster*, on the said *Thursday* the Sixth Day of *January* One thousand eight hundred and eighty-one.

"Given at Our Court at *Windsor*, this Twenty-seventh Day of *November*, in the Year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and eighty, and in the Forty-fourth Year of Our Reign.

"God save the Queen."

And the PARLIAMENT having met accordingly, the Session was opened by Commission.

The HOUSE of PEERS being met;

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House,

"That it not being convenient for Her Majesty to be personally here present this day, She has been pleased to cause a Commission under the Great Seal to be prepared, in order to the holding of this Parliament."

Then Five of the LORDS COMMISSIONERS —namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR, The LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl Spencer); The LORD HIGH STEWARD (The Earl Sydney); THE EARL OF CORK, and THE LORD MONSON; being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to let the COMMONS know "The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House, to hear the Commission read."

Who being at the Bar, with their Speaker:—The Commission was read by the Clerk:—Then

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH to both Houses of Parliament, as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I HAVE called you, at a period earlier than usual, to the resumption of your labours, as some affairs of more than common urgency demand your attention.

"My relations with Foreign Powers continue to be friendly and harmonious.

"The main question relating to the Frontier between Turkey and Montenegro has been settled.

"The Powers are now engaged in communications which have in view the determination of the Frontier between Turkey and Greece.

"Some important portions of the Treaty of Berlin, which have so long remained without fulfilment, continue to form an object of my anxious attention.

"A rising in the Transvaal has recently imposed upon me the duty of taking military measures with a view to the prompt vindication of my authority; and has of necessity set aside for the time any plan for securing to the European settlers that full control over their own local affairs, without prejudice to the interests of the natives, which I had been desirous to confer.

"I regret that the War in Basutoland still continues, notwithstanding the efforts of the Cape Government, It would cause me much satisfaction if a suitable occasion should present itself for friendly action on my part with a view to the restoration of peace.

"The War in Afghanistan has been brought to a close, and, with the exception of the Candahar force, my troops have been recalled within the Indian frontier. It is not my intention that the occupation of Candahar shall be permanently maintained; but the still unsettled condition of the country, and the consequent difficulty of establishing a Native Government, have delayed for a time the withdrawal of the army from that position.

"Papers on the several subjects to which I have adverted, as well as further Correspondence on the Military Estimates of India, will be presented to you.

" *Gentlemen of the House of Commons*,

" The Estimates for the Services of the coming year are in a forward state of preparation, and will be speedily laid before you.

" *My Lords, and Gentlemen*,

" There has been a gradual, though not very rapid, improvement in the trade of the country; and I am now able to entertain a more favourable expectation of the Revenne for the year than I could form at its commencement.

" The anticipation, with which I last addressed you, of a great diminution of the distress in Ireland, owing to an abundant harvest, was realized; but I grieve to state that the social condition of the country has assumed an alarming character. Agrarian crimes in general have multiplied far beyond the experience of recent years. Attempts upon life have not grown in the same proportion as other offences; but I must add that efforts have been made for personal protection, far beyond all former precedent, by the police, under the direction of the Executive. I have to notice other evils yet more widely spread; the administration of justice has been frustrated, with respect to these offences, through the impossibility of procuring evidence; and an extended system of terror has thus been established, in various parts of the country, which has paralysed almost alike the exercise of private rights and the performance of civil duties.

" In a state of things new in some important respects, and hence with little of available guidance from former precedent, I have deemed it right steadily to put in use the ordinary powers of the law before making any new demand. But a demonstration of their insufficiency, amply supplied by the present circumstances of the country, leads me now to apprise you that proposals will be immediately submitted to you for entrusting me with additional powers, necessary in my judgment not only for the vindication of order and public law, but likewise to secure, on behalf of my subjects, protection for life and property, and personal liberty of action.

" Subject to the primary and imperious obligations to which I have just referred, I continue to desire not less than heretofore to prosecute the removal of grievance and the work of legislative improvement in Ireland as well as in Great Britain.

" The Irish Land Act of 1870 has been productive of great benefits, and has much contributed to the security and comparative well-being of the occupiers of the soil, without diminishing the value or disturbing the foundations of property. In some respects, however, and more particularly under the strain of recent and calamitous years, the protection which it supplied has not been found sufficient, either in Ulster or the other Provinces.

" I recommend you to undertake the further development of its principles in a manner conformable to the special wants of Ireland, both as regards the relation of landlord and tenant, and with a view to effective efforts for giving to a larger portion of the people by purchase a permanent proprietary interest in the soil. This legislation will require the removal, for the purposes in view, of all obstacles arising out of limitations on the ownership of property with a due provision for the security of the interests involved.

"A measure will be submitted to you for the establishment of County Government in Ireland, founded upon representative principles, and framed with the double aim of confirming popular control over expenditure, and of supplying a yet more serious want by extending the formation of habits of local self-government.

"Bills will be laid before you for the abolition of Corporal Punishment in the Army and in the Navy.

"You will be asked to consider measures for the further Reform of the Law of Bankruptcy; for the Conservancy of Rivers and the Prevention of Floods; for revising the constitution of Endowed Schools and Hospitals in Scotland; for the renewal of the Act which established Secret Voting; and for repressing the Corrupt Practices of which, in a limited number of towns, there were lamentable examples at the last General Election.

"I trust that your labours, which will be even more than usually arduous, may be so guided by Divine Providence as to promote the happiness of my people.

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

Prayers.

Roll of the Lords—Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Second Session of the Twenty-second Parliament of the United Kingdom: The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW PEER.

The Right Honourable Edward Robert Lytton Lord Lytton, G.C.B., having been created Viscount Knebworth of Knebworth in the county of Hertford, and Earl of Lytton in the county of Derby was (in the usual manner) introduced.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Clifford, after the death of his father.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

Select Vestries—Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1^a.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The Queen's Speech *reported* by The Lord Chancellor.

Lord CARRINGTON: My Lords, in venturing to take upon myself the duty of moving an humble Address in answer to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne, I feel that on no former occasion of the kind has any Member of this House stood in greater need of that indulgence which I solicit at your Lordships' hands. It will be my great anxiety not to make use of any expressions that may disturb that unanimity which is of paramount importance in these critical times. You will, my Lords, hail with pleasure the announcement that the Government intends to deal with the question of corrupt practices at elections. The bribery that took place at the last General Election was a disgrace to the country, and also an indication of a degree of political corruption in some constituencies which, if not counteracted by the most drastic treatment, must in the end jeopardize the essential liberties of the nation. Evidence has shown that, while a portion of the money goes in direct bribery, the chief share disappears in virtual embezzlement. This is a matter with which, no doubt, the Lower House will deal effectively. My Lords, although hostilities have happily ceased, our anxieties as regards Afghanistan are not altogether at an end. We have dethroned the late Ameer. We have inflicted just retribution on the proverbially rebellious city of Cabul for the cruel murder of our Envoy; and, having restored the Native Government under Abdurrahman Khan, we have entirely withdrawn, as I believe was always the intention of the Indian Government, from Northern Afghanistan. We still remain at Candahar, but with no desire to continue there longer than is necessary to secure the permanent peace of the country. But it must be remembered that the commercial high road from India to the sea lies through Southern Afghanistan, and continues thence through the British Indian Province of Scinde to Kurrachee. Such vast considerations are involved in our relations with India, and so great an ignorance exists in regard to them in this country, that I will not presume to express an individual opinion on the momentous question whether Candahar should be held or evacuated. It is one that the Government alone must decide on their own responsibility to history, to their consciences, and to their country. We may rest confident that their decision would be determined by no preconceived prejudices, but by their own well-informed sense of what is best for the highest interests of the Empire. My Lords, there is one portion of the Queen's Speech which it is impossible to touch upon without experiencing feelings of pain, humiliation, and disappointment. I refer to that which deals with the condition of Ireland. When we read the history of that country, we find "coercion" written upon almost every page of it. No one would pretend to say that there have not been landlords who have succeeded in maintaining happy relations with their tenants; and we can point with pride to the fact that the foremost of them have been Members of your Lordships' House; but, however numerous or distinguished, it is only too patent that they have been but the exceptions to the general rule. That true and proper relationship which is the only secure guarantee for the common welfare of both has, unhappily, existed with far too little frequency; and the Legislature of this country has but rarely interposed to remedy the evil. The Encumbered Estates Act was followed by the memorable attempt, ten years ago, of the present Prime Minister to benefit the Irish people; and, though the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year did not become law, Her Majesty's Government have no reason to regret its introduction, nor the small band of their independent supporters in this House the votes they gave in its favour. I do not mean for an instant to imply that its passing would have silenced the voice of those who are so loud and so fierce in their denunciations of this country and have done so much to alienate its sympathies. It might not have discouraged a single agitator, nor checked one of those crimes which have outraged civilization; but its record remains to testify to an honest endeavour to cope with a difficulty of most formidable proportions. In renewing their efforts for the same object, Her Majesty's Government will not be deterred by the repeated assertion that beneficial legislation is impossible amid circumstances of revolutionary agitation and excitement; nor will they admit the assumption that men who have succeeded in exciting their fellows to the commission of crimes which are execrated by every right-minded person possess the power, to which they pretend, of setting the British Government at defiance. My Lords, whatever differences of opinion may exist on the subject of Irish land legislation, no one can doubt for a moment that it is the unanimous resolve of your Lordships that order must be restored; and I may be permitted to express my firm belief that it is the determination of the people of England—the determination, I say, of every loyal subject of the Queen, however humble his origin, however lowly his calling, and whatever his political opinions—that, before all and above all, the majesty of the law shall be upheld. This once effected, the Government, relying on the encouragement of the nation, and trusting to the wisdom, co-operation, and forbearance of your Lordships' House, will be able to frame such legislation as, under the blessing of Almighty God, may bring peace and prosperity to the people of Ireland.

My Lords, I will conclude by moving that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, thanking Her Majesty for Her Majesty's most Gracious Speech from the Throne, as follows:—

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament, informing us that Your Majesty has called us, at a period earlier than usual, to the resumption of our labours, as some affairs of more than common urgency demand our attention.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that Your Majesty's relations with Foreign Powers continue to be friendly and harmonious; that the main question relating to the Frontier between Turkey and Montenegro has been settled; that the Powers are now engaged in communications which have in view the determination of the Frontier between Turkey and Greece, and that some important portions of the Treaty of Berlin, which have so long remained without fulfilment, continue to form an object of Your Majesty's earnest attention.

"We regret to learn that a rising in the Transvaal has recently imposed upon Your Majesty the duty of taking military measures with a view to the prompt vindication of Your Majesty's authority, and has of necessity set aside for the time any plan for securing to the European settlers that full control over their own local affairs, without prejudice to the interests of the natives, which Your Majesty had been desirous to confer.

"We share Your Majesty's regret that the War in Basutoland continues, notwithstanding the efforts of the Cape Government, and we thank Your Majesty for informing us that it would cause Your Majesty much satisfaction if a suitable occasion should present itself for friendly action on Your Majesty's part with a view to the restoration of peace.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that the War in Afghanistan has been brought to a close; and that with the exception of the Candahar force, Your Majesty's troops have been recalled within the Indian frontier; and we thank your Majesty for apprising us that it is not Your Majesty's intention that the occupation of Candahar shall be permanently maintained; though the still unsettled condition of the country, and the consequent difficulty of establishing a native Government, have delayed for a time the withdrawal of the army from that position.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that papers on the several subjects to which Your Majesty has adverted, as well as further correspondence on the Military Estimates of India, will be presented to us.

"We rejoice to learn that there has been a gradual improvement in the trade of the country, and that there is a more favourable expectation of the Revenue for the year than could be formed at its commencement.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us of the diminution of distress in Ireland, of the present social condition of that country, and of the considerations which lead Your Majesty now to apprise us that proposals will be immediately submitted to us for intrusting Your Majesty with additional powers for the vindication of order and public law, and to secure for Your Majesty's subjects protection of life and property, and personal liberty of action.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that, subject to these primary and imperious obligations, Your Majesty continues to desire not less than heretofore to prosecute the removal of grievance and the work of legislative improvement in Ireland as well as in Great Britain.

"We humbly assure Your Majesty that our careful consideration shall be given to the subjects which Your Majesty has recommended to our attention and to the measures which may be submitted to us, and we earnestly trust that the guidance of Divine Providence may attend our labours."

The Earl of YARBOROUGH, in seconding the Motion for an Address, said, he had heard the appeal for indulgence made to their Lordships by his noble Friend, and had noted the cordial response given to it—it only made him feel the stronger how much he wanted their Lordships' forbearance, and how little right he had to claim it. He would, therefore, endeavour to be as brief as possible, and for this purpose would avoid going over the same ground as that which his noble Friend had trodden with so much power, and would confine himself to those topics of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech to which he had not made especial allusion. The subject which, as usual, occupied a prominent place in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech was that of Foreign Affairs. It must, he thought, be matter of satisfaction to all their Lordships to have noticed that during the last few months further progress had been made towards the settlement of those questions which the Treaty of Berlin was intended to set at rest. Her Majesty's Government, on their accession to Office, appeared to have frankly accepted the engagements of the Treaty; they had since endeavoured to carry out those provisions which remained unfulfilled by the joint action of all the Great Powers—a task which was admitted to be one of great difficulty. One complicated question, that of the Montenegrin Frontier, had, after many delays and objections on the part of the Porte, been brought to a practical solution. He thought Her Majesty's Ministers were to be congratulated on the success which had so far attended their persevering efforts in the interest of the general peace; and they must all hope that they might be able to contribute to the settlement of those other questions which, so long as they remained open, were a continual menace to the tranquillity and an impediment to the progress and development of South-Eastern Europe. The outbreak in the Transvnal was a matter of great regret. It was to be hoped that prompt and efficient measures would be taken to restore tranquillity and vindicate the authority of the Crown. When this was done, it appeared to him most desirable that the settlers should enjoy all the liberty in managing their local affairs compatible with the obligations the English nation had incurred to the numerous Natives in the Transvaal. A Bankruptcy Bill was promised in Her Majesty's Speech. It was a subject on which he felt it presumptuous to speak before the learned Members of their Lordships' House; but he was informed that men like Lord Brougham, Lord Westbury, and Lord Hatherley had tried their hands on the matter, but without giving full satisfaction to the commercial community. He hoped that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack would be more successful in proposing a scheme which would better protect the minority of the creditors, which would diminish the expenses of liquidation, and which would give stringent powers of control to some independent authority. He believed these were principles which the commercial world desired to see established. There was one other question with which he was glad to find the Government proposed to deal. It was of practical importance as regarded property, agriculture, and, in some degree, health. It was a subject of especial interest to the county with which he was connected, and which had lately suffered from the want of sound legislation on this point. The neglect of river channels, owing to the disuse of inland navigation, the accelerated influx of water due to subsoil drainage, and other causes had—especially in years of heavy rainfall—rendered floods more frequent, more extensive, and, in some cases, of longer duration than formerly. The natural difficulty of the subject was great, and it was aggravated by legislative difficulties. There were in existence numerous Commissions of Sewers under the various Acts of Parliament; there were local Acts in force, estimated to number from 2,000 to 3,000. The result was a multiplicity of different, and often of conflicting, areas, authorities, and interests. There appeared to be a need, in the case of each river, of some one body that should itself control, or, at all events, exercise general superintendence over, the subordinate bodies that controlled its entire course. At the same time, it must be remembered that the nature and circumstances of rivers were so different as to require differences in the legislative provisions to be applied to each. Legislation on such a subject must appeal largely to spontaneous action, and rely largely upon local management. The question was not a new one to the House of Lords. He found that in 1877 a Committee of that House made inquiry, collected valuable information, and pointed out in their Report the general lines upon which legislation should be based. In the same Session the noble Duke the late President of the Council introduced a Bill which passed in their Lordships' House after careful examination, but was not pressed in the Commons, owing to other Business. The ground had thus been cleared for the present Government; and they would, no doubt, avail themselves of the experience acquired by their Predecessors. He hoped their Lordships would give the subject a cordial and favourable consideration. He had heartily to thank their Lordships for the patience with which they had listened to him, and begged to second the Address. [See page 11.]

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, I wish I could feel it my duty to treat the matters before us to-night in as pleasant a manner as the two noble Lords who have just addressed us have done. I agree with my noble Friend and neighbour who moved the Address that the times are critical; and, although I am sure that your Lordships are not pessimists, and although, whatever my errors are, pessimism is not generally among the imputations made against me, I confess I have never addressed Parliament with a deeper sense of anxiety and gloom than that which the present state of affairs forces me to feel. My Lords, there have been occasions in which our foreign affairs have filled us with anxiety, occasions on which our Colonial position has been very critical. There have been occasions before this on which our domestic interests, especially in Ireland, have filled the nation with alarm. But, my Lords, I do not recollect a time in which our foreign relations, our position in important Colonies, the almost unparalleled state of things which prevails in Ireland, all at the same time have occurred and have demanded the deepest consideration, the deepest sense of responsibility on the part of your Lordships. And, my Lords, I am bound to say that I cannot help feeling that much of the disaster with which we have to grapple at present is to be attributed, in no slight degree, to the spirit in which Her Majesty's present Ministers acceded to Office. My Lords, hitherto it has been generally understood that when there was a change of Administration it was the duty of both Parties to effect no more alteration in the general conduct of our affairs than was absolutely necessary. Although there was a due assertion of Party principle, still, so far as it was possible, unnecessary changes were discouraged in the general conduct of our affairs, so that there should be some continuity of policy; and that there should be as little foundation as possible for the imputations made, I fear sometimes with justice, against our Parliamentary Government, or the inconsistency in which it involved our affairs. Well, my Lords, it must be admitted that this spirit introduced some feeling of magnanimity into our public life, and, no doubt, added greatly to the strength of our Councils. But when the present Administration was formed nothing of the kind was done. On the contrary, in every manner and on every occasion it was announced that the change of Government meant a change in every part and portion of the Government; that everything which had been concluded was to be repudiated; that everything consummated was to be reversed, and upon the most important questions, either of our foreign relations, our Colonial situation, or the government of Ireland, upon all these questions the utmost change must immediately and rapidly be accomplished. Immediate and complete reversal of all that had occurred was the order given and the profession of faith announced. See, my Lords, how this has worked. Take the case on which the noble Earl who has just addressed you dwelt — take the case of our foreign relations. The system of repudiating everything that was approved, promoted, or carried into effect by their Predecessors, this system may be tested very well upon the very subject to which the noble Earl has referred. Everything was to be altered. Well, though you might denounce and abuse the Treaty of Berlin, you could not easily repudiate that Treaty. It was an act which expressed the opinions and included the engagements of all the Great Powers of Europe; but yet the Treaty of Berlin, being so completely disapproved of by the new Government, it was proposed, most ingeniously, that, as there had been a Congress at Berlin, there should now be a Conference at Berlin; and it was generally understood and felt by everyone that that meant that the engagements of the Congress of Berlin were, in fact, to be modified, changed, and superseded by the determinations of the Conference of Berlin. Now, how has that been accomplished? Whatever observations I may make to-night I shall avoid giving any opinion on questions of policy, because I have no doubt we shall have an opportunity of discussing these, and on an occasion like the present it is most inconvenient to enter into controversies of that kind. Therefore, I refer only to facts. Generally speaking, I think all sensible men will agree that whatever may have been the shortcomings—I admit none—but whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Treaty of Berlin, and whatever may have been the points neglected or left unsettled, one thing is quite clear, and seems to be generally admitted, that at least the peace of Europe was insured. Well, now, what has happened by your having a Conference at Berlin, and re-opening questions? Well, I believe that I am not using any unauthorized expression when I say that the result of that Conference was that the war in the East of Europe and in the West of Asia was on the point of being revived, and England was near being a belligerent, and a belligerent, too, against our old Ally! No one can say now that the peace of Europe is certain and secured. We have very little information on this subject, though I presume that more will be afforded; but from what we see there is no doubt that even in the space of the next 24 hours events may occur which might shake that peace. What is the cause of all this? It is because Her Majesty's Government, directly they took Office, adopted the system of superseding and disturbing everything their Predecessors had settled. Now let me advert to another question — that, namely, of Afghanistan. I am not going to refer to the policy of the occupation of that country—that is a question that must come before the House, and I believe my noble Friend the late Governor General of India (the Earl of Lytton) will take an early opportunity of bringing it before your Lordships' notice. Now, whatever may be our opinion as to the policy or impolicy of the military occupation of Afghanistan, in this, I think, all will agree—that it was an event of great political moment, undertaken in consequence of information, part of which only has as yet been revealed to the country, but which is adequate to enable them to form an opinion as to its gravity and importance; that it was an event preceded by startling incidents of conduct on the part of another Great Power which demanded serious consideration. All these are results and circumstances which no one can dispute. It may be that Her Majesty's Government are perfectly right in the views they take on the subject of Afghanistan. The occupation of that country may have been a most impolitic act, and it may be their conviction that it was their duty to counteract its effect, and to terminate the policy that we attempted to establish. All this may be perfectly true; but I think all impartial persons will feel that such a step should be taken with great prudence; that it should be taken gradually, with a wise and dignified reserve; and that Ministers ought not to have gone to the housetops to proclaim their peril to the world—their peril; I may rather say their perplexity. We should remember also that the military feat of the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan was no mean one. Rarely have the discipline and valour of our troops, both British and Native, been more distinguished; and, above all, we produced a General equal to any conjuncture of the war. These were all circumstances that won respect in Asia and Europe; but Her Majesty's Ministers, as I say, go to the housetops to proclaim to every bazaar in the East that they do not know what to do in the situation in which they find themselves, and that, after all this anxiety, and after all these triumphant efforts of military power, they are going to scuttle out of the country as fast as they can. What I want your Lordships chiefly to observe is what is the consequence of such conduct. Why, the consequence of such conduct is most destructive. It may be our policy to quit Afghanistan; but if we quit it in this spirit and after such declarations, every military adventurer feels—"This is my opportunity; the British are going to leave the country which they have so easily conquered, and so completely occupied, and I will succeed them as far as I can." Clearly, you have produced a state of anarchy; but, at the last moment, you hesitate to follow the fatal policy on which you have decided, and you only say that when an opportunity is afforded that you will consummate your confession of impotence and blundering by giving up the city of Candahar. But why, my Lords, has all this taken place? Because there have been declarations made on the subject, declarations of the most unmeasured kind; because the country has been agitated to believe that the change of Government would, among other things, instantly terminate the dangerous occupation of Afghanistan; and because pledges made in total ignorance of the circumstances of the case have now to be redeemed at the cost of the credit of the country. Both in Turkey and in Afghanistan—in the one because the peace of Europe is no longer assured but menaced, and in the other because Central Asia is in a state of anarchy, you have now to pay the cost of declarations made in a polemical and not in a political sense to the people of this country. My Lords, I will not touch on a great many small questions in which changes have been made, and which might, if necessary, have been delayed, but which had been made to show the difference between the present Government and the last. But I will touch on that subject which, after all, absorbs all our thoughts at the present moment, and that is the subject of Ireland. When the late Government were responsible for the administration of affairs the state of Ireland undoubtedly caused them much anxiety. In ordinary circumstances, I believe, the skilful and beneficent administration of my noble Friend (the Duke of Marlborough) would in no way have been disturbed. But we had the threatening of a terrible visitation and its subsequent appearance; and we all know that when these calamities occur in Ireland there is a body of men in the country who will take advantage of the distress of the peasantry, and bring about results which render the work of government most difficult. Fortunately the famine was not as fatal as we once feared; and the prudent but liberal measures taken by the Government, and supported by private charity almost unprecedented, which, under the direction of a noble lady, touched the hearts of the Irish for the time, gave us every hope that we might proceed without further disaster. The Peace Preservation Act was, no doubt, a law which had a very beneficial effect, and greatly assisted the Government; and although we had before us information which, no doubt, is well known to Her Majesty's present Ministers, and which must make any Government sensible of the painful responsibility which Irish administration involves, still I believe it would have been possible to carry affairs through safely with the law which then existed; with the mitigation of the great calamity which then prevailed, and which promised to be more prevalent; and that we might baffle that conspiracy which the prevalence of famine in Ireland always brings about—namely, a conspiracy which seeks not only the separation of the tie which exists between the two countries, but the establishment of an independent foreign Power. Just before the General Election I felt it my duty, occupying the position I then did, to place before the country the issues which I thought demanded at that critical time the consideration of the country. Not sitting in the other House of Parliament, and, therefore, not having the privilege of addressing my old constituents, as in old days, I thought it becoming to address to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland a letter, in which I called the attention of the country to the state of Ireland. I placed before the country only two points. I warned it to be most careful not to meddle thoughtlessly with foreign affairs, because I foresaw that if it did there would be a chance, and more than a chance, of a European war. What has occurred has, I think, quite justified that warning; but we can at least hope that, a war not having occurred, Her Majesty's Ministers may have been successful with their Allies in preventing it. But as regards Ireland, in my letter to the Lord Lieutenant—on the 3rd of March, I think it was—I warned the country of what was going on in Ireland, and that if the Government did not show a becoming vigilance something would happen which would be almost as bad as famine and pestilence. Now, what was the consequence of that declaration? The head of the present Government took an early opportunity, soon after I had made that declaration, to express a directly contrary opinion. He said there was in Ireland an absence of crime and outrage, with a general sense of comfort and satisfaction, such as was unknown in the previous history of the country. Now, my Lords, that was the issue placed before the country to decide. I warned the constituencies that there was going on in Ireland a conspiracy which aimed at the disunion of the two countries, and probably something more. I said that if they were not careful something might happen almost as bad as pestilence or famine. The country, on the other hand, was immediately authoritatively informed that there was in Ireland a general sense of comfort and satisfaction unprecedented in the history of that country. Now, there was a clear issue to be decided, and the country decided that Ireland was in a state of comfort and satisfaction. My observations, of course, were treated with that ridicule which a successful Election generally inspires. What has occurred in Ireland since then? What is the state of Ireland at this present moment? I do not want to indulge in exaggerated phrases, nor do I care to use language that would adequately express the horrors which have occurred in that country. I think, however, I am not using exaggerated language when I say that in a great portion of Ireland the sovereignty of our Queen has been absolutely superseded. I think I am not using exaggerated language when I say that Her Majesty's Executive in Ireland have absolutely abdicated their functions. I think I am not using exaggerated language when I say that there have been months of murder and incendiarism and of every conceivable outrage. I think I am not using exaggerated language when I say that the Judges of the land have been denounced and defied, and that the administration of justice has altogether ceased; and that the law—the Queen's law—is no longer respected by the majority in that country. What has been the occasion of this? Why have not steps been taken in proper time to prevent what everyone feels might have been nipped in the bud? Why, it was because of these declarations that Ireland was in a state of comfort and content, and because the person who made them, being the most responsible person in the land, or about to become so, felt it necessary to act in his political position in harmony with his polemical one. Now, my Lords, what happened with regard to Ireland when the change of Government took place? The first thing that was done was a slight thing, but significant. We had established a Royal Commission to inquire into the state of agriculture, not only in England, but in Ireland. That Commission had reached Ireland and was busy in its operations. I believe there never before was a Royal Commission formed with such anxiety on the part of a Government that it should be an able, an adequate, and an impartial Commission. Every shade of opinion was represented, and the ablest men were invited to sit upon it. I speak with confidence on this, as I myself undertook the task of forming that Commission. No sooner was the Government changed, however, than a new Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the state of agriculture in Ireland. What was the effect of that? Whatever the intention might have been, the effect was to make the country understand that the new Government could place no confidence in the Royal Commission of the late Administration. They were told in effect—"It is true it may be formed of very able men; it is true they may be labouring for the sake of the public without pay; but we have no confidence in such people. You must look to our Commission; they will tell you what we want." What was the next step? Her Majesty's Government being in Office, the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland naturally thought the time had come when he ought to offer his opinion with regard to that country. There had been great anxiety to know what would be the course of Her Majesty's Government in regard to the continuance of the Peace Preservation Act. I think there was at that time, if not a formal declaration, at least a general understanding, that the new Government would not propose to continue that Act. But, however that may be, the Lord Lieutenant impressed upon Her Majesty's Ministers his opinion that the Peace Preservation Act should certainly be continued. Noble Lords will perfectly recollect what occurred on that occasion. It has been said very frequently—I do not mean in this House, for that would give it great authority—but it has been said by what are called organs of opinion, which are in communication with political personages of influence, and which, therefore, speak with authority, that it was never the intention of the late Government to continue the Peace Preservation Act. I read such a declaration this very morning. It is not true. It is fortunate that I can prove this in a manner which will be satisfactory to your Lordships and to the country, for a noble Lord asked me a Question on the subject before the Dissolution of Parliament. In my reply to him, after deprecating the assumption of the noble Lord that, as a matter of course, I should be

Prime Minister in the new Parliament, of which I had very great doubt, I used these words—

> "But it is by no means imprudent to assume that the next Parliament will do its duty to the country, and that it will repeat that Act, or, if necessary, support it with stronger measures, if they are required by the circumstances of the times."—[3 *Hansard*, ccli. 971.]

But my letter to the Lord Lieutenant alone involved the continuance of the Peace Preservation Act. It remains as a positive fact that the late Government were pledged to it. In regard to what happened out of this House there can be no question. We had our own Bill drawn; and I am permitted to say that the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, who, unfortunately, is no longer a Member of Parliament, offered that Bill very courteously to his successor. His successor declined that offer; but he necessarily had the advantage of the official information upon which the late Cabinet had determined to continue the Peace Preservation Act. That information consisted of confidential Reports from 70 persons of the highest authority in this matter. All that he had, which alone ought to have convinced him that the time had arrived when that Act ought to be continued. However, Her Majesty's Government took quite a different view. They had made up their minds not only to give a good shake to the Congress of Berlin, and to do everything they could to inform every being in Central Asia, and in every other part of Asia, that they meant to cut and run from the scene of a splendid conquest, but, following the same plan of throwing a stigma on everything their Predecessors had proposed or executed, they determined that Ireland was to be considered as a country in a state of comfort and satisfaction; and they have, from that moment, been legislating and administering affairs for a country in a state of comfort and satisfaction. As time has advanced they have changed their course. Now, at the last moment, they are about to do so on a great scale; because unless they do it on a great scale it is useless. Why, if they had only deigned to follow in the steps of their Predecessors—if they had only partially done so—they would not have found themselves in their present difficulties. Was the country really so devoid of incident that there was nothing to guide them as to the immediate future? Parliament was not prorogued till the 7th of September. There was a slight allusion in the Queen's Speech to the state of Ireland; but it was of a cheerful character. I think the Government said that it was satisfactory to find that the condition of the Irish people had been improved by the good harvest. Only a few days afterwards the murder of Lord Mountmorres occurred. Your Lordships know the condition of Ireland at the present time. Europe knows it, Asia knows it. It is no longer, unhappily, a merely English question. The honour, perhaps the existence, of England depends upon our rallying our forces, not only with regard to Ireland, but with regard to other scenes of disquietude and danger which have been created by what has occurred in Ireland. It may be said, if these are your views, why do you not call upon Parliament to express them? If these are your feelings, why do you not ask the House to sanction their correctness? I candidly say that if your Lordships were to come to a resolution to congratulate the country that Her Majesty's Government were going to take measures to preserve peace and order, to guard life and property, and, let me add, liberty, which is also equally in danger, I believe that very likely your Lordships might arrive at an Amendment to the Address which would place you high in the confidence of the people. Now, as regards mere Party conduct, I do not know anything which would be more justified than an Amendment to this Address, expressing our deep regret that measures were not taken in time, and pointing out that had they been taken in time an enormous quantity of dreadful incidents, which have harrowed the feelings of the country, might have been averted; that men would now have been alive who have been murdered; that houses would now be in existence which have been burned; that cases of torture to man and beast would never have happened—for these things, as your Lordships are aware, have mainly occurred within the past two months. But, my Lords, there are occasions when even Party considerations must be given up. There are occasions when it may not be wise, even for your Lordships, to place yourselves, as it were, at the head of public opinion in indignant remonstrance at the action of the Ministry. The great dangers and disasters which are impending or have happened in this country during the past nine months have arisen, in no small degree, from the abuse of Party feeling; and for that reason alone, if there were no other, I would recommend your Lordships to pause before taking any step which could weaken the movements of the Administration at this moment. I conclude that the Government have come to their determination in a *bonâ fide* spirit. I expect that their Bills, when introduced, will be found adequate to the occasion, for I am convinced that only ridicule and failure will result if they are not conceived and planned in a comprehensive spirit. I conclude also that it is their intention to proceed with these Bills *de die in diem*, in order that some hope, some courage may be given to our loyal and long-suffering subjects in Ireland. When those Bills have been passed, when the country is restored to order, we shall be ready to consider any other measures which Her Majesty's Government may bring before Parliament. But I think it utter mockery to discuss any questions connected with Ireland now, except the restoration of peace and order, the re-establishment of the sovereignty of the Queen, and a policy that will announce to Europe that the spirit of England has not ceased, and that, great as are the dangers that now environ and menace us, the Parliament of England will be equal to the occasion.

EARL GRANVILLE: Your Lordships will understand that I do not speak without a great sense of responsibility this evening. The late Prime Minister, who has just sat down, has on one or two occasions, when himself at the head of the Government, explained what the duties of an Opposition were; that though criticism was fair at ordinary times, yet that at moments of national danger it should endeavour either to turn out a Government, or endeavour to co-operate and support it in the execution of its duties. The noble Earl has deprecated polemical as compared with political arguments; but I am not perfectly certain that all his arguments this evening have been purely political, without any dash into the polemical. The noble Earl began by charging the Government with having broken the continuity of action which he thinks ought to subsist between one Government and another. For my part, I was a little surprised at that accusation; because, if I remember aright, in the last Session we were taunted with the reverse, as he said—"Oh, you are appropriating all our policy." One of these two views, therefore, cannot be correct. I think it must strike your Lordships that when a Ministry that was in an enormous majority in the House of Commons appeals to the constituencies, and the latter answer that appeal by condemning the Minister who made it, the succeeding Government should not be too much blamed for not following servilely the example of its Predecessor. When the noble Earl complained of our reversing the policy of our Predecessors I felt a certain movement of satisfaction at the thought that at least my own Department—the Foreign Office—was safe. But it turned out to be one of the heads of the noble Earl's accusation that we had entirely reversed his policy in foreign affairs. I have been under the delusion that I was honestly and steadfastly engaged in endeavouring to carry out the Treaty which the noble Earl himself and the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) had negotiated. He says we proposed that Europe should take steps for modifying the Treaty of Berlin. We made no proposal of the sort. It happens that it was the French Government, which rather took me by surprise by proposing that, as negotiation regarding the Greek Frontier had hitherto been fruitless, that question should be settled by a meeting outside of Turkey. I acquiesced in this view. There was no question at all as to reversing the Treaty of Berlin; the desire of all parties was to give effect to that instrument. I think, therefore, the noble Earl acted wisely in not entering further upon the consideration of foreign affairs, especially as our minds are occupied with other matters nearer home. The noble Earl went on to state that the verdict of the constituencies, which had made so great a change in Parliament, was owing to an expression in one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches to his constituents, which expression the noble Earl gave without the context and the explanation which Mr. Gladstone has since given. I do not think the verdict of the country turned entirely upon that sentence; but I think it is just possible with regard to that very question of

Afghanistan, as to which he reproaches us with being blundering and impotent, that, rightly or wrongly, the country believed that the blundering and impotency had been on the part of those who preceded us, and not on that of those who have been in Office since. I rejoice to know that the noble Earl (the Earl of Lytton), who has lately come back from India, intends to bring on this question. We shall be most happy to discuss the state of affairs in Afghanistan when it left his hands, and to defend the measures which we have subsequently taken. The noble Earl opposite went on to say a great deal with which I entirely agree with regard to the most unfortunate state of Ireland at the present moment; but I differ from him at that point at which he endeavoured to fix exclusively upon the present Government the blame of that condition of affairs. He spoke of his letter to the noble Duke near him (the Duke of Marlborough), and told us that the two points which he put before us in that letter were the danger of an imminent war in Europe and the state of Ireland. I must say, in passing, that I could not quite reconcile the noble Earl's statements with regard to the peace of Europe. He told us at the beginning of his speech that the Treaty of Berlin had absolutely secured the peace of Europe, and yet he writes to the noble Duke that there was imminent danger of a European war. But the present Government has been eight months in Office, and yet there was no war at all. I confess, therefore, that I do not quite follow the logic of the statement of the noble Earl. With regard to the other question—that of Ireland—the noble Earl has a perfect right to state that the apprehensions of danger which he entertained at that moment have been to a great degree fulfilled. The noble Earl complained of our having dropped the Peace Preservation Act. Well, the noble Earl stated absolutely and conclusively that it was the intention of the late Government to introduce a Bill upon that subject; and he quoted what had already been stated by the late Chief Secretary for Ireland—namely, that there had been the draft of a Bill which the Government had been prepared to recommend. Now, what was this draft of a Bill? The noble Earl talked of the Peace Preservation Act and of stronger measures, if necessary. The draft Bill was seen by one of my Colleagues, and it consisted of two or three lines, renewing the Act of that time. Now, that Act was modified, very much to the credit of the late Government, in 1875 or 1876, I forget which. That Government modified the Peace Preservation Bill brought in by Lord Hartington in 1870, and, as Mr. Plunket said the other day, reduced it to such mild proportions that it was the mildest form of coercion ever applied to Ireland—and this was the Bill they proposed to re-enact! But, may I not ask, was the success of that Act so complete in the hands of the late Government as seemed to be supposed? Was it completely successful in 1879? In that year the agrarian outrages increased enormously; and you are hardly, perhaps, aware that in January, 1830, the number of outrages was greater than at any subsequent part of last year, except in the month of December. I believe that that Act was not sufficient to deal with agrarian outrages if they became fully developed. There were some very useful provisions in the Act with regard to arms; but with regard to agrarian outrages, it is, unfortunately, too easy to obtain arms for them. There are other things, such as imposing large fines on districts in which crimes were committed, and other clauses as regards witnesses, which have hardly ever been put in motion, and which, I believe, would not have had any effect in preventing what has since occurred. My Lords, if it was so important to renew this Act, if the Dissolution turned almost entirely on the state of Ireland, how was it that the late Government were so perfectly inconsiderate as to make it impossible for their successors to renew that Act, and very difficult for themselves to have renewed it if they had remained in Office? With Obstruction brought to the perfection to which it had been brought, and their inability to deal with that Obstruction, I think it extremely likely they would have found it impossible in a few days to renew that Act. Our business would not have been to renew the Act, but to re-enact it; and then we should have had to consider whether we were to re-enact a measure which had been insufficient for the purpose under the hands of the late Government for the prevention of a great increase of agrarian outrages, or whether we were to come and at once introduce, without reflection, a stronger Bill, such as would alone deal with the subject. Then the noble Earl says—"At all events, why did you not come to Parliament earlier? Why did you not come in the autumn and get all the power which it was necessary to obtain?" My Lords, I do not deny that there are not only very plausible but very strong arguments indeed in favour of our having taken such a course. They have been urged by a portion of the Press; they have been urged by those gentlemen who have the greatest possible right to speak on the matter—those who have been the victims and who are at this moment great sufferers from the present state of Ireland—I mean the landlords of Ireland. The arguments to which I refer have been repeated by the noble Earl opposite. Now, I am bound to say that I do not think it such a very light matter to come to Parliament for extraordinary powers, despairing of the action of the existing law. I think that it is the duty of a Government, not only to consider whether all the circumstances make a complete case for such an appeal, but also whether they constitute such a case that you can come to Parliament and ask for coercion alone, without anything of a remedial character for that fire which always exists under every smoke, so as to secure that the great majority of the country will be able to back you up both in and out of Parliament. I cannot help referring, as some sort of an index to what the feeling of the country may be, to what has been done in this respect. We certainly have had measures of coercion too often unaccompanied by remedial measures, and that coercion has not permanently settled the questions which were raised at the time, and which were the occasion of the coercion. Now, what has been the state of England? Some of your Lordships are old enough to remember when the Government of this country were very apt to apply for extraordinary powers, and were very reckless in their application of them. My belief is that the reign of our present Sovereign perhaps affords the brightest example in history of so many years of the union of perfect peace, order, and liberty in a community. But there have been episodes even during that reign. Take the case of "Swing." "Swing" destroyed an enormous amount of agricultural property——

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: But not in this way.

EARL GRANVILLE: No; I do not say that the cases are exactly the same; but threatening letters went about, and they had the effect of raising labourers' wages, sometimes spasmodically. The question of the rent of farms was also involved, and it took this country four years to put down "Swing" completely. Then there is another case, that of the Rebecca riots, which began in 1839, in consequence of an alleged grievance, though perfectly legal—that of levying tolls at turnpike gates—and the disturbances were renewed still more remarkably at the beginning of 1843. What happened then? There was destruction of property and a perfect defiance of the law, and it was impossible to obtain necessary evidence. One tollkeeper was murdered; and the jury were so intimidated that, against all the facts of the case, they returned a verdict of acquittal. This state of things, which extended itself to the questions of workhouses, justices' clerks' fees, tithes, and rent complained of as exorbitant, was put an end to after four years by a complete concession with regard to the original alleged grievance. Take another case—the outrages at Sheffield, which might have been described in stronger language than that used by Sir William Smith and Chief Justice Bush in 1832, or than that which has just been used by three Judges in reference to Ireland. You had then every sort of iniquity. You had explosions; you had compounds thrown into houses with the intention of destroying houses, property, and life, of destroying the property of the workmen as well as the employers. You could not get evidence; you could not trust your jury. The most atrocious cases were acquitted, and in other instances juries—I suppose they were manufacturers—insisted, contrary to the direction of the Judges, in bringing in verdicts of guilty, and free pardons had to be given. The result was that the perpetrators of these outrages escaped, and the law was altered in favour of trades unions. The noble Earl says these cases are not similar. If they were, I should shrink from mentioning them. They would be perfectly incompatible with my supporting a Speech from the Throne in which you are asked to give additional powers for dealing with the existing state of things in Ireland. You cannot, as in the Swing case, wait for four years with disorder spreading from one county to another. You cannot deal with it by abolishing an alleged grievance as you did in Wales, because you cannot abolish rents and trifle with all the rights of property. Nor can you deal with the case by issuing a Commission. That has been one of the things often thought of; it has been carefully considered, and has been deemed to be perfectly inapplicable. I say, therefore, that the grounds on which we have come to Parliament are perfectly distinct; but when you wish to secure, I cannot say the unanimous opinion, but the opinion of the great majority, of the people in England and Scotland and the well-thinking people of Ireland, it is well to take these circumstances into consideration, and to fortify the Government as much as possible in the efforts they are making. The noble Earl utterly condemned what he called delay. There have been other Leaders of the Conservative Party who have spoken at crises in the affairs of Ireland. In 1829 the state of Ireland was very bad, and it got worse and worse until 1833; and this is the description of that country in 1832 which was given by the late Earl Grey in the following year—

> "The disturbers prescribed the terms on which land should be let, and any who disobeyed their orders were subject to have their property destroyed or to be put to death. . . . The catalogue of Irish crime during last year contained 172 homicides, 465 robberies, 568 burglaries, 455 acts of houghing of cattle, 2,095 illegal notices, 425 illegal meetings, 796 malicious injuries to property, 753 attacks on houses, 280 arsons, 3,156 serious assaults. The aggregate of crimes of every description during the year connected with the disturbed state of the country amounted to upwards of 9,000, and it was on the increase. In the Province of Leinster the number of crimes during the months of July, August, and September had been 1,279; in the three following months it had risen to 1,646. There was a system of general demoralization such as had never before existed in a country calling itself civilized."

That was the state of things in Ireland which the late Earl Grey, being then Prime Minister, allowed to go on—his son, the then Lord Howick, being either his Private Secretary or the Under Secretary of the Home Office—I do not say rightly—for a whole year, without coming to Parliament for any increase of legal power; but in 1833 they did so. I am now going to read the words of another great Conservative statesman, Sir Robert Peel; and I suppose nobody will deny that Sir Robert Peel was a man most anxious and competent to maintain the majesty of law and order and peace in the country. After strong measures had been asked for, he said this—

> "Upon this subject he claimed the privilege of being able to form a disinterested and impartial opinion. He had never taunted his Majesty's Ministers for not proposing at an earlier period the measures of coercion which they now demanded. When others said that they ought to have applied for coercive measures he had been no party to the complaint. His language had always been, 'Try the ordinary laws; there is great evil in coercive measures. You cannot rely upon them for any permanent good, but there is great risk that they will relax the energy of the ordinary law, and that they will widen the breach between the richer classes, for whose protection, and the poorer classes, for whose punishment, they appear to be intended.'"

After some observations on the courses which he had at former times proposed, he went on to say—

> "But thinking, as he did, that the Government had acted wisely in not applying at an earlier period for those strong coercive measures—thinking, as he did, that it was wiser for them to have an accumulation of evidence to negative the insinuation that they would seek extraordinary powers for the promotion of their own selfish ambition—avowing the sentiments which he had done as to the objectionable nature of such extraordinary powers, and, above all, wishing as he did to secure life and property in Ireland under the ordinary law—still he could not refrain from saying that, upon the evidence before the public, there was a strong presumption that such powers were imperiously required by the emergencies of the State."—[3 *Hansard*, xv. 371.]

If I remember rightly, Sir Robert Peel had to propose a coercive measure himself somewhat late; but that measure was defeated by the strong opposition and the speeches of the noble Earl opposite. The noble Earl opposite has promised, and thanks to him for it, the support of the Opposition to the measures we may think necessary for securing the execution and support of the law; but I cannot help thinking that Sir Robert Peel's observations are quite as statesmanlike as those of the noble Earl, for Sir Robert Peel approved instead of condemned the conduct of the Government of the day, who showed, as the Government of to-day has shown, some patience and some avoidance of alacrity to try the ordinary method of law before they came to such extreme measures as are now proposed. I am very glad the noble Earl did not repeat some of the personal attacks upon the Government which some of his Colleagues have not shrunk from making; and I am sorry to say not only some of his Colleagues, who, perhaps, are not so free from Party feeling as he is, but also a noble Friend of mine (Earl Grey), whom I regret not to see here. Among the charges which have been made against the Government is that of an entire absence from expressing the reprobation and indignation which must have been produced in their minds by the outrages in Ireland. My Lords, I have heard it stated positively, and in a manner calculated most injuriously to excite the ignorant peasants of Ireland, that it was the wish of Her Majesty's Government that the outrages should increase, in order that they might bring some drastic measure of Land Reform before the country. I would shrink from attributing such a diabolical motive to any of my noble Friends sitting opposite to me; and I must say that we were entitled not to have such motives attributed to us. All I can say is that in the Cabinet and out of it I have never heard the slightest hint of such a wish for such an argument on the part of the Ministers. I should like also to defend ourselves against the charge of having been entirely silent and of having refrained from the expression of all indignation. I can speak of occasions on some of which I was present. One of these was the Guildhall banquet; and on that occasion Mr. Gladstone, after entirely endorsing the strong remarks made by the Lord Chancellor, to which I will refer, declared that, anxious as we are for the practical improvement of the Land Laws, we recognize the priority of the duty, above every other, of enforcing the law for the purpose of order. And what did the Lord Chancellor say? His words are important, and they were—

"Liberty and law are the two great pillars of the State. Each is absolutely and indispensably necessary to the perfection of the other. No man's liberties would be safe either to his person or to his political rights, or his private rights of property, if law were not respected, independently administered, and loyally obeyed. It is, therefore, and it always must be, one of the first, greatest, and most paramount duties of every Government to maintain the authority of law with firmness, steadiness, and without respect to any man who seeks to introduce public disorder into the State and to insist that the law, while it exists, is not to be obeyed."

I beg pardon for quoting observations of my own. I myself, speaking, of course, with less authority than the Prime Minister, or than the head of the law, yet speaking as a Member of the Cabinet, said—

"It is painful and discreditable that there should exist in Ireland a want of security for life and property,"

and I described the existing state of things in Ireland as a new and dangerous interference, not only with proprietary rights, but with the liberty of the existing tenant, of the would-be tenant, of the tradesman, and of the labouring man. I said it shocked the reason that there should be a conspiracy to destroy contracts already made, and that it horrified the feelings that for this purpose recourse should be had to the most cruel outrages on animals as well as men. I said it was impossible that such a state of things should continue. I announced the meeting of Parliament for this date, when I stated the public would have a right to expect an appeal to the two Houses for such extraordinary powers as were best fitted to strengthen the hands of the Executive in this particular emergency, as well as for remedial measures on a sound principle to secure the future contentment of the people. I can only say that if these words did not express the deepest and warmest sympathy that I feel with the victims of every class in Ireland, it is certainly not from any deficiency of feeling, but from a want of power of expression on my part, although I doubt whether the addition of epithets and superlatives would add much to a description of that sort. There is another Liberal statesman whose language on this subject I should quote. Mr. Bright described the agency of the agitators as one of terror, of outrage, and murder. He denounced their expropriation of the landlords and other violent and impossible schemes. He said—

"These propositions, which no Government can listen to, which no people can submit to—these propositions, depend upon it, are made by men who, in their hearts, hate much more than they love the farmers of their country."

I may be wrong, but I think Ministers

have not been deficient in expressing their indignation of the lawlessness we have witnessed in Ireland. I have quoted Sir Robert Peel, and now I shall quote more recent expressions of Conservative speakers. We are blamed for not having sought last autumn the powers we now deem necessary. I am sorry that official demands upon my time do not allow me to read the newspapers with the care and attention desirable. But I do not think that before the period at which we met, most deeply and anxiously to consider whether we should summon Parliament or not—I do not think, although several Conservative Members and Members of the late Government had spoken on the state of Ireland, any one of them advised our meeting for the purpose of getting additional powers. One Gentleman did speak on the task before Her Majesty's Government—a man who had been for four years Chief Secretary for Ireland to the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Marlborough); and, no doubt, his services in that capacity marked him out for the position in the Cabinet which he afterwards held. I refer to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; and he said he rejoiced that the Government were going to exhaust all the means which the law of the land gave them before asking Parliament for exceptional powers.

A NOBLE LORD: What was the date of that speech?

EARL GRANVILLE: Ten days before we met to consider whether Parliament should be called together c ı not. It was on October 28 last. It shows that Members on the Liberal side were not alone in their view that it was expedient to take all the precautions possible to make your case complete when you came to demand these extraordinary powers. In the remarks I have made I have endeavoured to confine myself as well as I could to answering the principal observations which were made by the noble Earl. I believe the state of Ireland to be painful and humiliating. I believe it must be dealt with firmly, carefully, and prudently. I believe, after the statement which the noble Earl has made, both in regard to measures of repression and the responsibility which falls on the Executive—I believe, if Parliament were to refuse the remedies proposed by Her Majesty's Government, the task of government in Ireland would be very difficult indeed, not only of Her Majesty's present Government, but of any other that may follow them. But I will say this—that if you give us the power which we think best fitted for the purpose, and which we shall immediately apply as soon as the Rules of the other House permit us to make the application, and if you give us encouragement, we believe that on sound and wise principles you will help us to deal, not only with the immediate pressure of the moment, but to establish measures that will lead to an improvement of the relations between landlord and tenant and the better economical position of the tenants of Ireland. I do not look upon the future with the despairing gloom of the noble Earl; but I do look forward with no inconsiderable hope to the fact that peace, prosperity, and order may be restored to that, one of the most important portions of Her Majesty's Dominions.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, I wish, with a full sense of the responsibility under which I speak, to make a few observations on the crisis which prevails in Ireland—a crisis of the gravest character, and portentous with interests of the Empire. The state of things in Ireland has riveted the attention of every class of Her Majesty's subjects. It has roused their fears and excited their apprehensions. We may truly say—"*Paries quum proximus ardet.*" No class of the community knows how soon the same state of things may reach our own shores. I cannot attempt to approach the subject in the exhaustive manner of my noble Friend who leads the Opposition in your Lordships' House. It is not for me to refer so much to general principles; but I entirely concur in his statement that it will be the duty of the Opposition to refrain from anything like Obstruction, and to give the Government every assistance they can in preparing those measures of coercion which, unhappily, have become necessary in Ireland; but, at the same time, I do think that a due measure of responsibility should be affixed to the Government for having permitted such a state of things to grow up in that country. The noble Earl who has just sat down has remarked upon the course that would have been incumbent on the late Government to adopt with regard to measures for the repression of crime in Ireland. The noble Earl said that crime had increased, and the proportion of outrages was more numerous in the beginning of last year than at previous periods. Unfortunately, that was the case; but it was somewhat inconsistent with the language of the present Government in the Queen's Speech at the beginning of last Session of Parliament. The noble Earl said there was not time to renew the Act; but if the late Government had retained power after the Election it would have been their duty to apply to Parliament to renew the Act; and although there would have been difficulties it would not have been impossible to overcome them. The noble Earl has referred to precedents which had been followed in somewhat analogous cases. But I think this a little inconsistent with the very terms of the Speech itself. I read in Her Majesty's Speech—

> "In a state of things new in some important respects, and hence with little of available guidance from former precedent, I have deemed it right steadily to put in use the ordinary powers of the law before making any new demand."

The noble Earl alluded to matters which showed that there were precedents, although it was stated in Her Majesty's Speech that the occasion was entirely without precedent. The noble Earl says that the Government have redeemed the pledges given to Parliament at the time when they announced their determination not to renew the Peace Preservation Act. My Lords, these pledges were of a very extraordinary character. In the first place, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant took upon himself the entire responsibility for the advice which he gave to Her Majesty's Government not to renew the Act. The words which he used on that occasion were very remarkable. He said—

> "He would only say that in coming to the conclusion that they could do without the Peace Preservation Act, it was with a full sense of their responsibility. He wished to say that, feeling the responsibility specially rested upon himself, he looked into the matter as closely as he possibly could; and he came to the conclusion that he could, as far as it was his business to do so, give an opinion and advice to his Colleagues that they could trust to maintain peace and order and give protection to life and property without the help of exceptional Acts. He did believe that the attempt would be successful. . . He repeated he believed they would succeed; but he need not say if they did not succeed, their first duty was to preserve order and cause the law to be maintained; but he did not believe that they would be obliged to re-enact that law."—[3 *Hansard*, cclii. 158.]

My Lords, I do not wish to quote from confidential records; they are in the possession of the Government; they were in the possession of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He had them before him and could draw his own conclusions. I venture to assert that these confidential records were of a character entirely opposed to the conclusion come to by the right hon. Gentleman. They were opinions invited from 70 resident magistrates in Ireland, gentlemen of great experience, of great knowledge of the country, intimately acquainted with the habits of the people, knowing their history and the tendencies of the social disturbances in existence at that period. Out of these 70 magistrates, 60 gave it as their decided opinion that it would be essential to renew the Peace Preservation Act of 1875. Some, indeed, went so far as to say that they would renew the Act of 1870, and some were in favour of still more stringent legislation. But the 60 magistrates united in the opinion that it was most important that the Act should not be allowed to expire; and some of them stated as the ground for their opinion that the existing agitation, which has since grown to such formidable proportions, was of such a character as to render it imperatively necessary for the Government to renew the Act. And yet we have the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant stating in the House of Commons that he had inquired fully into the subject, that he had all the information before him, and that he could take upon himself the responsibility of advising his Colleagues not to renew the Act. The right hon. Gentleman might take upon himself that responsibility; but it was one which many in this country would not commend. The provision with regard to compensation in the case of injuries, the provision for the police tax, and the provision with regard to arms were among the most effectual provisions of the Act, and experience has subsequently proved them to be of the most necessary character. When I ventured to bring this subject before your Lordships at the beginning of last Session, the noble Earl opposite (Earl Spencer) expressed his opinion that no value was to be attached to the provisions for imposing a police tax upon a district, and stated that there were provisions in previous Acts of Parliament which would have precisely the same effect. Those provisions had been tried, and what had they resulted in? In a sense of the grossest injustice possible, because they enabled the Government to increase the force of police in a county, and to tax the whole county for the police, though a portion of it might not be in a disturbed state. There has been nothing upon which popular orators have dwelt more strongly during the autumn than that the police could have been thus thrown into a county, and the county at large could be charged with the expense. There was another matter for which great responsibility attached to the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, and that was the line adopted by the right hon. Gentleman in the other House with respect to the Irish landlords. There were certain subjects which pressed heavily upon the attention of Parliament in the last Session. One was a measure for the relief of distress, for carrying on the beneficial operations inaugurated by the preceding Government. In the meantime the Government had their attention constantly called to the outrages which were being committed. But, in addition to those matters, the Government imported, in an entirely unnecessary and gratuitous manner, a raid upon the landlords of Ireland. I will not now refer to all that then occurred. I will only say that the spirit and tone adopted by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant were not calculated to insure peace or harmony in Ireland; but rather to create an *à priori* impression that the Government were not favourably disposed to the landlords of Ireland. "Injustice" was the word constantly launched at the heads of the Irish landlords; and they were made to appear, at the hands of those responsible in the other House of Parliament, as a class almost proscribed, as a class against whom penal legislation should be enacted, rather than against the real disturbers of the public peace. The right hon. Gentleman said, on August 24, in one of the debates—

> "If they found—as they had not within the last two or three weeks found, and as they hoped they would not find—that the landlords of Ireland were to any great extent making use of their powers so as to force the Government to support them in the exercise of injustice, the Government should accompany any request for special powers with a Bill which would prevent the Government from being obliged to support injustice. . . . The Act was necessary to take from them the possibility of having to support a law which in any circumstances might be unjust."—[3 *Hansard*, cclv. 2021-3.]

My Lords, I must say that it was a pity and an error that such expressions should have been used during the debates in the other House of Parliament; and, whatever their motive or their meaning, they had the effect of creating a feeling throughout Ireland that the Government were not favourably disposed to the landlords as a class, but looked on them as oppressors. Now, the noble Earl has dwelt very much on the necessity which the Government felt of exhausting every available means of enforcing the existing law before they applied for further extraordinary powers; but I will ask the noble Earl whether they are not conscious that the general opinion and prevailing feeling in the mind as well as the mouth of everyone during the last three months has been as to what term the Government would put to the experiment they were making, and that everyone has been asking when they would admit the fact that the existing laws were not sufficient, and that the time had come for the exercise of extraordinary powers. If ever there was such a time I should have thought it would have been when the Chief Secretary issued his remarkable Circular to the magistrates of Ireland. If ever there was a confession of the impotence of the existing law in Ireland, surely it was when the Chief Secretary in Ireland thought it time to look up the musty records of the past for powers to enable the magistrates to act with the necessary vigour. What was the state of the country? Armed bands were patrolling everywhere; murders were frequent; the law was paralyzed; the police were hardly effective; and yet, in these circumstances, the Chief Secretary issues his remarkable Circular, in which he recalls to the magistrates the fact that they possess extraordinary powers and have authority to summon under a penalty any person within their jurisdiction whom they may think capable of giving material evidence as to offences mentioned in the 5th and 6th paragraphs. No one, however, would venture to come forward, or would give the slightest indication that he was capable of giving evidence; and it was, therefore, the height of irony to say "the magistrates have power to summon any person whom they may think capable of giving evidence." The magistrates declare in answer that it is absolutely impossible to obtain information sufficient to bring to justice the perpetrators of outrages. And yet one would have thought that, when the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had recourse to such measures as these in the last resort, the time had come when he might believe the powers of the ordinary law to be insufficient. But what did the Government do? Did they strengthen the hands of the police? Did they give them any idea that they would be actively supported in the performance of their duty? I believe that a more honourable, a more intelligent, or a more effective force does not exist than the police in Ireland, and yet we find a Circular of a most extraordinary character sent to them from the Inspector General's Office. It is as follows:—

> "The fact that armed parties move about the country at night and commit outrages, and are seldom, indeed, even met with on their advance to, their return from, or during their stay at the place they commit such outrages by police patrols is very difficult to understand, and causes considerable discredit to attach to the force, and would appear to lead to the conclusion that the very full and clear instructions which are laid down on the subject of patrolling are not properly carried out. It is, therefore, most essential that you should carefully consider this matter and report fully and as early as possible, giving your opinions as to where the fault lies and how it may best be corrected. You will also at once call on each sub-inspector in your county to give his immediate and special attention to the matter, and inform him that he must not only issue directions, but must, by frequent nightly and early morning visits to his out-stations, and by such other means as are in his power, satisfy himself that the regulations of the force on the subject are faithfully carried out, and he must be held responsible that they are so."

Compare this Circular with one of another kind issued shortly before, which was so extraordinary that it was looked upon as a sort of practical joke, and which regulated the proceedings of the Constabulary at meetings, and enjoined that they should be concealed fron view. When we consider the character of these meetings, their seditious nature, and the doctrines that are preached at them, to tell the police that they are to be concealed from view is just one of those directions most likely to discourage them. The Irish Constabulary have, indeed, had to perform a task encompassed by no ordinary difficulties. They have acted with energy and fidelity, and directions of this sort are calculated to exercise the most prejudicial influence upon them. The noble Earl has referred to events that occurred in the year 1833, and has quoted speeches of Sir Robert Peel, and of Lord Grey, in which he accounts for the delay that took place at that time in summoning Parliament and in calling for repressive powers. I am, therefore, all the more struck by that part of Her Majesty's Speech in which it is stated that there were no precedents by which the Government might be guided. The noble Earl, at any rate, could hardly say that, for he seems to have studied the case thoroughly. With regard to the extraordinary similarity that existed between the year 1833 and the events of the last autumn, I may mention that Lord Grey, in moving for coercive measures, used these words—

> "The organization, too, extends over the whole country. There is a central association in Dublin calling itself the Pacificators of Ireland; and a part of their pacific plan is that parties of three persons shall go in the character, and bearing the name of pacificators, to different parts of the country, appealing to the farmers and the people to join the association, which is thus planned to branch out in all directions and embrace the whole society, under the guidance and control of the central association of Dublin. Observe, my Lords, that these Pacificators are to hold public meetings—that they are to come together at the period of the Quarter Sessions; they are to decide disputes between man and man, superseding the police and the law, and obtaining possession of the whole power of the State."—[3 *Hansard*, xv. 724].

There we have an organization exactly like that in existence at the present day. The noble Earl has quoted Sir Robert Peel; but I will also read a passage from his speech on the Coercion Bill of that year—

> "He admitted that this was a measure of intolerable severity, unles there was a paramount necessity for it; but he denied that this was a suspension of the British Constitution. The British Constitution in many parts of the country had been long ago gone. He saw a ghastly form, which called itself the British Constitution. The British Constitution was not a form of jurisprudence intended to give impunity to crime; it pre-supposed the existence of institutions and of elements which could be employed for the protection of life and pro-

> perty. The British Constitution knew nothing of the abominable doctine of passive resistance; it never took a precaution against it, because it confided in the equity and justice of Englishmen, and never supposed that the doctrine of passive resistance would be resorted to by any man as an authority for the purpose of depriving others of their rights. When acts like these went unpunished, when they were triumphant, do not let any man say that this was a suspension of the British Constitution. While such a state of things existed, it was a mockery to talk of this being a suspension of the British Constitution. Talk of the British Constitution! it was the impunity of guilt perpetrated under the shield of the British Constitution. He was reconciled to the support of this Bill, because he consulted the honour of the British Constitution in endeavouring to prevent the odium of these atrocities being cast upon it. All law must be paralyzed where scenes such as he had described prevailed, and every moral restraint must be at an end. With a spirit like this, the House could make no compromise. However they might talk of adopting healing measures and hoped to conciliate powerful parties by concessions, Parliament would gain nothing by giving way to popular clamour or yielding one single point beyond that which their sense of justice dictated. If Ministers established principles leading to future confiscations, they might, indeed, be cheered in that House by the voices of many around them; but not only would they fail to procure additional security for life and peace and property, but, so far from satisfying their deluded countrymen, they would only whet their appetites for further rapine."

The noble Earl opposite seems to suppose that Earl Grey waited the whole of the autumn before he took any measures. The fact was, however, that Special Commissions were sent into several counties in Ireland, and when Parliament met he himself laid stress on that fact of these Commissions having been sent and having failed to restore law and order. Now, owing to the inaction of Her Majesty's Government, evils have become aggravated which might have been arrested if dealt with with promptitude. The Land League has gained greater and greater influence in the country, until at last a state of things exists which beggars description. I will not weary your Lordships by quoting from the Charges of the Judges and the statements made by them as to the difficulty of getting evidence and of obtaining convictions from juries. These facts have been before the public, and these statements are well known; but I think it is necessary that I should read to your Lordships what is the state of things which the organization calling itself the Land League has brought about. Here is a statement of the proceedings of the League Court at Limeri k. It is stated that "an Equity League Court was constituted to enforce the League Laws." A Kerry paper, giving a report of the proceedings at the Tralee branch of the Land League, said—

> "The first case called on was an adjourned one, that of Mrs. Barton, who claimed to get back her farm, which was given up some years ago. One of the Land Leaguers, who holds some of the land, said he had offered to give it up; but the agent insisted on holding him to his bargain. The next case was that of Sir Henry Donovan, who was called to account for hard treatment of his tenants. He did not appear, but his cause was ably advocated by Messrs. Power and Walpole, who showed that the fault lay more with the tenants; and, no specific complaint having been made, the case was dismissed. In another case, 'Faris *v.* M'Eligitt and Deane,' the secretary laid before the Court 'sworn affidavits and counter affidavits,' and evidence was produced. Other cases were disposed of; and at the close of the sitting notice was given to the effect that, in consequence of the heavy business which members of the League had to dispose of, a committee should be appointed to investigate certain cases before bringing them under the jurisdiction of the general meeting. A complaint was made by a woman named Carmody that Mr. M'Cowen, a town commissioner, had taken up her farm in lieu of debt, and it was ordered that Mr. M'Cowen be summoned to appear before the committee. A case between two brothers was afterwards heard, and this led to an angry altercation which lasted till three constables arrived to restore order. The meeting was held in a licensed house."

The fact is that these Courts are arrogating to themselves all the powers of the existing law. They pass sentences of three months' "Boycotting." There are three or four ways in which persons may protect themselves. One way is by subscribing to the funds of the Land League. Another is by serving on a jury and "doing his duty;" and it is well known what means. A third method was to recognize the authority of these Courts by putting in an appearance. Her Majesty's Government seem to have risen at last to the exigencies of the situation, for I see some members of one of these Courts have been arrested while they were carrying on their business. If the Government have been advised that they possess these powers, I should like to know why this course was not resorted to six or seven weeks ago? Why did not they arrest these conspirators before? The Government have not fulfilled their pledges with regard to the repressive measures which it was possible to adopt. The noble Earl states that they were anxious to leave no stone unturned, and that they were determined to have full and irrefragable proof of the existence of the evil, and that, therefore, they did not take steps to call Parliament together at an earlier period in order to pass exceptional legislation. But what was the pledge given last Session by the Chief Secretary? In answer to a Question addressed to him in the House of Commons by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock, the right hon. Gentleman said there was certainly much cause for anxiety in many parts of Ireland, although there was no fear of a rising, and he added—

> "If we find that in the course of the autumn or winter we cannot rely on the existing law, we shall not, in that case, hesitate to call Parliament together for the purpose of giving us such additional powers as may be needed to fulfil our first duty—the protection of life and property."—[3 *Hansard*, cclv. 1846.]

I ask whether the Government have fulfilled the pledge then given by the right hon. Gentleman? In consequence of the agitation which has been going on for so long a time many employers of labour have been compelled to discontinue the employment they were giving, and the result is that there is a great deal of distress in the country. The Act passed last Session for the relief of distress gave exceptional powers for the granting of out-door relief. Those powers were expressly given, however, for the granting of out-door relief in the event of another failure of the harvest. But we know that there has been a most bountiful harvest in Ireland, and that, but for this agitation, there would have been plenty of employment, and no necessity for extraordinary relief. I find, however, although there has been a decrease of 2,428 in the number of inmates in workhouses, that there is an increase of upwards of 10,000 persons in the receipt of out-door relief as compared with the year 1879. Under these circumstances, it would appear as if a most improper use has been made of the Relief Act. It is not my intention to advert to any other portion of Her Majesty's Speech. As regards the measure for the restoration of aw and order in Ireland, I fully concur with my noble Friend the Leader of the Opposition that it will not be desirable to impede in any way the action of Her Majesty's Government, and I shall feel it my duty to give them any support they may require. At the same time, I cannot but feel that they have shown a large amount of ignorance as to the state of the country, and that they have coupled with that ignorance a lamentable amount of inaction which is dangerous to the integrity of the Empire.

EARL CAIRNS said, he rose for the purpose of pointing out that the extract quoted by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) from the speech of a Member of the late Cabinet scarcely represented accurately the sense of that speech in its entirety. If the noble Earl had read on he would have seen that the speaker doubted whether they were wise in declining to renew in June last exceptional powers. He (Earl Cairns) had a full report of that speech in his hand. It was made in October, and in it the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) said—

> "I am glad, I confess, that the Government are attempting to exhaust all the means which the law of the land gives them before asking Parliament for exceptional powers, though I doubt whether they were wise in declining to renew in June last those exceptional powers under which, without any harm to Ireland, that country had so long been peacefully governed. If the ordinary law will suffice, let the ordinary law be used for the purpose; but I think the Government should remember this—that by their inaction hitherto, and by their action now, they have incurred, and are incurring, a fearful responsibility. If it should be that these prosecutions drag on for months, as prosecutions sometimes do, if, in the end, they should fail in their object, and if, in the meantime, crime and outrage should extend and stalk through the country without fear of the law, then what defence will the Government have to give to Parliament next year?"

The right hon. Baronet concluded by saying that if the Government failed in the primary duty of enforcing the law as they found it and securing life and property, Parliament and the country would, whatever their intentions were, "judge them as men who had failed in their first and greatest duty to their country and Queen."

EARL GRANVILLE said, it did not seem to him that the noble and learned Earl opposite (Earl Cairns) had at all shaken his argument. The right hon. Baronet from whose speech he quoted did, in fact, as he (Earl Granville) had stated, express satisfaction with the Government for desiring to exhaust all the powers of the ordinary law before asking for exceptional measures.

Earl CAIRNS said, the noble Earl ought to have included in his quotation the fact that the right hon. Baronet said he doubted whether the ordinary law would be sufficient, and that the Government would incur a fearful responsibility by their inaction in the matter.

Earl SPENCER: My Lords, after the speech of my noble Friend the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Duke of Marlborough), I feel it my duty to address some observations to your Lordships, and I do so with a sense of great responsibility. In the course of last Session I had very frequently to answer Questions and take part in debates, in your Lordships' House, on the state of Ireland. Your Lordships will remember that I never minimized the grave state of affairs existing in parts of that country, and that I always stated that the Government would be prepared to maintain order and secure life and property, either by means of the ordinary law, or—though, perhaps, I did not say so in so many words—by means of exceptional measures. I very willingly acknowledge the general fairness and moderation of the noble Earl who leads the Opposition in this House, and of the noble Duke the late Viceroy; but throughout the country we hear and see accounts, as if Her Majesty's Government are solely responsible for all the acts of the Land League in Ireland. Even the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition has attacked us for not having, as he says, nipped in the bud that organization. I wish to repudiate that responsibility, on the part of Her Majesty's Government. I do not repudiate the responsibility of not having—as some noble Lords thought we ought to have done—applied to Parliament sooner for exceptional measures; but I do deny that the present Government are solely responsible for the existence of the Land League in Ireland. For more than a year of the period during which the late Lord Lieutenant ruled in Ireland that Land League was established there. It was in no way different then from what it is now. Its effects were precisely the same, though, no doubt, they are more intense now. I find that from the 1st of April, 1879, to the end of March, 1880, no fewer than 203 Land League meetings were held in Ireland, the object being to intimidate landlords into a reduction of rents. I do not mean to say that the late Government ought to have put down the organization directly it formed itself; but I do contend that if any blame rests upon the present Administration for not having taken that step, the late Government must share the blame with them, for they had a much easier part to do in dealing with it. Agrarian outrages rose very rapidly last year, attaining the number of 860, whereas in 1878 they were 301, and in 1875 only 136. They attained an especially high figure in the month of January; and, although they were unquestionably the outcome of the Land League meetings, I have not heard that one of those meetings was ever stopped by the late Government. The late Government did, no doubt, institute a prosecution against certain persons in November, 1879; but the proceedings were very dilatory, the final pleas not being filed till the 27th of February, and ultimately they came to nothing. When the present Government succeeded to Office, they found that abortive prosecution so much "blown upon" that they did not consider it worth while to take it up. I come now to the question of the non-renewal of the Peace Preservation Act. We have heard to-night, from the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, that it was the intention of the late Government to renew that Act before its expiry on the 1st of June last year. Well, if the late Government believed, as they must have done, that the renewal of that Act was necessary, they incurred a very grave responsibility in not renewing it before the Dissolution of Parliament. The difficulty the present Government had in dealing with the Act was that instead of having six weeks, as was alleged, for introducing a measure of renewal, they had practically only ten days, and it was impossible to renew the Act within that time. The late Government were not ignorant of the kind of opposition which, unfortunately, exists in "another place;" and they must have known that it would have been impossible, after the meeting of the new Parliament, to pass those Acts before the end of May. A considerable gap must have been left between the expiry of those Acts and their renewal, and during that period large quantities of arms might have been imported into the country. This Act, we thought, moreover, was not an Act which really gave us the powers necessary to put down agrarian outrages and disturbances. Why, the noble Duke himself said the Act was only capable of mild repression; but the Government did not want mild repression; what we wanted was just and complete repression of an evil which we knew, and the magnitude of which we acknowledged. I will now touch on one or two points where I think the Act was practically of very little use. On a former occasion my noble Friend opposite said that he attached the greatest importance to the clause in the Peace Preservation Act affecting the power of magistrates to summon witnesses. But I find that the provision in question was only put in force once in 1878, not at all in 1877, twice in 1876, twice in 1875, and four times in 1874. In 1879 it was only put in force four times. If that clause were one of such great importance, would not my noble Friend have put it in force more often in 1879, when we know that the criminal returns were considerable? Then I come to the provision regarding threatening letters. It was only put in force 21 times in 1879, and 13 times in 1878, though the number of threatening letters in Connaught alone increased from 35 in 1878 to 253 in 1879. That provision, therefore, was not of very great use in putting down crime. Then, with regard to the power of taxing small districts in contradistinction to large counties where extra police were sent down. Well, in Mayo £2,850 was the moiety for the extra police charged on the county, and only £200 of that sum was charged on a small part. Then we come to the compensation for injuries, as to which there was a great lament over the loss of the power for awarding compensation for injuries at the expense of the district in which it took place. This law was introduced when I was responsible for the government of Ireland; but my experience of the Act, I must say, led me to the conclusion that not a single case of murder or outrage was prevented by that Act. In 1879 there had only been 15 applications for compensation, amounting to £9,470. Of these only 12 were granted, and the sum given was £2,000. Moreover, I found that the provision was very difficult to administer, and that it was constantly doing great injustice, two or three people being justly punished for 20 or 30 who suffered unjustly. Turning to another point, I do not believe that compulsory licences for those who want to carry arms would have any deterrent effect, for I think that a man who intends to commit a murderous crime will commit it, whether he is obliged to get a licence for arms or not. If, however, the Government had had the power given by the Peace Preservation Act with regard to arms they would not have been sorry for it when the country reached the state of increased agitation after October. But simply to obtain this one power they did not think that it would be desirable practically to take up the whole of last Session. I maintain that in October the non-renewal of the Act had not caused one extra outrage, though it had increased the panic in the country, because many persons were alarmed when they found that people had arms in their possession. This power over arms is undoubtedly an important one. Notice will be given in "another place" in reference to this matter, and I think your Lordships will find that the question has been carefully considered by the Cabinet. Now, my noble Friend said to-night that though we knew many resident magistrates were in favour of renewing the Peace Preservation Act we preferred to act on our own responsibility. I should be extremely sorry were your Lordships to suppose that these influential gentlemen were not treated with the respect due to them. I know what excellent service the resident magistrates do in Ireland, and I attach the greatest importance to their work; but it is fair to remember that gentlemen who have long been accustomed to very strong powers are naturally very reluctant to give any of them up, and shrink from the responsibility of recommending such a course. Now, a few words on a point already referred to. When a Government is going to ask Parliament for exceptional powers, the first thing to be asked is, Has the Executive exercised to the full extent the powers already in existence? Well, I think I shall be able to show that it is owing to no neglect or want of skill in the administration of those powers that they have not been successful. Up to August crime did not increase very rapidly. The numbers of agrarian outrages were 92 in June and 103 in August. I believe that the Executive Government have done all they could in exercising their powers in connection with the police. It was found that the numbers of the Constabulary were insufficient, and they have been increased in seven counties alone by 591 men. It was found that we could not train the police rapidly enough; and, therefore, the accommodation at Dublin has been increased, and a depôt established at the Curragh for the purpose of training men for the force. An endeavour has also been made to organize patrols, not only of the police alone, but also of the police in combination with the military. It is a painful thing to refer to; but there is one thing which shows how vigilant the Executive and how active the police had been, and it is the number of people who are receiving protection. If the number of personal outrages has been small in comparison with the increase of other crimes, it is owing to the great vigilance of the police under the direction of the Lord Lieutenant and the present Chief Secretary for Ireland. In 1870, when crime was rife, the number of people who had special personal protection was 23; it was 15 in 1871; and now it is 153. These figures show that the Government give every facility for the protection of life in the country. I was glad to hear my noble Friend say he had the highest respect and admiration for the Royal Irish Constabulary; and I believe, from long experience, there never was a more intelligent, energetic, active, and loyal body of men. One of the first things that happen when there is any want of protection for life and property is that people begin to accuse all those who have anything to do with the maintenance of the peace. They attack the Ministers and the permanent officials. The Ministers can defend themselves and the officials in Parliament; but people are still more inclined to attack the police force and to say they are inefficient. I have seen many attacks of this sort, and it will be a satisfaction to your Lordships to know that the present Irish Government have the same implicit confidence in that force that former Lords Lieutenant have had in it. As to the Circular issued to the police, I have made inquiry, and I find that my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland did not wish to convey any displeasure or rebuke; he only wanted to draw attention to one of their duties. Unfortunately, that Circular was made public, and it may have caused pain to some members of that admirable force; but it was not issued with the view of suggesting that they had been in any way neglectful of their duty. My right hon. Friend has looked into the matter, and he assures me that the police have been very active in patrolling; but the state of feeling in certain parts of the country where these outrages are committed is such that the police are more watched by the people than the people are by the police, and the information the people have of the crimes committed is almost better than the police can obtain. The explanation is that in those districts there is want of willingness to give information, and the people on whom the outrages are committed are often afraid of coming forward to state their case. There is much sympathy on the part of the people with the offenders, and the police labour under the greatest possible difficulties in those districts. As to the posting of the military in different parts of the country, when I was asked a Question on the subject last Session I said I felt assured there had been no change of policy, and when I spoke to my right hon. Friend I found that I had interpreted his views correctly. In July the military numbered 19,027 men; but they have been increased since, and now number 25,062 men. That is a material increase, and the Government most sincerely trust that that large number of men will not be called upon for any active duty; but they thought it better in the extremely disturbed state of the country that they should be prepared for any emergency, and they felt that in sending these men into the disturbed districts they would give confidence to loyal people, and have ample means of repressing any disturbance should it arise. The number of stations had been increased at the end of November by 23. My noble Friend asks why the Government have not suppressed all the meetings at which what are called "Tribunals" have passed sentences? The reason is that I believe it is only recently that those who take part in them have lost the cunning and cleverness which they displayed at first. Just as my noble Friend might wish to stop some meetings and could not, so I believe there were few of these meetings which could have been legally stopped by the Government. The meeting he referred to was dealt with in the most summary way, and all in the assembly were arrested by the police. Within the last few weeks, owing to the greater want of caution displayed by the conveners of the meetings, we have been able to stop several where people were to be denounced. They have also been stopped when the Executive had reason to believe that the meeting might lead to a breach of the peace. For a long time the conductors of these meetings abstained from summoning them for the purpose of denouncing individuals, and, therefore, they could not be legally stopped; but within the last few weeks they have done so, and, therefore, several meetings have been successfully stopped. Between June and the middle of October there was only one meeting which could have been stopped; there was always some technical difficulty in the way of interfering with others. My noble Friend has asked whether the Government consider they have performed the pledges which my right hon. Friend gave as to asking for extraordinary powers, if such a course became necessary. I believe we are now fulfilling that pledge in the manner which will be most conducive to the future interests of Ireland and of the United Kingdom. Some noble Lords think the Government have postponed too long dealing with the matter. I must claim for the Government the power of saying for themselves when they consider the time to have come. We did not in our pledges say when it should be; and we are now about to fulfil them in the manner which we think best for the interests of the country. My noble Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Granville) has ably explained the reason why we did not feel justified in applying to Parliament earlier. We did not want to apply mild repression to this alarming state of things. We wanted, when we did act, to act with justice, with vigour, and with success; and I maintain that that success will be in a measure governed by the amount of the support which the Government will receive from the country. We believe we have selected the right moment for taking action—a time when, practically, there will be a unanimous opinion in Great Britain in favour of measures of restoring tranquillity to Ireland, and when, therefore, the Government will be practically supported by the unanimous opinion of this country. We believe that if we had come to Parliament earlier we should not have had that unanimous feeling; but I quite admit it is a matter on which there may be differences of opinion. Now we practically carry with us the united voice of Great Britain; and that, we think, is a matter of most vital importance to the interests of Ireland. If we had had a division of opinion in this country, disturbance in Ireland would have had material support in many parts of this country, and that would have diminished the influence it is desirable the Government should have in carrying repressive measures accompanied by remedial measures. At the same time, I must say that England has too often dealt with Ireland by means of the strong hand alone, without trying to remedy the existing evils complained of. We, therefore, thought it was of great importance, after having exhausted all the powers of the law, to endeavour to do right by carrying some remedial measure to redress the existing grievances in Ireland. We do not wish to be driven by fear to extremity; we wish to do what is just to all classes concerned; but we believe we shall be doing what is much more right towards the Irish and much more likely to make a permanent settlement of the question if we accompany strong measures to restore tranquillity with the proposal to do justice where wrong may be suffered. I am sorry, my Lords, to have detained you so long; but I thought it right, in replying to the observations of my noble Friend, to make some remarks on the great difficulties that exist in Ireland. I need hardly say that I sincerely trust the efforts of Her Majesty's Government in dealing with a condition of things which has not for the first time existed in Ireland may be successful; that the present condition of affairs will only be temporary; and that, before long, Ireland will again enter on that path of prosperity on which she seemed to be advancing a few years back.

THE DUKE OF ABERCORN: I wish, my Lords, to say a very few words. I must at once declare, in answer to my noble Friend, that, in my opinion, repressive measures, accompanied by measures of a remedial character such as we understand are to be proposed, is a course of treatment which will most assuredly not succeed in Ireland. I would, therefore, venture to warn the Government that if, as they propose, they go to the Irish poeple with repressive measures and a conciliatory Land Bill *pari passu*—with a rod of iron in one hand and sugar in the other, they will entirely fail in their object. So long as agitation and terrorism remain unchecked, any proposed modification of the Land Laws would be thrown back in their face as a useless measure of fear and timidity by Parnell and his confederates of the Land League, who care nothing for any amendment of them. In fact, they are the last things they wish to see improved. The Government must, in the first instance, vindicate the law and assert effectually the Queen's authority. When they have shown their determination to uphold the law, to put down intimidation and terrorism, any measure for the improvement of the Land Laws will be regarded as a measure of justice and not of fear by the people of Ireland, and be received with acquiescence, if not with gratitude.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, it will be in your Lordships' recollection that, in the month of October last, a deputation waited upon the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, with the view of laying before those authorities the state of things in Ireland. As the individual who had the honour of introducing that deputation, I venture to interpose between your Lordships and the other important items in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech with a few words upon the subject which, as the noble Earl (the Earl of Beaconsfield) has said, engrosses all our minds at the present moment. I cannot speak with the authority of the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough), who filled with such dignity and ability the high position he occupied under Her Majesty's late Government; but I can, at all events, address your Lordships as one who has not been an inactive observer during the last few months, and who, in common with all peace-loving and law-abiding citizens, with every right-minded subject of the Crown who knew the true facts, has watched in shame and consternation the progress of events, and the apparent helplessness of Her Majesty's Government to control them. It appears inconceivable, to anyone who pretends to any knowledge of Englishmen, that the great mass of the people of this country can have weighed and appreciated the state of things in Ireland — I mean the conditions under which we are now living, and have been living more or less since September. They are only now, and now I believe only partially, awakening to the truth that a revolution is seething at their doors. Had it been otherwise, things would have been different. I do not believe, had the state of Ireland been really understood by them, had they appreciated the true extent of the revolutionary reign of terror by which we have been swayed, that the enlightened people of this civilized country would have permitted the Cabinet to stand by with folded hands, while every function of government was slipping from its grasp into that of a revolutionary faction. No, my Lords, it has not been known in this country. The secret has been carefully locked in the Ministerial bosom; and Ministers, at least, cannot deny that they had a full knowledge of the gravity of the crisis. I do not want to go back to the promises made in this and the other House of Parliament at the beginning of last Session, to maintain the authority of the law, and to protect all the Queen's subjects in the peaceable enjoyment of their property and the exercise of their legal rights. But I take my stand on the deputation that waited upon the Lord Lieutenant on the 6th of October last. That deputation was received in private, and I will tell your Lordships the reason why. We numbered amongst us men of all creeds, and of all shades of political opinion; and we were desirous, in laying our views before the authorities, that the speakers should state their opinions freely and fully. But there were those amongst us who had statements to make, whose lives, had what they said been made public, would have been in imminent and constantly recurring danger. That was the reason the deputation was private. We were bound to respect what some Members of the Cabinet call the "panic" of men who carried their lives in their hands. Well, the Lord Lieutenant complimented us upon the moderation with which we had stated our case; and Mr. Forster, who followed him, fully concurred in our estimate of the situation. This is our view of it, as I took it down at the time, and as expressed at the meeting previous to the deputation—

"That a system of lawless terrorism prevails over many parts of Ireland, more especially in the Western portion—a system which is daily increasing and spreading wherever the meetings of the Land League take place; that under this system, not only are the lives of landowners, agents, and bailiffs, as well as those of persons engaged in carrying out the ordinary process of the law, rendered insecure, but men of position and stake in the country are intimidated in their magisterial and county duties, while respectable and hitherto law-abiding farmers and tradesmen are forced against their will to join in combinations against the rights of property and the maintenance of order, or are otherwise subjected to a persecution which places their lives in peril, and is, at the very least, aimed at bringing about their ruin; that a state of things is hereby created and maintained which ought to be impossible in any civilized country enjoying the protection of a responsible Government; that the attempts to enforce the law have become a mockery, and that the only passport to safety in many parts of the country is obedience to the orders of persons whose avowed objects are the carrying out of a conspiracy against the rights of property and the welfare of the Empire. The meeting was therefore desirous to impress upon Her Majesty's Ministers the urgency of losing no further time in taking such measures as are clearly necessary for the protection of life and property and the maintenance of law and order, as it has been proved beyond doubt that the law as it stands is insufficient to check crime and outrage in the present crisis."

This is our estimate, the accuracy of which was admitted, and which involved a further admission as to the inefficacy of the existing law. So much for the Irish Executive; but what does your latest addition to the Government say? Mr. Courtney, in his speech to his constituents at Liskeard, when he was fresh from a tour in Mayo and Galway, and had had an opportunity of judging for himself, makes the following remarks:—

"What kind of dislocation is it? It has come to this—that in many parts of the West of Ireland no man is free to do what he likes. Everywhere you find men unable to do what they have done, and would go on doing, in consequence of the terror which is exercised by the society which has sprung up among them."

And, again, further on, he adds—

"It appears to me that one of the most elementary aims of society is this—that the man who gets up in the morning to go forth to his daily labour shall do so without fear of molestation. It is equally simple that the man coming home at night and going to his bed shall have no fear of midnight attack. And if it comes to this—that a man against whom no charge can be made is exposed in his daily life and toil to threats and to injuries—is exposed to murderous attack by night or to outrage by day—then I confess that it becomes with me a serious reflection that, whatever may be the work to be done in the future, there is some work to be done in the present."

Well, in October the terrorism was only partial; but it had spread from its original centre, and both the deputation at the Castle, and later on Mr. Courtney at Liskeard, spoke words of warning. I myself pointed out that it showed itself wherever the Land League placed its cloven foot. Mr. Courtney says—

"You have to deal with a sort of brief madness. The people willingly live in peace and quietness; but the madness has run among them, and will run further."

And those warnings have been fully realized. There is hardly a district in Ireland which is not innoculated with the disease. The arguments of the Land League are, no doubt, too strong for the ordinary passions of human nature, appealing, as they do, to the moral principles of the peasantry by the substantial prizes they hold out; while the roughs and the ratteners, armed with the revolver, the firebrand, the billhook, and the other insignia of terrorism, do the rest. But, in spite of seductive arguments, there are hundreds and thousands of honest men in Ireland, who, were it not for the terrorism, from which they have no protection, would still act up to their principles. And this is one of the gravest charges the Government have to meet. They have undermined the morality of the people. They have driven honest men into dishonest courses. They have handed them over to the contamination of the desperado classes. Dr. Webb puts it clearly in his very valuable pamphlet, *Confiscation or Contract*, when he writes—

"This population, like every other population, contains its disaffected and its desperado classes, and it is these that keep Ireland disturbed by a smouldering civil war. It is these who, at the present moment, are mutilating cattle and assassinating men, and wreaking their vengeance upon women and young children. Any Englishman would smile contemptuously if anyone were to describe the ratteners of Sheffield and the roughs of London as the English people. But that is the very mistake which he himself makes whenever he begins to talk of Ireland. No; the outrages which excite the horror and arouse the indignation of the world are not perpetrated by 'the high-souled Irish people;' they are perpetrated by the ratteners and roughs of Ireland."

Now, my Lords, I do not wish to

waste your time with details—there are plenty of them, and he who runs may read—but I could bring your Lordships case upon case upon my own property, where there has not been for 25 years, I may say ever since the great Famine, the slightest trouble or disagreement. There has always been the most cordial feeling. And I wish to say now, my Lords, that in my opinion, and in spite of what is passing, that friendly feeling subsists still. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman told his constituents at Stirling the other day that there is not, and never has been, any real sympathy between the Irish landlord and Irish tenant. This is incorrect. In the great majority of cases, the tenant looks to the landlord for advice and assistance, not only in his agricultural career, but in the incidents of his social life. Anyone who has read the letters in *The Times* from a Special Correspondent, which have been appearing lately, will recognize how largely this feeling exists. And what I have said of my own property I may say of neighbouring estates. The district has enjoyed for many years a peaceful and quiet reputation. But look at it now. On the 5th of November last the Land League came down with its satellites, and held a meeting in Clonmel; and now the organization is perfect and complete. It cannot be better described than it is by a friend and neighbour of mine—an assiduous magistrate, the Chairman of the local Board of Guardians, and one who has personal knowledge and acquaintance with almost every farmer in the district. This is what he says—

> "A law enforced by outrage and terrorism is established in the country, and the law of England is powerless or in abeyance. What good, then, appealing to its forms for redress or to assert your rights? You can gain nothing; for at this moment no bailiff can with safety to his life serve a writ from a sheriff or a Superior Court. Nine-tenths of the farmers are holding back rents through fear and threats that they will be turned out and beaten. I know many such near here. Several have told me so, and have begged me not to ask for my rent till all is settled, which they confidently hope will be soon after Parliament meets."

That is a true description of the state of things where I reside; but I should like to tell your Lordships, in order to show the power of this Land League, a case that came to my notice, and occurred in a different part of Ireland altogether. A friend of mine in the West told me that his tenants came to him a couple of months ago, saying they were prepared to pay their rent in full, and only awaited his order to do so. They acknowledged his liberality to them during the previous bad seasons; but stated that, notwithstanding what he had done for them, all their little savings had been swept away. They therefore asked him, not as a right, to consider their case—to give them, if he thought fit, some slight abatement. My friend considered the case, and finally made a reduction of 10 per cent, which was joyfully accepted; and the whole body of tenants paid, and went away in a high state of gratification, vowing that no power on earth would make them join the Land League. My friend left home for three weeks, and on his return found every one of those men enrolled in the League; and from those whom he had an opportunity of asking their reasons for joining he had the stereotyped reply—"We have wives, children, houses, cattle, crops; we cannot run the risk of being murdered or beaten ourselves, of having our wives and children ill-treated, our houses burned over our heads, our stock and haggards destroyed." And I venture to affirm that, had the rent-day been but three weeks later, not one penny of rent would have been received. But it is not only the farmers who suffer; it is every honest man, be he shopkeeper, farmer, or what you will. Traders cannot any longer get goods from wholesale houses on credit; their custom diminishes day by day; they have no security for their outstanding debts. The functions of the Landed Estates Court have practically ceased. Insurance Companies, and other lenders, will no longer advance money upon Irish real property. The officers of the law cannot perform their duties. Some are resigning their offices in despair. And we have, besides all this, the cardings, the Boycottings, the houghings of cattle, acquittals of guilty prisoners, undiscovered criminals without number, sacrilege and murder unpunished. All this the Government have watched growing, and have never stirred a finger. They stand convicted by the progress of events. This is the lesson they have taught the people—"The lesson which the English Government has conveyed to its Celtic subjects by its conduct since last May, in the matter of the Irish rising, cannot be more pithily expressed than in the three short English words, 'Do it again.'" This, with a slight alteration in words, is taken from the opening paragraph of *Lessons in Massacre*, an exposition of the conduct of the Porte in and about Bulgaria, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., with the following motto:—

> "Away, with me, all you whose souls abhor
> The uncleanly savours of a slaughter-house,
> For I am stifled with the smell of sin."

And how has this policy of the Government, as regards Ireland, been defended? There are two modes of defence which have struck me particularly—one, by denouncing your Lordships' House in the matter of the Disturbance Bill; the other, by assigning a reason for the agitation which, in my opinion, is as misleading as it is ill-founded. The Prime Minister has told the country that the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill by your Lordships' House was the *fons et origo malorum.* Well, I hardly think the proposition will bear investigation on the face of it, and your Lordships are not likely to forget that Mr. Gladstone's card has been over-trumped by Mr. Parnell. But I desire to remind your Lordships of what was laid down not once, but several times, in this House during the debate on the Bill, and, if my memory serves me right, in the other House also. The mischief of the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill was complete, not when it was rejected by your Lordships, but on the day that its principle was adopted by the Government. You proposed that contract should be violable, not only with impunity, but with advantage to the violator. You denied the principle; but you could not eradicate it, and it has ever since been the first article of the agitator's creed. And now, my Lords, for the reasons, the objects of this agitation. The idea prevails among thinking men in England that there must be some deep-rooted disease in the Irish system to cause all this tumult. Nothing of the sort. Anyone who has studied the subject must see that this cry about land is only raised as a means to on end. None of the arch-agitators, with one exception, have, or ever had, any concern with land; their avowed object is not to reform the Land Laws, but to expropriate the present landowners, with the ultimate view of the dismemberment of the Empire. That is a part of the substance of the indictment brought against Mr. Parnell and his associates for conspiracy, and against the Government as accessories after the fact, at the Four Courts in Dublin by the Attorney General for Ireland. It is not the cry of a majority that are discontented, but of a minority who are disloyal. Study the policy of the Parnellite Party. Its first object was to render Parliamentary Government in England impossible as long as the Irish element remained; its next, to drive out of Ireland, by making their existence there unbearable, those who were loyal to the English connection. It is on the surface in all their speeches. I need not remind your Lordships of the oft-quoted words of Mr. Parnell at Galway—

> "I would not have taken off my coat and gone to this work, if I had not known that we were laying the foundation in this movement for the regeneration of our national independence."

Or, again, at Cincinnati—

> "Let us not forget that this is the ultimate goal at which all we Irishmen aim. None of us, whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

The settlement of the Land Question is entirely distinct from this. This is a revolution, the primary object of which is robbery, the ultimate aim—separation. My Lords, I said the Government was condemned by the progress of events. They are also condemned by the verdict of history. They are condemned by the operation of their own Westmeath Act; and, not to multiply instances, they are condemned by the experience of 1797 and 1798. The analogy is perfect. For the Duke of Portland, read Mr. Gladstone; for Lord Camden, Mr. Forster; for United Irishmen, the Land League; for the introduction of French principles, American sympathizers. You have the Irish Executive asking for further powers, the Cabinet urging remedial legislation. It is the old story over again. There is an unreasonable agitation, and what does the Government do? Instead of enforcing the law, it begins to think of legislation. And now, my Lords, you are to be asked to legislate. I do not wish to prejudge the question. I must, however, take this opportunity of correcting an error that fell from my noble Friend the Mover of the Address (Lord Carrington). He stated that though there were many landlords in Ireland who were what are called "good landlords" they composed the minority of the class. My Lords, in this my noble Friend has been misinformed. He will find on investigation, and by statistics which I hope will shortly be in his hands, that the contrary is the case; and those of your Lordships who are acquainted with this subject will recollect that if the charge is ever brought specifically against any, it is chiefly levelled against that comparatively small number who bought with a Parliamentary title from the Encumbered Estates Court. I said I did not wish to prejudge the question. I merely ask your Lordships to consider, Is this the moment for legislation? In the month of May, 1797, Lord Camden wrote as follows to the Duke of Portland:—

> "You ask whether His Majesty should be advised to accede to a concession which is made the excuse of rebellion. Rebellion must first be overcome."

And, further on—

> "I cannot conceal how melancholy a presage I consider the system to which we appear to have been forced, of yielding to the demands of persons who have arms in their hands."

And the Government have asked us for sympathy. My answer to that is, show a little sympathy yourselves first. I have been unable to detect any sympathy with those gentlemen with small or moderate properties, say up to £5,000 a-year, who may be called the backbone of county society, and who at this moment do not know where to turn for a £5 note. This is the Government sympathy; this is how it is shown. By the studious silence of your Secretary of State for War, during his progress through Ireland—where crime and outrage was being perpetrated before his eyes, and the murdered Lord Mountmorres, hardly yet cold, was lying in that deserted house, a reproach to Mr. Childers and the Government of which he was a Member. Not a reproof, not a regret, not a word passed his lips. By the cynical indifference of the Prime Minister, when Captain Boycott prayed redress for the wrongs he had endured by your failure to perform your first duties. My Lords, in the long catalogue of crime and horrors, there is hardly any occurrence to my mind so damaging to the reputation of the Government as this case of Captain Boycott. He was the proto-martyr of his class, which is now a large and widely extended one. He was a living testimony of the lawlessness that existed; but not one attempt did the Government undertake to restore order, until they were forced to action by a handful of honest men, who refused to tolerate so glaring an abuse; and when he comes to you for redress, your leader wilfully misunderstands his plea, but condescends to tell him, now that he is done with, and has no further interest in the matter, that "the law will be amended and enlarged." And, lastly, your sympathy is evinced by the fierce exultation of Mr. Bright, at the report that a large and hitherto influential class of his fellow-subjects were running for their lives. My Lords, the time will, I hope, come when we shall look back upon 1880 in Ireland as a bad and horrible dream; but the memory of the Government that tolerated its atrocities will remain, stamped with the censure and the condemnation of a civilized age.

The Earl of DUNRAVEN said, that the common, but wholly erroneous, impression that existed in England was that the object of the Irish agitation was the removal of some of the grievances connected with the tenure of land; whereas, in fact, its real design—and they had it on the authority of the leader of the Land League himself—was to bring about the separation of the two countries; and, therefore, there was no Act which Parliament could pass short of the Repeal of the Union which would satisfy them. In that opinion, he (the Earl of Dunraven) agreed. As long as there was any misunderstanding on that point it would be impossible for Parliament to remedy the present unfortunate state of things. The noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Granville) had spoken of the desirability of bringing in coercive and remedial measures at the same time. That, no doubt, had been done now and then with success, as in the case of the Rebecca riots, alluded to by the noble Earl; but in that instance the objects of the rioters were well understood, and, their ends having been attained, the riots ceased. Nothing was easier. But the case of Ireland was altogether different; and to introduce remedial measures of Land Reform, and to expect the country to be straightway pacified, was to court complete disappointment. The noble Earl who had last spoken (the Earl of Donoughmore) had given a terrible account of part of the country, and he (the Earl of Dunraven) did not believe he had said one word in exaggeration. He was unwilling to say anything disagreeable to the present Government; but he believed that their inactivity had led to an absolute reign of terror in Ireland, and he feared it had helped to produce a state of things for which the Peace Preservation Act would be an inefficient and an inadequate remedy. Therefore, he could not acquit Her Majesty's Government of all blame in refusing till now to adopt measures of repression; and he felt that, instead of allowing that Act to drop, they ought rather to have brought forward a stronger measure still. Very great material damage had been done to property in Ireland; but the moral injury was far worse. The people of the country had been demoralized, and had learned that the Executive was a broken reed, and that to rely on the law was to trust to an unsubstantial phantasm. That, to the lawless, was an encouragement. They could not, therefore, expect that those who had been disappointed in expecting the assistance of the law would be ready on another occasion to come forward to assist the Government which had disappointed them. Already a great proportion of the people were indisposed to rank themselves on the side of law and order, and there were many circumstances in their history which rendered it easy to understand why they were so. The truth was, there was much moral cowardice about them, as was natural in a country of which the inhabitants had only in recent years come to regard the law as their best friend. He wished to know how far it was probable that the people would in future support the laws under which they lived, seeing the late growth of the law-abiding spirit, and the rude shock it had received from the inaction of the Government. The Ministers, he did not doubt, had only been anxious to do what was right and just; but they assumed that the Irish had a greater grievance than actually existed. He thought all the prejudices which they had inherited from centuries of oppression might have been by this time obliterated, if it were not that British statesmen persisted in looking upon Irish questions with English eyes. There was not, however, in that country any deep-rooted cause of complaint. He did not deny that there were causes of complaint; but they were very slight in comparison to the extent of the present agitation. That agitation, so far as it related merely to an alteration of the Land Laws, would have been impossible; the truth was, that the object of the agitators was to separate Ireland from England. It was important for statesmen to recognize that fact, and not to apply to Ireland a course of reasoning that was applicable only to England. He should have been glad to hear something more definite as to the Government proposals for the alteration of the Land Laws; but, at any rate, the proposed experiment of a peasant proprietary was commendable. Personally, he had no faith in its success, though, if only it succeeded, the effect would be very satisfactory. Again, he regretted the inaction of the Government, and thought the noble Earl opposite had made out a good case against the Government for their delay in not coming to Parliament sooner for powers which would have enabled them to take the necessary action to arrest the mischief being done throughout the country, and which would have prevented the irremediable injury which had been done by the demoralization of the people through the present impotency and consequent disregard of law and order. It was impossible to say that the Land Act had had a good effect when they saw that the condition of the country was worse than it had been at any time for 100 years past.

THE EARL OF BELMORE regretted that the distribution of arms among the population had grown to the extent that it had, seeing that in the North of Ireland no one went to market without a revolver in his pocket, and that those weapons, with other firearms, were openly retailed in large numbers in the Irish fairs. He did not, however, wish to lay it entirely to the charge of the present Government that they had allowed the cast-off arms to be sold, for the practice had prevailed with every Government;

but he trusted that the subject would receive the attention of the Government, with a view to its prevention in the future. He agreed with almost all that had been said by the noble Earl who had just addressed the House (the Earl of Dunraven); and he wished particularly to impress upon their Lordships the necessity of putting an end to the present lawless state of things in Ireland, before bringing forward any remedial measures.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK asked when the Foreign Papers, those relating to India and Colonial matters referred to in the Queen's Speech, and he hoped he might add those relating to Ireland as well, would be in their Lordships' hands?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Before my noble Friend answers that question, I should like to say a few words on the question which we have been chiefly discussing—namely, that of Ireland. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Dunraven), and to those of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Donoughmore), and it seems to me that the result they would arrive at would be that we should altogether despair of Ireland. The object of the agitation, they say, is separation from England; and, therefore, there is nothing to be done but to pass severe coercive measures, and never to look forward to the improvement at any time of the condition of Ireland. That is a view which is untenable by those who are practically acquainted with the state of affairs. No doubt, it is extremely difficult to apply any measure with a chance of success; but the greater the difficulty the more incumbent is it on the Government of this country to change a state of things which is so prejudicial to the whole Empire. The noble Earl who spoke last (the Earl of Belmore) seems to think that it is the intention of the Government to bring in remedial measures and measures for the protection of life and property, and to push them on at the same time. I can assure him that there is no such intention. Our view is that it is our duty, first of all, to bring in and pass measures for the protection of life and property before we shall be in a position to bring before Parliament those remedial measures which we may consider desirable. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Beaconsfield) referred to a speech made by Mr. Gladstone to the effect that in Ireland

> "There was an absence of crime and outrage, with a general sense of comfort and satisfaction, such as was unknown in the previous history of that country."

The noble Earl, unintentionally, no doubt, led the House to suppose that Mr. Gladstone was referring to the state of Ireland at the time he spoke; but the whole passage will show that the meaning of Mr. Gladstone was different. The speech was made on the 31st of March —at least, so I am told—and my right hon. Friend is reported to have spoken as follows:—

> "He admitted that in a part of the country a most uneasy state of things prevailed; but he would say that, speaking generally, the cultivation of Ireland had been carried on for the last eight years under cover and shelter of the Land Law in Ulster and the North, and the other three Provinces in Ireland, with a sense of security on the part of the occupier—with a feeling that he was sheltered and protected by the law, instead of feeling that he was persecuted by the law. There was an absence of crime and outrage, with a general sense of comfort and satisfaction, such as was unknown in the previous history of the country."

That referred to the last eight years, and I am certainly curious to know how the noble Earl could reconcile what he said with the fact that the speech referred to a different time altogether. It was not an extraordinary statement to make, and it is in accordance with what the noble Earl himself said—namely, that for a considerable time when the late Government were in Office Ireland did enjoy a considerable amount of prosperity. In the course of his speech the noble Earl made another statement, of which, I confess, I complain a great deal more—namely, he said Her Majesty's Government had upon their shoulders the responsibility of the murders which had been committed. If there had been any large number of murders committed, I should not have anything to say to that statement, strong as it is; but, in point of fact, the number of murders committed from agrarian causes in the first 11 months of the year 1880 was less than the number committed in the years 1878 and 1879. There were eight agrarian murders in 1878, nine in 1879, and seven in 1880. Yet we are told that we are specially responsible for the murders which have recently occurred. If noble

Lords tell me that the fact of there being a smaller number of murders is not a sufficient argument for our policy I perfectly agree with them. I do not rest the policy of the Government on such an argument; but I say that the Government cannot be held responsible for the murders which were committed last year. The question is, I admit, grave enough apart from murders. There is a state of terror existing in the country, and that probably explains why the outrages have not been more numerous, as no one has ventured to set himself up against the will of the populace. There having been that system of terrorism in Ireland, the question arises—"Why was it that the Government did not think it necessary to come forward with a strong measure of repression?" Well, it may be an old-fashioned view; but I think it is a very serious thing indeed to entirely replace the ordinary law under which life and property exists, and to have recourse to the extraordinary measures which, no doubt, it will be necessary to propose. I therefore think we have rightly delayed, till now, to take those measures. I do not mean to say that the Fenian conspiracy runs on all-fours with the present agitation; but everyone will admit that it was of a very dangerous character. In 1865, when I was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, a large number of persons implicated in the Fenian conspiracy were arrested in the month of September; but we did not consider it necessary immediately to call Parliament together to ask for exceptional powers. I watched that conspiracy, and when Parliament met in the following February application was then made to it. As soon as evidence was forthcoming, the Irish Government put the law in force, and were not at all backward in doing that which was right. We are told that we ought to have continued the Peace Preservation Act. Well, undoubtedly the restriction which that Act placed upon the carrying of arms was a valuable one, and one which we have arranged shall not be lost; but there was a general belief that otherwise it was not of great use, and it is a remarkable fact that during the time it was in force there was a great increase in the number of outrages perpetrated. I do not myself believe that if it had been in force during the whole of last autumn it would have produced any great effect, except as regarded the possession of arms. As to the object of the Land League, there is no doubt that there are, unfortunately, a considerable number of persons in Ireland who desire a separation of that country from England. In former times, recourse was only had to coercive measures to counteract the schemes of those persons; but lately, for many years—ever since the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act, I believe—it has been the aim of successive Governments to disarm that feeling, and to promote cordiality between the two countries. I believe the proper course for us is to pursue this policy of conciliation. To refuse to consider measures of redress would be to play directly into the hands of the agitators. It is said that the mass of the Irish people are loyal, and that the agitation we hear of is maintained by these agitators alone. For my own part, I do not believe that agitators can lead people who are not willing to be led; and if these agitators have power in Ireland, it is because of a latent, if not an active, sympathy on the part of the people with their aims. The people believe they have a considerable grievance in regard to the land, and they manifest their discontent in a most marked manner by refusing to pay rent and by making demands of a most unreasonable kind. If Parliament is not to recognize this evil I despair of the government of Ireland. I believe the Government have done wisely in not hastily calling Parliament together to consider measures of coercion, but in waiting till public opinion has been aroused. At the same time, I do not believe they would content either the Irish people or the people of this country if, in determining to uphold the law, they did not also show themselves willing to consider the grievances under which Ireland labours, and to endeavour to remedy those grievances in a speedy and effective manner.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK repeated his inquiry as to when the Indian, Foreign, and Irish Papers would be produced?

EARL GRANVILLE said, the Foreign Papers would be produced almost immediately. As to the others, he would make inquiry.

Address *agreed to*, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Earl of **Redesdale** appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

Committee for Privileges — Appointed.

Sub-Committee for the Journals— Appointed.

Appeal Committee—Appointed.

House adjourned at Ten o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 6*th January*, 1881.

The House met at half after One of the clock.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners ;—

The House went ;—and having returned ;—

NEW WRITS DURING THE RECESS.

Mr. **Speaker** acquainted the House, —that he had issued Warrants for *New Writs*, *for* Carnarvon County, *v.* Charles James Watkin Williams, esquire, one of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice; *for* Clackmannan and Kinross Counties, *v.* Right honble. William Patrick Adam, Governor of the Presidency of Fort St. George, at Madras, in the East Indies ; *for* Renfrew County, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel William Mure, deceased ; *for* Reading Borough, *v.* George John Shaw Lefevre, esquire, First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings; *for* Kendal Borough, *v.* John Whitwell, esquire, deceased ; *for* Wexford Borough, *v.* William Archer Redmond, esquire, deceased.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. **Speaker** informed the House, that he had received from Mr. Justice Lush and Mr. Justice Manisty, two of the Judges selected, in pursuance of The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, for the Trial of Election Petitions, a Certificate and Report relating to the Election for the City of Worcester.

From Mr. Justice Grove and Mr. Justice Bowen, two of the Judges selected, in pursuance of the same Act, a Certificate and Report relating to the Election for the Borough of Evesham ; and

From Mr. Justice Hawkins and Mr. Justice Lopes, two of the Judges selected, in pursuance of the same Act, a Certificate relating to the Election for the Town of Berwick upon Tweed.

And a Certificate and Report relating to the Election for the Borough of Wallingford.

CITY OF WORCESTER ELECTION.

The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868.

The Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Act, 1879.

The Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Act, 1880.

To The Right Honorable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

We, the Right Honorable Sir Robert Lush, knight, and the Honorable Sir Henry Manisty, knight, Judges of the High Court of Justice, and two of the Judges for the time being for the trial of Election Petitions in England, do hereby, in pursuance of the said Acts, certify that upon the eighth, ninth, and tenth days of July, and by adjournment on the twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh, twenty-eighth, twenty-ninth, and thirtieth days of October, and the first, second, third, and fourth days of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty, We duly held a Court at the Shire Hall, in the City of Worcester, for the trial of and did try the Election Petition for the said City between George Farnsworth, Frederick Wadeley, Walter Baylis, Henry Davis, and James Edmonds, Petitioners, and Thomas Rowley Hill and Æneas John McIntyre, Respondents ; and, in further pursuance of the said Acts, We certify and Report that, at the conclusion of the said trial, We determined that the said Thomas Rowley Hill and Æneas John McIntyre, being the Members whose Election and Return were complained of in the said Petition, were duly Elected and Returned, and We do hereby certify in writing such our determination to you.

And whereas charges were made of corrupt practices having been committed at the said Election, We, in further pursuance of the said Acts, Report as follows :—

That no corrupt practice was proved to have been committed by or with the knowledge or consent of any Candidate at such Election;

That there is no reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the Election for the City of Worcester to which the said Petition relates.

Dated this fourth day of November 1880.

Robt. Lush.
H. Manisty.

EVESHAM ELECTION.

The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868.
The Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Act, 1879.
The Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Act, 1880.

To the Right Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

We, the Honourable Sir William Robert Grove, knight, and the Honourable Sir Charles Synge Christopher Bowen, knight, Judges of the High Court of Justice, and two of the Judges for the time being for the trial of Election Petitions in England, do hereby, in pursuance of the said Acts, certify that upon the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th days of December 1880, We duly held a Court at the Shire Hall, Worcester, in the County of Worcester, for the trial of and did try the Election Petition for the Borough of Evesham between Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland, Petitioner, and Frederick Lehmann, Respondent, which prayed that it might be determined that the Respondent was not duly Elected or Returned, and that his Election and Return were and are wholly null and void, and that the Petitioner was duly Elected and ought to have been Returned.

And, in further pursuance of the said Acts, We report that at the conclusion of the said trial we determined that the said Frederick Lehmann, being the Member whose Election and Return were complained of in the said Petition, was not duly Elected or Returned, and that his Election and Return were and are wholly null and void on the ground of bribery and treating by Agents, and that the said Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland was duly Elected and ought to have been Returned, and we do hereby certify in writing such our determination to you.

And whereas charges were made of corrupt practices having been committed at the said Election, we, in further pursuance of the said Acts, report as follows:—

(a.) That no corrupt practice was proved to have been committed by or with the knowledge or consent of any Candidate at such Election.

(b.) The following persons have been proved at the trial guilty of the corrupt practice of bribery:—

Persons by whom Voters were bribed.	Persons bribed.
Francis Bell (alias Evans).	William Henry Pinchin.
Henry Berry.	Thomas Henry Herbert.
Edward James Stephens.	

The following persons have been proved at the trial guilty of the corrupt practice of treating:—

Persons by whom Voters were treated.	Persons treated.
Richard Walker.	Divers Voters unknown.
Edward James Stephens.	The like.
George Hughes.	The like.

(c.) That on the evidence before us there is not sufficient reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the Election for the Borough of Evesham to which the said Petition relates, but it was proved before us that considerable sums of money had been expended by the Agents of Mr. Lehmann, the Respondent, on his behalf, which ought to have been paid by or through the Election Auditor and included in the general account of the expenses incurred at such Election, and of the expenditure of which sums of money no satisfactory explanation was given by Mr. Lehmann or his Agents.

Dated this 17th day of December 1880.

W. R. GROVE.
CHARLES BOWEN.

BERWICK ON TWEED ELECTION.

To The Right Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

In the matter of the Petition relating to the last Election of a Member of Parliament for the Borough of Berwick on Tweed.

The Petitioner, John M'Laren, prayed for a scrutiny of the votes given at the said Election, and that the Return should be amended by the insertion of his name in the said Return in the place of the name of David Milne Home, who had been declared duly elected.

We, Sir Henry Hawkins, knight, and Sir Henry Lopes, knight, two of the Judges for the time being on the rota for the trial of Election Petitions in England, do hereby certify that we tried the said Petition, and find that the said David Milne Home was duly elected by a majority of legal votes at the said Election, and that the Return ought to stand.

That the following persons were proved at the trial to have been guilty of corrupt practices:—

Joseph Edmundson,
John Rutherford,
Archibald Ruffhead,
James Ruffhead, and
John Elliott.

And that there was no reason to believe, from the evidence before us, that corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the said last Election.

December 21st, 1880.

H. HAWKINS.
HENRY C. LOPES.

WALLINGFORD ELECTION.

To the Right honble.
the Speaker of the House of Commons.

In the matter of the Petition relating to the last Election of a Member of Parliament for the Borough of Wallingford.

We, Sir Henry Hawkins, knight, and Sir Henry Lopes, knight, two of the Judges for the time being on the rota for the trial of Election Petitions in England, do hereby certify that Pandeli Ralli was duly elected and returned at the said Election.

We report that no corrupt practices were proved to have been committed by or with the knowledge or consent of the Candidates.

That the following persons were proved at the trial to have been guilty of corrupt practices:—

James Green,
William Eustace,
Henry Knight,
Alfred Gurney,
Joseph Green, and
Abraham Munday.

And that there was no reason to believe, from the evidence before us, that corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the said last Election.

December 21st, 1880.

H. Hawkins.
Henry C. Lopes.

And the said Certificates and Reports were ordered to be entered in the Journals of this House.

EVESHAM ELECTION.

Ordered, That the Clerk of the Crown do attend this House To-morrow, at Four of the clock, with the last Return for the Borough of Evesham, and amend the same, by substituting the name of Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland for Frederick Lehmann, as the Member returned to serve in Parliament for the said Borough.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

James Cropper, esquire, *for* Kendal; Alexander Crum, esquire, *for* Renfrew; Right honble. George John Shaw Lefevre, *for* Reading; John Blair Balfour, esquire, *for* Clackmannan and Kinross; William Rathbone, esquire, *for* Carnarvon County.

PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

OUTLAWRIES BILL.

Bill "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

Mr. SPEAKER *reported* Her Majesty's Speech, made by Her Chancellor, and read it to the House.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

Mr. STUART RENDEL: Sir, I ask the forbearance of the House. Till now I have not addressed it; and in undertaking the honourable task that has been confided to me I have counted upon a full measure of the accustomed and generous indulgence of the House. The circumstances which have rendered necessary the re-assembling of Parliament within the first week of the new year are, perhaps, the saddest which have troubled the domestic affairs of the country within living memory. The House will be all the more glad of the assurance contained in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, that her relations with foreign Powers continue friendly and harmonious. Certainly, of late years, these relations have not assumed that calm and settled appearance which they wear at this moment; and the country will see in that fact the first fruits of the policy to which it gave its emphatic approval at the late General Election. The rectification of the Montenegrin Frontier accomplishes one more step towards the final completion of the terms of the Treaty of Berlin. There may be differences of opinion as regards the intrinsic merits and importance of this rectification; but the House, I think, will congratulate Her Majesty's Ministers upon an achievement which has placed them in their natural and healthy position before Europe; which has reaffirmed the principle of the concerted action of Europe, vindicated the sanctity of Treaties, and imposed upon the Porte the necessity of fulfilling its solemn obligations. It is to be regretted that the Greek Question could not have been settled concurrently with the Montenegrin Question. At one time there was reasonable ground to hope that such might have been the case, and hon. Members who have perused the official despatches of the Government of France will have observed that that Power made it a condition of peremptory action, and of joining the naval forces on the coast of Albania, that such action should have reference to Greek claims as well as to those of Montenegro. From that position France appears to have withdrawn, though she still takes a leading part in the endeavour to bring about a solution of the question. The cause of Greece will, I think, have the sympathy of this House. It has been affirmed by Europe and admitted by Turkey herself. The claims of Greece are not of her own formulation. They were determined by the arbitrament of the Plenipotentiaries at the Congress of

Berlin, and she has shown as much patience as might satisfy the invocation of a distinguished statesman. The difficulties imposed on the Government at Athens under such circumstances will be readily realized by this House. Greece has certainly exceptional claims upon Europe in general, and upon us in particular, for having sacrificed a golden opportunity, by an act of self-restraint, during the late war. Yet it will not have been expected that Ministers should take any single-handed action in her favour. I believe this House will approve the principle of the policy which actuates Her Majesty's Government—I mean the policy of concerted action by the Powers; not anything in the nature of a Holy Alliance, but a joint action of confederate Europe in the common interests of Europe. Sir, I believe the House will sympathize to the keenest extent with the present position of Greece. We gave to the Greek people the cradle and shrine of their illustrious race; but we did not secure to them a sufficient appanage for their maintenance. Athens attracts the youth, the talent, and the ardour of a scattered people, but cannot give them scope. Her relations with her children under foreign yoke keep her in perpetual unrest. She has now one-third of her men under arms. Her situation is well-nigh intolerable. It is strange that the Power which has, perhaps, done the least for the world occupies the ancestral homes of the two races which, in their separate time and way, have done the most and the best. Europe is beginning to feel the ill results which follow the exclusion of an ancient people from the most natural and healthy field for its ambition and energies. It is enough that the Jewish race should be homeless and scattered in Europe without adding the Greek race also.

I suppose we may consider that the fallacy of bringing Turkey to reason by argument, well enough in its day, is now worn out; and that portion of Her Majesty's Speech will be read with regret which implies that no internal reform has taken place in Turkey. The Turkish Government seems incapable of any spontaneous movement for good, and lies in the lethargy which too often precedes decease.

Turning to the affairs of India, it will be observed that Her Majesty's Government are steadily following that policy which, from the outset, they proclaimed. The disaster of Maiwand has been retrieved by the relief of Candahar; and I doubt not that the names of the two distinguished Generals —Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Frederick Roberts—who devised and executed that brilliant feat of arms, will stand high in the military annals of the country. Stone by stone the edifice of our old Frontier policy, which to some seemed so ruthlessly destroyed (alas, how much easier it is to do evil than good in this world!) is being laboriously rebuilt—that policy which, though connected with the name of Lord Lawrence, was, in fact, during a full generation, the policy of successive Viceroys, chosen from both the great Parties in the State. It is to be hoped that the health and strength so happily restored to Lord Ripon may find their application in attending to the moral and material amelioration of the condition of our marvellous Dependency, in which, perhaps, will be found the truest elements of its strength and allegiance. Last Session Her Majesty's Government declared its intention of giving very substantial aid from the Imperial Exchequer towards the discharge of the Debt of India in connection with the War in Afghanistan. I hope that this Session it may be possible to fix the amount of this aid, and that it will be substantial, if for no other reason than to furnish a salutary check upon the policy which led to the accumulation of that enormous burden.

In surveying our vast Colonial Empire, our attention is still rivetted upon the dark spot in South Africa. The Basuto War, Her Majesty's Speech informs us, still continues. The Basuto War was not of our making, the Disarmament Proclamation, which was issued during the late Election, having been the work of the Cape Parliament, which fully discussed the question, and decided upon the policy which led to the war, by a majority equal to one of 80 in this House. Although the self-governing Colonies will, undoubtedly, commit errors, which are lamentable in themselves, it would seem a questionable course lightly to interfere with their responsibilities; and, so far as this war is concerned, it must be remembered that the Colonists bear the pains and penalties of it entirely on their own shoulders. At the same time, let us hope that the friendly action referred to in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech may be rendered fruitful in the prevention of further bloodshed. In estimating the conduct of the Colony, it is but fair to remember that it had to consider the security of a district in which some 500 Whites were surrounded by no less than 128,000 Natives, bearing arms; and we must also remember that it was under the influence of the forward policy and subject to the charm of the presence of that distinguished man with whose name that policy is associated. Therefore, some pardon must, I think, be extended to what might be otherwise considered recklessness on the part of the Colonists. The unhappy events in the Transvaal will also engage the anxious attention of the House, and it must be a matter full of regret to many that there is no alternative but to vindicate in that district the authority of the Queen by force of arms. At the same time, it will be noticed that Her Majesty in the Gracious Speech has taken that large and humane step of referring to the measures of reform, and the benefits which it was her desire to confer, even while her authority is disputed; and it is not difficult to see that as soon as possible a measure of self-government will be conceded to the Transvaal which ought to satisfy even the most passionate lover of freedom in that Colony. Surely the Dominion of Canada enjoys all the independence that a community like that of the Boers could reasonably demand. As to the responsibility for the state of affairs, it will be remembered that the annexation was not the act of the present Government. One hon. Member of it, whom we must all wish to congratulate, from the first protested against it, and the Prime Minister has constantly condemned it. Once done, any attempt at the time by the then Opposition to reverse it could have been but mischievous; and, in fact, the present Government, on coming into Office, seem to have found it impossible to shake off the unfortunate legacy. To do so would have been to restore 800,000 Natives, whom we had taken under our protection, to the tender mercies of the Boers, and thereby to create a very serious danger to our neighbouring possessions.

Mr. Stuart Rendel

But it is the most sad and painful condition of things in Ireland which is the disheartening subject of the hour. It is surely a blow to our pride, our just, but perhaps our overweening pride, to have to confess that our boasted institutions no longer give security or protection to life or property close to our doors, in one of the Three Kingdoms itself, and to have to confess that there the very elements of civilization may be said to be wanting. It is difficult too much to deplore the condition of Ireland'; but it is not difficult to mis-describe it. The loss of life, after all, has not been so serious as was supposed; but, at the same time, it has been found necessary to extend protection to very large number of persons, and I believe at one time there were as many as 125 persons daily, nightly, and hourly under the protection of the police in Ireland. Agrarian offences also have risen with alarming rapidity, and, I am told, exceed by something like seven-fold the fair and ordinary rate of ordinary times. But it would not be true to say that the Government in Ireland has broken down. The Executive has continued to exert its authority. When meetings have been prohibited they have not been held, and where protection has been required it has been given; but too much may be required of the Executive—for instance, it is not the business of the Executive to collect rents. That which has broken down in Ireland is not the Executive, but the administration of justice. It is the administration of justice that is paralyzed, that is dead. It is impossible to obtain evidence, and I fear it is more than difficult to obtain juries of sufficient independence and courage to give impartial verdicts. Sir, under these circumstances, an absolute deadlock has been reached in the government of that country, and it has become necessary for Her Majesty's Government to ask for extraordinary powers. It is the first and paramount duty of the Government to secure order; and it is upon that account, I presume, that in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech we find that it is only subject to the obtaining of extraordinary powers that remedial legislation is to be proposed. That remedial legislation would appear to follow on the lines of preceding legislation. The Land Act of 1870, in the beginning, at any rate, was followed by several years of comparative contentment and calm; but it was, no doubt, defeated to some extent in the integrity of its principles by Amendments which emanated from "another place." No doubt, also, it was evaded substantially in practice by small and successive rises in rents; and, unquestionably, it received a heavy blow from the three years of bad harvests, which enabled some landlords to confiscate the property of the tenants within the provisions of the Act. Some of the suggestions made on the subject of Land Reform in Ireland have been of a speculative character. It will certainly not be expected that Her Majesty's Ministers will give favour to theoretical propositions which upset the very foundations of property. In so far as they contain the germs of a true political economy, they will, I believe, be found in embryo in the Act of 1870, and I trust that Her Majesty's Government will be able to pass such an amendment of that Act as will develop those germs, restore the integrity of the Act, and fortify its operations. No doubt, there are other remedial measures in the mind of Her Majesty's Ministers. Reference is, in fact, made in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech to a measure for the establishment of local county government in Ireland, which, I trust, may ere long extend itself across the Irish Channel also. No doubt, it will be suggested that Her Majesty's Government might have earlier asked for extraordinary powers in order to the better government of Ireland; but Her Majesty's Ministers apparently felt it their duty to exhaust all the ordinary forms of law before appealing to Parliament for special powers. Nothing could have been easier than for the Government to have asked Parliament for special powers; but, in the absence of evidence of their absolute necessity, with which to convince Parliament, this would have been but the shuffling off on to Parliament of the responsibility which belongs to the Administration.

Turning to the home legislation, the House will admit that it would have been barely sincere for the Government, in the face of the Business which will probably monopolize this Session, to produce any long array of measures, or pretend to be in a position to carry forward that scheme of legislation to which they were pledged when they came into Office. A general measure of Land Law Reform, for instance, must stand over for the present. But there are useful measures referred to in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech which will be welcomed by all. Our soldiers and sailors are to be relieved from a degrading punishment. With reference to the Army, I believe it is proposed to carry to completion the beneficial reforms introduced by a Liberal Administration some years ago. I believe it will be proposed to form county regiments of two battalions of the Line, combined with the Militia, and that some improvement will be made in the pay of non-commissioned officers. The period of service will also be lengthened in order to provide for Inland and Colonial duties. Reference to the measure under which the scandals of our bankruptcy procedure may be removed, and that which deals with electoral corruption, I propose to leave in abler hands than mine. Sir, I shall now conclude by thanking the House for the patience with which it has suffered me to address it, and by moving—

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for the Most Gracious Speech which Her Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament, informing us that we have been called at a period earlier than usual to the resumption of our labours, as some affairs of more than common urgency demand our attention:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that Her Majesty's relations with Foreign Powers continue to be friendly and harmonious; that the main question relating to the Frontier between Turkey and Montenegro has been settled; that the Powers are now engaged in communications which have in view the determination of the Frontier between Turkey and Greece; and that some important portions of the Treaty of Berlin, which have so long remained without fulfilment, continue to form an object of Her Majesty's earnest attention:

"To express regret that a rising in the Transvaal has recently imposed upon Her Majesty the duty of taking military measures with a view to the prompt vindication of Her Majesty's authority, and has of necessity set aside for the time any plan for securing to the European Settlers that full control over their local affairs, without prejudice to the interests of the Natives, which Her Majesty had been desirous to confer:

"To assure Her Majesty that we share Her Majesty's regret that the War in Basutoland continues notwithstanding the efforts of the Cape Government, and to thank Her Majesty for informing us that it would cause Her Majesty much satisfaction if a suitable occasion should present itself for friendly action on Her Majesty's part with a view to the restoration of Peace:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the War in Afghanistan has been brought to a close, and, with the exception of the Candahar Force, Her Majesty's troops have been recalled within the Indian Frontier; and to thank Her Majesty for apprising us that it is not Her Majesty's intention that the occupation of Candahar shall be permanently maintained, though the still unsettled condition of the country, and the consequent difficulty of establishing a Native Government, have delayed for a time the withdrawal of the Army from that position:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that Papers on the several subjects to which Her Majesty has adverted, as well as further Correspondence on the Military Estimates of India, will be presented to us:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the Estimates for the Services of the coming year are in a forward state of preparation, and will be speedily laid before us:

"To assure Her Majesty that we rejoice to learn that there has been a gradual improvement in the trade of the Country, and that there is a more favourable expectation of the Revenue for the year than could be formed at its commencement:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us of the diminution of distress in Ireland, of the present social condition of that Country, and of the considerations which lead Her Majesty now to apprise us that proposals will be immediately submitted to us for entrusting Her Majesty with additional powers for the vindication of order and public law, and likewise to procure for Her Majesty's subjects protection of life and property, and personal liberty of action:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that, subject to these primary and imperious obligations, Her Majesty continues to desire not less than heretofore to prosecute the removal of grievance and the work of legislative improvement in Ireland as well as in Great Britain:

"Humbly to assure Her Majesty that our careful consideration shall be given to the subjects which Her Majesty has recommended to our attention, and to the measures which may be submitted to us; and that we earnestly trust that the guidance of Divine Providence may attend our labours."

MR. SLAGG: Mr. Speaker—Sir, I rise to second the Motion with a full consciousness of the honour which has been conferred on the important constituency I represent, and incidentally on myself, by the duty with which I am intrusted; and, in view of the exceptional difficulty which attends the position I now occupy, I trust that I may obtain the indulgent consideration of the House for the few remarks which I shall offer to it.

It is satisfactory to learn that the foreign relations of Her Majesty's Government are of a friendly nature. In Eastern Europe the concert of the Great Powers has succeeded in pressing to a solution at least one problem of a difficult and menacing description. The friendly co-operation of the Great Powers in matters of common interest is a principle for which we must all wish a full measure of success; and I beg to express the hope that this principle may be found effectual for an early and satisfactory consummation of those aspirations of the Greek nation, as to which both Turkey and Europe have given such solemn, and, as it seems to me, irrevocable pledges.

From Her Majesty's declaration on the subject of Afghanistan, it would appear that the policy of withdrawal from that country is soon to be completed, and a limit placed on those enormous expenses which fall with such crushing weight on so poor a population as that of India. The announcement that the finances of this country are to be charged with a portion of the sum recently expended in the Afghan War affords an additional incentive, if, indeed, any be needed, for the just and economical administration of India; for it becomes more and more obvious that our responsibilities relate not only to the good government of that country, but extend also, in a large degree, to her financial affairs.

In South Africa events of a very deplorable nature are in progress. The Basuto War, though, to some extent, the natural sequence of a policy in which the present Government had no share, is, in reality, a war for which the Colonial Government is alone responsible, and with which, it is to be hoped, their own resources will be sufficient to cope. In the Transvaal greater troubles have arisen. The annexation of that region involved this country in serious responsibilities; and it is surely desirable that the future action of the Government should be in the direction of diminishing rather than increasing their obligations in that vast and distant land.

The renewal of facilities for secret voting, provided by the Ballot Act, will commend itself to all, I think, who have had experience of the pressure which was brought to bear under the old system; and though, unfortunately, it cannot be denied that influences of the most ignoble description are still found to prevail among a certain class of voters, it would be difficult to show that the system of voting by ballot is in any degree responsible for those abuses. The House will learn with pleasure that a Bill is to be introduced dealing with the shameful practices which have been resorted to at some elections. The recent Commissions have disclosed an amount of wrong-doing in this respect which is little short of a national discredit; and there can, I feel sure, be no difference of opinion as to the necessity of effectively repressing such practices.

There are, I believe, Sir, few measures promised in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech which will be accepted, both in this House and in the country, with more satisfaction than that which proposes to abolish the degrading practice of flogging in the Army and Navy.

The legislation which is to be presented on the subject of bankruptcy is a well-recognized necessity. The enormous expense which attends the administration of insolvent estates; the cost in legal and accountants' charges; and the injustice which now so often accompanies the process of liquidation by arrangement have long been a reproach to our law and a serious burden on the commerce of the country. The prospect of some uniform method of conducting these affairs with economy and despatch, under independent and responsible authority, must, therefore, be hailed with universal satisfation.

In the commercial world—of which I have some little experience—I am happy to discern a more hopeful feeling than has recently prevailed. Our relations with foreign countries being in a less strained condition, there is a manifest increase of that spirit of confidence which is so valuable in mercantile affairs. Our great markets in India have recently displayed an augmented capacity for consuming the industrial products of this country; which shows, at least, that a better harvest is already improving the buying power, and, therefore, the material condition, of our fellow-subjects in that part of the Empire. Our trading relations with foreign countries have not increased as we could desire, their commerce being, in too many instances, restricted by high tariffs. I feel very strongly the necessity, on the part of this country, of promoting those principles of free intercourse which tend so largely to the political and commercial welfare of nations. During the Recess efforts have been made to develop our commercial relations with France, Spain, and Portugal. To these endeavours I attach extreme importance. The special restrictions imposed on our commerce by the almost prohibitory tariffs of the Peninsula tend to destroy a trade which would be of inestimable value to the respective countries; and I sincerely hope that some means may be found of disposing those Governments to adopt a more enlightened commercial policy.

With regard to the Treaty of Commerce with France, which is now about to expire, I am strongly of opinion that every effort should be made to extend its provisions in the direction of Free Trade. Under that Treaty there has been an increase of commerce between the two countries which is capable of enormous expansion, and which tend not only to their material advantage, but also towards strengthening those relations of good feeling and common interest which were so greatly developed by Mr. Cobden's work of 1860. But, Sir, I may point also to many signs of substantial improvement in the condition of the country. Throughout all the staple industries there is now full employment, and, in many cases, higher wages; while the relations between employers and employed have rarely been on a more satisfactory footing. Pauperism is also decreasing throughout the country; while the evidence afforded by the Revenue returns, the railway traffic, and monetary transactions, all point to a return of activity and prosperity in our commerce.

Sir, it would be well if these cheering signs could find a parallel in the sister country of Ireland, where, unhappily, a condition of disorder prevails as sad as it is serious. Experience must now have demonstrated that, whatever may have been the capabilities of the Land Act of 1870, as originally framed, the modifications imposed during its passage through the Legislature took away, in a large degree, its utility, and the measure has broken down as to many of its most important provisions. The tenant has not been secured against unjust and arbitrary advances of rent and consequent eviction, nor has the Act prevented, in many cases, the appropriation of his tenant right. Further, the clauses known by the name of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster have largely failed to fulfil the intentions of the framer. In a country whose people have little resource but the land, where their passion for the soil is intense, where the legal rights of landowners are, in many instances, unjustly founded and pushed to intolerable extremes, a neglected or inequitable system of land tenure must necessarily constitute a standing menace to social order. Under the aggravation of scanty harvests, and an agitation of exceptional dimensions, we are now confronted with a condition of affairs in which the law stands practically in abeyance. Whether at any stage of these proceedings it behoved the Government to intervene is not now within my province to discuss. But history surely teaches us that repression as a policy has not only failed in its ultimate object, but has tended finally to aggravate the disease of which it only at best attacked the outward symptoms. That order and public safety should be maintained in every part of the Empire I think few will dispute; but if the Government should hereafter demonstrate the necessity of exceptional means for the recovery of those conditions in Ireland, it would, in my judgment, be wise also to determine that the just and ample reforms—which are by no means newly-born intentions of the Liberal policy—shall still constitute the most powerful weapons for the pacification of the country. But, Sir, I discern some element of hope in the fact that this ever-recurring question of Irish grievances is at last brought completely before the bar of a fully-awakened public opinion in this country. It can be of as little advantage to England as it is to Ireland that the Government should be perpetually distracted, that the current of Public Business should be continually stemmed, through the importunity of those cries of suffering, those demands for justice, which all humanity must now surely admit have, at least, some grave foundation. May I venture, Sir, to express very fervently the hope that those extreme aspirations, which are the invariable progeny of justice too long delayed, may be modified by the desire to bestow quickly on that unhappy country the blessings of order and equitable laws?

In the belief, Sir, that the measures of the Government are designed and calculated to promote the welfare and contentment of the Empire, I beg to second the Motion now before the House, and to add the expression of my gratitude for the patience and courtesy with which the House has received my imperfect remarks.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, &c." [See p. 82.]

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Mr. Speaker, if I feel some embarrassment in paying the usual compliments to the speeches of the Mover and Seconder of the Address, it is not because I do not do full justice to the ability with which both those Gentlemen have spoken, and the skill with which they have performed a task of no little difficulty; but I am afraid that if I simply content myself with paying the compliment which their skill deserves, I may, perhaps, be thought to admit much that has been said by them, and which I am not at all prepared to agree with. Now, I wish to say, with regard to the speech of the Mover of the Address, that I must compliment him upon having thrown a rose-coloured tint over a great deal of very disputable and anxious matter. I speak particularly of the earlier part of his remarks, and his observations upon the earlier part of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. I think it very possible that the hon. Gentleman is in possession of information with which we have not been so liberally supplied, and which may, perhaps, permit him to take the views which, for the present, at all events, I, and I believe a large proportion of this House, find ourselves utterly unable to accept. He has told us that, with reference to the relations of this country with foreign Powers upon Asiatic and European affairs, the position of the present Government is a calm and settled position, such as has not been known for many years. I trust that is so. We are promised that Papers shall be, in due time, laid before us; and when those Papers come before us, I must hope, and am ready to believe, that the observations of the hon. Gentleman will be found to be justified by the evidence laid before us. But, from the information at present in our possession, I must frankly say that it does not appear to me that we are in the position in which we can rely with the extreme comfort and satisfaction upon the condition of foreign affairs that appears to animate the Mover of the Address. We have heard but little on the direct authority of our own Government as to what has been going on in the last few months, or, indeed, since they acceded to Office. The few revelations that have from time to time been made to us have been from sources of general information, open to all the world, or from the publications of foreign Governments. The intimations which have occasionally been made to us from those sources have raised in my mind, and the minds of others, great anxiety lest we should find ourselves on a sudden committed, without our knowledge or consent, to uncomfortable conclusions and an unsatisfactory position. If I read aright what we have heard of what has been going on, this country has not been very far from finding itself committed to actual war, or, at all events, to complications which must have led to that very undesirable state of things; and how, if that is so, we are to reconcile the proceedings to which I refer with the description which has now been given of them I feel unable to see. I am unwilling to enter at any length into this part of the subject—especially unwilling, because we are not yet furnished with information—but I hope that when the Prime Minister rises, in the course of this discussion, he may be willing to tell us, rather more fully and authoritatively than the Mover and Seconder have been able to do, what is the actual state of our relations, and what are the prospects we have in these interesting but difficult and important matters. Is it the case that our relations with foreign Powers are, in all respects, friendly and harmonious? Of course, that is put into the Speech delivered from the Throne, and there can be no doubt that it is literally true; but what I want to know is—Is there unity of purpose amongst those foreign Powers and ourselves? Are they and we agreed with regard to the steps to be taken in relation to the matters referred to? We have been told that the main question between Turkey and Montenegro has been settled. Well, that may be satisfactory. [*Ironical Liberal cheers*]. Well, I should like more particulars, that we may know how far it is complete as well as satisfactory, though I am not at all prepared to doubt that the settlement may be so described. With regard to the next paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, the question with respect to the communications of the Powers as to determining the Frontier between Turkey and Greece, we have received the most meagre and barren information. We are simply told that the Powers are now engaged in such communications. We are not told what the nature of the communications is, or what prospect there is of any result being arrived at. The Mover of the Address, having told us that everything in our relations with foreign Powers is harmonious and friendly, went on to express regret that the Government of France had apparently withdrawn from the position which they at first took up; and he also went on to tell us that the Greek Army had been trebled, and that great burden and expense were thrown upon Greece, which that country was ill-fitted to bear. If that is the case, I can hardly regard the state of things as fairly settled. I am most unwilling to say anything which could in any degree inconvenience the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government in relation to foreign communications; but I do say it is now incumbent upon the Government to present to us at least as much information as foreign Governments have presented to their Legislatures. As I presume that will be done, I will not enter further on the question. We have been called together, as Her Majesty's Gracious Speech observes, at an earlier period than usual—a period at which it is impossible for hon. Gentlemen to assemble without some inconvenience, and at a particular season of the year which many Members devote to the consideration of local matters. But whenever Her Majesty summons her Parliament to assemble, in order to consult them and to ask their assistance in dealing with important and urgent affairs, it will never be wanting in readiness to come. We come with the greatest readiness, prepared to assist Her Majesty's Government in every proper step they may wish to take. [Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Hear, hear!] We come in January, as we would have come in November, and we shall be told by-and-bye why we were not called upon to come then. I will only add at this moment that we are perfectly prepared to give our time, and to give it to any extent that may be really required for the discussion of important questions that may be brought before us. Well, there are other passages in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech which go beyond the domestic administration of this country. We have a reference to that unfortunate rising in the Transvaal, of which I would only say at this moment that it has been suddenly sprung upon us; and that we await, with anxiety, further information on the subject. It is one of so large a character that it demands a discussion to itself. Neither do I propose to enter into a discussion of the next paragraph of the Speech, which relates to the war in Basutoland, further than to say that there is a very remarkable expression in the Speech which I have read two or three times over. It says—

> "I regret that the War in Basutoland still continues, notwithstanding the efforts of the Cape Government. It would cause me much satisfaction if a suitable occasion should present itself for friendly action on my part, with a view to the restoration of peace."

That is, no doubt, a sentiment by which a Government must always be animated in its relations with other friendly States which are at war among themselves; but here we are dealing, not with the case of an independent Power, but with the case of a British Colony, and I think we ought to have a fuller explanation as to the attitude in which the Members of the Government feel themselves to stand in regard to these hostilities. The Cape Colony, after all, is a Dependency of England, and part of the British Empire; and we cannot be expected to treat the affairs of the Colony as if they were merely on the same footing as the affairs of some independent country. There is another question upon which it will be necessary at some time to have a full discussion, and that is with regard to our position in Afghanistan, and the views of the Government as to Candahar. I do not propose to raise that question now. I only refer to that paragraph in Her Majesty's Speech in order to say that I think Her Majesty's Government might find it advisable to acknowledge the great gallantry and great skill with which our military operations have been carried on in Afghanistan. I think they might have done that wholly apart from any question as to the policy of those proceedings. But, perhaps, in the midst of all the business pressing upon them, it has escaped attention; and I hope before the debate closes we shall have that matter set right by an expression of the pride and satisfaction with which we have seen those military exploits. With regard to the paragraph of the Speech which refers to the Military Estimates of India, I presume the time will soon come when we shall be informed of the views of Her Majesty's Ministers with reference to the proposed contributions from the Imperial to the Indian Revenues on account of the expenditure in Afghanistan. I come now to the part of the Speech which, after all, is that to which every man is looking with attention in both Houses of Parliament, and among the public as well. I feel that it is a matter of the gravest and most serious consequence to us to see the condition in which the Sister Island is now placed. The hon. Gentleman has told us that the Government of the country has not broken down in Ireland, but that it is the execution of justice—the administration of justice — which has failed. Well, let us examine that for a moment. Are we going really—can the Government be going—to endeavour to remove from their own shoulders the responsibility which rests upon them, and throw it upon the Executive officers or the judicial authorities? Sir, I can well believe that the feelings of the Government in regard to the position of Ireland must be intensely painful.

The feelings of any Government which found so important a part of the Kingdom in such a state as is here described must be anything but enviable. But when we remember the history of the present Government and its action towards Ireland, when we see how many considerations must enter into their minds in regard to the condition in which Ireland is now, I cannot but feel that their position, thoughts, and feelings must be of the most painful description. The paragraphs in Her Majesty's Speech which we now have before us are paragraphs which I have read and re-read; and the oftener I read them the more extraordinary does the picture they present appear. I am told that there is a comparative ignorance—I will not go so far as to say there is an apathy, but a want of realization—of the condition of Ireland amongst a great part of the people of this country. They see from time to time, and indeed every day, the columns of the newspapers filled with most fearful accounts of the proceedings in that Island; they see every appearance of insecurity, of the entire destruction of law and order, and a great overbearing of all the rights of property and of individual liberty, which are so dear to Englishmen. But the people in many parts of this country, I believe, look at all this with wonder and amazement, and do not believe it. They cannot bring themselves to believe that things are so bad as they are said to be; and it is not until evidence comes before them in the shape of a pronouncement by an authority which cannot be disputed and which has no temptation to overrate the difficulties or the evils of the situation, by an authority speaking solemnly in the name of the Crown to the Parliament of England, that people can in any degree realize the position of that portion of Her Majesty's Dominions. Her Majesty's present Government, Her Majesty's Prime Minister, must look back with amazement, as the other subjects of Her Majesty look back with amazement, to the words which he himself spoke much less than a year ago, when he was not in Office, but when he was aiming at Office, and when he was on the point of assuming that great responsibility, when words coming from him could certainly not be said to be the words of an irresponsible personage. In the middle of that great contest which took place in the beginning of last year for the possession of power, the right hon. Gentleman made use of this language to his constituents, describing the condition of Ireland—

> "There is an absence of crime and outrage, with a general sense of comfort and of satisfaction, such as was unknown in the previous history of that country."

That was the state of Ireland, in the judgment of the right hon. Gentleman, at the end of last March. And very shortly afterwards he acceded to power, and became responsible for the administration of the affairs of Ireland, as well as of the rest of the Empire. What was the first question which came before him? It was whether or not the Government should renew the Peace Preservation Act. They had all the information that was in the possession of their Predecessors. They had information of a minute, elaborate, authentic character from persons who were responsible for the administration of the country, all pointing in a general way, I may say, to one conclusion—namely, that it was necessary that that Act should be renewed. They had that before them. They waited, and they came deliberately to the conclusion that it was not necessary—and if not necessary of course it was not desirable—that they should advise Parliament to renew that Act. They announced in the Speech from the Throne that they believed that Ireland would be sufficiently well governed without any resort to measures of an exceptional nature; and they therefore pledged their character as statesmen, when they came to deal with the matter in a responsible position, that it was not necessary that any measure of this kind should be passed. Well, what happened? Time went on, and various uneasy symptoms appeared, and Questions were put and discussions were raised. Matters went so far that the Lord Lieutenant who had just quitted Office, and who had administered Ireland for some years and was thoroughly well acquainted with its condition, thought it right to call the attention of the Government and of Parliament in his place in the other House to the great imprudence of proceeding without the renewal of this Act. The Ministry were thoroughly warned and prepared for the whole matter, and they had, no doubt, the fullest information always at command from the persons they consulted in Ireland. They concluded that it was not necessary to bring in this measure, and they did not do it. They passed through the Session without doing anything towards it. There were very uneasy symptoms even in the course of the last Session; but Parliament was allowed to separate without a word falling from the Throne on the subject. It is true that the attention of the Chief Secretary and of the Government was called in this House before we separated to the condition of affairs and to some of the meetings which were then taking place, and which appeared to many of us of a dangerous character. On the 23rd of August Questions and discussions were raised in this House with reference to meetings in Ireland which we believed to be of a dangerous character; and the Chief Secretary told us that he believed it was perfectly possible to deal with and prevent the spread of the mischief then apparent; but further, that if it should be in the judgment of the Government necessary to take further measures and to ask for additional powers to accomplish the task, they would not shrink from calling Parliament together without delay for that purpose. Now, we separated comparatively late in the autumn, on the 7th of September, and before we had been gone many days into the country we began to see what was really going on in Ireland. About 10 days or a fortnight after the Prorogation the first and very significant speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) was made at Ennis, in which he told those who listened to him, clearly and distinctly, that they must look out for the Land Bill that would be introduced next Session, and that the measure of that Land Bill would be the measure of the energy they threw into their operations in the autumn and winter. The hon. Member began then that remarkable course of political procedure which he and his Colleagues have since followed with such wonderful results — the organization of the Land League and of that secret government which is now fast becoming the true Government of Ireland. The Government were perfectly aware of what was taking place. Of course the Irish Government had information, and not only that, but a distinguished Member of the Cabinet—the Secretary of State for War (Mr. Childers)—had himself visited the country in order to see with his own eyes what was really the state of matters. That right hon. Gentleman was received with the hospitality for which the Irish are deservedly celebrated, with that courtesy which distinguishes them, and with the respect which I must say was due to his own position and character. But he was there in the middle of all this agitation, and at the laying of the foundation, or at the rapidly erecting, of the structure which has now become so formidable in his eyes. What did he see? What did he report? Did he see anything? He had the advantage of the Chief Secretary, because he was not tied to his post in Dublin, and was able to go about the country. It must have been an advantage, under the circumstances, for the Chief Secretary to know that a Colleague with such powers of observation was thus going about. With regard to the right hon. Gentleman's tour, I am only speaking from what I have been told by a friend when I say that I understand he described himself in rather a peculiar way—as not a visitor, but a passer-by. And when that phrase was suggested to me, I asked myself what that passing by could mean; and the only passers-by I could recollect were the priest and the Levite, who had passed by the poor man that fell among thieves. Whatever were the observations of Members of the Government, however, there were others whose observations on the state of the country were not so skin deep. There was a most remarkable Charge delivered some time later, and I ask permission to read a few lines from it as a companion piece to the few lines I have read from the Prime Minister's speech in March. In the early part of December, Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, in his Charge to a Grand Jury, said on the Bench—

> "I do not wish to be guilty of exaggeration or to create excitement or alarm. I desire to express myself in the calm and measured language which best becomes one to whom the administration of justice is committed, and I should fall short of my duty if I did not point out that in a large part of Munster true loyalty has ceased to exist, and an intolerable tyranny prevails; that right is disregarded, the process of the law is not enforced, and lawlessness and disorder desolate the land."

We have now laid before us a statement

fully as serious as that on the part of the Crown itself. We are told that "agrarian crimes in general have multiplied far beyond the experience of recent years." It is far beyond "a fair and ordinary rate." I do not know what a fair and ordinary rate is. But then a little light is thrown in, for we are told that the attempts upon life have not grown in the same proportion as other offences. Well, Sir, I have no doubt that that is perfectly true; and as far as we are able to say that a smaller number of lives have been sacrificed it must be a matter of thankfulnes to us all. But let us ask how it is that there has been this comparatively small growth of attempts upon life. The Government advise Her Majesty that

> "Efforts have been made for personal protection, far beyond all former precedent, by the police, under the direction of the Executive."

I am not prepared to express a doubt on that point; but let me give another reason, which I believe is the true reason—at all events, the main reason—why there is less loss of life than might be under other circumstances. This reason was supplied by the hon. Member for Cork when speaking of the organization of the Land League. When they have rebuked violence and murder, they have generally coupled their disclaimers with the remark—"We can show you a more excellent way. By organization, organization supported by terrorism, you may carry your point without the necessity for outrage." And they have organized. They have organized a Government which is now, as I have said, the real Government of Ireland, a Government of which a friend recently wrote to me—a man whose judgment and position would command respect among all the Members of this House, but I dare not give his name—and said—

> "There is now in Ireland a Government the most powerful, the most unscrupulous, and the most merciless that the world has ever seen;"

and he showed me by instance after instance, which he was able to give from his own knowledge, how the effect of this organization was to paralyze and utterly reduce to submission all classes brought under its influence or within its reach. And when you are talking of outrages, about how many people have been shot, how many have been beaten, how many have been mutilated, and find that the number is not so great as it has been on other occasions, you have to ask yourselves how many men there are who dare to disobey the orders given by the Land League. They have invented a new punishment, and one so terrible that the person from whom I have already quoted says—"for Heaven's sake don't expose me to being Boycotted. It is worse than the risk of being shot." It was once said that "Order reigns in Warsaw," and in the same way you may now say that "Order reigns in Mayo" and other places in Ireland. There is no need of murder. The fear of murder has done its work. The spirit is cowed and crushed, and that is the condition of affairs with which you have to deal. Do not let us then be told that the Government has not broken down. The Government has broken down. There may, no doubt, be many cases in which the administrators of justice are unable to do justice. Of course, they are. We know that perfectly well. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) some little time ago sent a Circular to the magistrates, calling attention to the position of the law, and pointing out that there were various powers which they might use, and which, if they would use with effect, would put an end to the state of things of which they complained. [Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The Circular did not say that.] I have not quoted the exact words, for I have not the Circular by me, and I will not further refer to it, as I have no wish to misquote the Circular. I have, however, in my hand the reply of the Cavan magistrates which appeared in *The Times* of Monday, December 27. Their reply is well worth considering. It is as follows:—

> "We, the undersigned magistrates of the county of Cavan, having carefully read your Circular of the 8th ult., defining our powers under the Acts 15 & 16 *Geo.* III. and 1 & 2 *Will.* IV., desire to point out that we were already acquainted with the powers conveyed to us under those statutes, but that, owing to the terrorism exercised throughout the county by the members of the Land League and its sympathizers (as well as by other societies), which renders the law powerless, it is absolutely impossible for us to obtain information sufficient to bring to justice the perpetrators of the outrages alluded to in that Circular. Shopkeepers, farmers, labourers, and, in fact, all classes of society are coerced into joining the League, knowing full well that if they refuse to do so

they are in imminent danger of having their houses burnt, their cattle houghed, and their fences levelled without even a remote probability of obtaining redress or protection from the law. We are anxious to do do our duty to the utmost of our power, and regret that, in consequence of the reasons already stated, it is impossible for us to deal with the offences mentioned in your Circular. We also earnestly request you to inform the Government that, in our opinion, immediate measures should be taken to protect life and property. We feel called upon to make this reply to your Circular, as it might be inferred that we were either ignorant of or unwilling to do our duty, and also to relieve ourselves from the responsibility of the present state of affairs."

When we consider what these bodies are that administer justice throughout this country—the earnest way in which Magistrates and Judges and all concerned in the administration of justice devote themselves to their duties, and the risks they are prepared to run in carrying them out—it is too hard that reflections should be cast on them in the discharge of their duties. There is only one word which I should suggest should be changed in the reply of the Cavan magistrates. They say—"Without even the remote probability of obtaining redress or protection from the law." I should say "protection from the Government;" because the Government are bound to use the powers they possess, or, if that is not sufficient, to come to this House to obtain other powers which may be necessary. [Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Hear, hear!] The right hon. Gentleman cheers that sentiment, and, no doubt, he says—"That is what we are now doing. We are calling upon Parliament to arm us with those further powers which you tell us, and we feel, we stand in need of. What can you want more?" I do not know that we want anything more now; but why did you not do it before? This is the case of a movement which began with small beginnings, but which has gradually and rapidly extended; and in proportion as it has extended from county to county, and place to place, so will the repression become a more difficult and a painful operation. You might have put out the flame when it was small. Every day that you allow it to proceed and gather strength, you make the putting it out more difficult and effects left behind more serious. The matter will not be put an end to by the abolition of the Land League and the re-establishment of the payment of rents. The mischief which has been done is incalculable, and it will take many years, and many years of careful and steady government, to repair the evil. Confidence has been shaken, credit has been shaken. Men who have been devoting their time, strength, money, and skill to the improvement of their properties in Ireland have been driven away from the country, and they have received such a lesson that they must be bold men to return and go on with the work they had in hand. But, worse than that, men have been demoralized by the doctrines which have been preached and the example set. If there is one thing more painful than another, I think it is the demoralization of the men ready to pay their rent, who have been forbidden to do it, and who now find themselves in the middle of an atmosphere where the rule is not to pay that which was due. Do not suppose that this is a matter which affects only the landlords of Ireland. There may have been occasions in which there have been attacks made upon particular parties. This combination, this movement, is an attack upon more than one class. It is an attack upon every class of property holders, upon all creditors, upon every class that represents that element in Irish society which is against those managing the Land League. We have been recently told on very high authority that it is remarkable—and it is remarkable—that the managers and promoters of this Land League are men not interested in the land. They are men who, with all their ability and success in other walks of life, have really no more to do with the land than many of us have to do with the land in Ireland, or than men who are engaged as soldiers or sailors or anything else have to do with it. But they are banded together for an object, and that object goes far beyond the mere dealing with the question of the land. It is not mere sympathy with the tenants which animates the League. The hon. Member for Cork, who carries on all this movement and conspiracy openly and in the light of day, was candid enough to tell us what was the real guiding and animating spirit that has impelled him in his work. He tells us —"I would not have taken off my coat in regard to this work if I had not known that we were laying the foundation of a movement for the regeneration of our legislative independence;" and it is because he sees that the landlord element hinders the progress of that movement that he and others are so keen in the matter. That is the condition of affairs. If it were possible to go beyond what I have already said, that is the confessed, the leading statement of the Government. I do say, as I said a little while ago, I cannot read over these passages in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech without unmixed astonishment at seeing that which I believe to be wholly unprecedented, and which amounts to an indictment against themselves. I do not wish to detain the House by going through the proceedings which took place after Parliament rose and before this decision was taken. But I must draw attention to this. Early in November, before the great political day to which we are accustomed to look as a sort of mid-Lent, if I may use such an expression—the Guildhall banquet—early in November, before that day, the Government had found that matters were becoming intolerable. They must have taken the advice of their Law Officers, and they then determined to institute proceedings against the leaders of the Land League. That step was taken on the 2nd of November, or, at all events, as I am not certain of the exact date, very early in November. That, therefore, was an acknowledgment by them that they were then satisfied, and had been advised by their proper Officers, that these meetings were illegal, and that those who took part in them were liable to be prosecuted. Having that advice, why did they not take any steps to put them down? The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Address told us, as though it was a matter for congratulation, that government in Ireland had not broken down, but had interfered and stopped these meetings. But, if that is so, why did they not do so earlier? What was the Government guilty of at that moment? They were guilty of one of two things—they were either guilty of unstatesmanlike want of foresight, or of what I may almost call criminal negligence. Now, Sir, we want to know what are the grounds upon which they abstained from action when action would have been effective, when these affairs were just beginning, and put it off to a time when things were very far gone? I expect an answer to that question. Then I cannot but add what is the real and serious question in the present position of Ireland, and that is the absence of all security and of all private rights and the protection of individuals. Now, what is the excuse given by the Government? Why, that they were unwilling to control individual liberty. Individual liberty! I do not wish to undervalue the principle of individual liberty, though that principle does not apply when you are endeavouring to prevent a man from setting a house on fire. But I ask what has become of the principle of individual liberty as regarded the great mass of orderly people? What has become of the individual liberty of men who are willing to work, but are told that they shall not go to work for their landlord, that they shall not supply him with the necessaries of life, or do the slightest piece of service for him? Not only that they shall not pay him rent, but that they shall avoid him as a leper or a loathsome outcast; and not the landlord only, but anybody desiring to do him service, is put under the ban. The matter was carried so far that even great public companies—Railway Companies, Steamship Companies—were not able to perform the public duties which they had undertaken. These excuses are excuses which make everything worse, which are utterly unworthy of the British Government. I can understand that the step would have been painful to any Government, and doubly painful to a Government upon which it would bring great personal mortification, inasmuch as they would be compelled to say that their declaration just before they came into Office and what they had said and done after they came into Office had been so singularly falsified. They would have had to suffer considerably in their pride in that the beneficial legislation of 1870—what good that legislation may have done I do not know; but I do not wish to question that it has done good in its way—as they would have had to confess, had utterly and wholly failed of the object they had in view, which was the pacification and settlement of the country; that it had not touched the root of the evil—that tinkering with the Land Laws did not reach the root of the evil; and that that was not the way to deal with the evil, which lay far deeper than that. I must apologise to the House for having spoken at such length on this subject. But it is one on which one might speak endlessly, because of all subjects which can come before us it is the one which most deeply touches our feelings. I do not pretend to have a very minute personal acquaintance with Ireland. I have been in that country on several occasions, and I have had at different times to pay some attention to Irish affairs; and I have numerous friends in different parts of the country. From all of these friends I hear accounts which, though varying in detail, all breathe the same spirit and contain uniform assurances—first, that not one-tenth of the outrages which are committed are reported to the public; and, secondly, that the evil is one that is growing gradually but rapidly. Cases have come to my knowledge of men who, in the beginning of December, were on such terms with their tenants that there was every readiness on the part of the latter to pay their rents. But before the day came, within less than three weeks, the tenants had been overawed and refused to pay. The same state of things prevails all over the country; at all events, over so large a district that one may fairly use that expression. I have letters describing it from several parts of Ulster, from Mayo, Cork, Limerick, Kerry, Kilkenny, Wexford, Tipperary. Though we look with dismay upon the effect produced by this state of things, and with shame at the contemptuous messages which we hear of from abroad, and Resolutions passed in the House of Representatives in America, and the language freely used by Oriental statesmen, to the effect that, when we begin to speak of their misgovernment, we had better look at our own, the really most serious question is the effect produced upon Ireland itself. If this were a question of promoting or securing the greatness of the Empire, at some cost to a part of it, I should not wonder at or blame those who, in the interests of Ireland, opposed the interests of England. But that is not the question. I look to the condition of Ireland itself. I look to every part of Her Majesty's Dominions, and I ask where does lawlessness produce so much harm as in Ireland, where should it be more the duty of statesmen and the object of patriots to maintain the principles of right and the truths of political economy, the truths of morality and of justice, respect for law and order, than in Ireland? You have two great dangers in Ireland now. There is, in the first place, the organization which is now being formed, and which is so perfectly managed by its chief that, I was going to say, as Wellington said of his Peninsular Army, it could go anywhere, and do anything; or as was said of a great secret religious Order, that its Superior could manage it as if it were a corpse in his hands. [Mr. PARNELL: The Land League is not a secret society.] I do not say it is; but that makes it all the worse, for it flaunts itself in the light of day, whilst we are sitting here paltering with the details of Land Laws. The Land Laws, I admit, are a matter of great interest in any country. They are a matter of great interest in Ireland. When we were in Office we appointed a Commission to inquire into those Land Laws. Our Successors have appointed another. We shall soon see the Reports of those Commissions, and shall be able to consider whether further legislation is desirable. If any measures are brought forward of a rational character, we shall give them our candid consideration. But it must be on the merits of the measures themselves and not for the sake of pacifying the Land League. For this is the second danger to which I have adverted—the danger of the arguments which are being drawn, not from the case itself, but from the attitude of the Land League. If any measures are to be considered not upon their merits, but because they will give satisfaction to men who are openly defying the law and subverting all the principles of liberty and justice in that country—[Mr. BIGGAR: No!]—then they must fail, and they will deserve to fail. I thank the House for having listened to me so patiently. I am quite certain that this is a matter which must engage the warm feeling of every true lover of his country; and I believe that the calling of Parliament together, late though it be, and sadly as it was needed, is a measure for which, at least, we may thank Her Majesty's Government.

MR. GLADSTONE: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that hon. Gentlemen connected with Ireland will not suppose that, by presenting myself to the House at this early period of the debate, I have the slightest intention of endeavouring to impede the execution of the determination they have announced—to raise at large upon this occasion the question connected with the state of Ireland. My object, on the contrary, is this. My right hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition has, in conformity with the usual practice and in the exercise of his right, criticized the terms of the Speech and the conduct of the Government; and it appears to me that it would be for the convenience of all parties if we were to endeavour to keep those more manageable issues—if I may so term them—apart from the wider questions that may be open, and leave the field perfectly clear for those hon. Gentlemen who intend to plead for what they believe to be the cause of their country at large. My right hon. Friend has paid a compliment to the Mover and Seconder of the Address for their speeches in terms which I should have expected from him, and I do not remember an occasion on which the task of the Mover and Seconder of the Address has been so arduous as on the present occasion. I am happy to be able to join my right hon. Friend in the compliment he has paid, and without the reserve which he was compelled to attach to his acknowledgment, in consequence of the expression of opinions at which he, as Leader of the Opposition, was greatly shocked, but which are naturally more congenial to me. I will follow the right hon. Baronet briefly in the comments he has made on certain passages in the Speech. He complained, among other things, of the want of information as to the action of the Government. Well, Sir, when I recollect to what treatment this House has been subjected to for about the last three years—what schemes of vast importance, involving wars, annexations—as some contended, breaches of Treaty and of law—were matured in secret, and announced to this House when they were full-blown and far past the opportunity of revocation—I am a little astonished at the squeamishness of the right hon. Baronet, who seems to possess that insatiable appetite which declares that food enough has not been administered to him. Why, Sir, the right hon. Baronet really thinks that the case has been extraordinary for reticence. I will venture to say that it has been extraordinary for the reverse of reticence. Papers are promised on certain subjects. Papers upon one of these subjects have been distributed this morning; but I do not refer to those Papers. I refer to an authority who, I suppose, may be considered a pretty good authority—a statement by my noble Friend Lord Granville, made within the last few weeks, in which he gave details as explicit of the whole of our course with regard to the communications with Turkey—our anxious communications with Turkey—and the European Powers during the last few months, as if he had made the statement in the Upper House. The right hon. Baronet himself cannot make out that there has been the slightest mystery as to anything which has taken place; but his demand is not that we should inform him as to what has taken place, but as to what is going to take place. He does not want to know what has happened in respect of Montenegro—for that he in the main already knows—but he thinks it is in our power to inform him upon everything that is about to happen with respect to Greece. With respect to Montenegro, his question is a perfectly reasonable one, and I will endeavour to answer it. The entire Montenegrin Frontier is not yet marked out; but the best authorities are of opinion that no grave question of a practical nature remains which is likely to lead to difficulties, or is likely to require the serious intervention of the Powers. That is the state in which the question remains. The statement in the Speech is strictly accurate, and the main—we might, perhaps, have left out that epithet—the main question with respect to the Frontier has been settled. The right hon. Gentleman says that that may be satisfactory, and it ought to be satisfactory to him, as he and those who sit near him consider themselves as the authors of the Treaty of Berlin, but have not been able to bring the Treaty to a conclusion. If I cannot predict everything that is going to take place with respect to Greece, I am sure I shall have his sympathy; for in the course of two years, during the time when he held Office, he had not advanced one single step, or obtained from the Sultan one single admission or concession with respect to the Greek Frontier. With regard to the Greek Frontier, all I can say is this—that every step that has been taken has been taken in harmony with the European Powers. I will not pretend to predict how near this question is to its solution; but progress has been made, at a time when I am able to say that steps of the kind have been taken, and have been taken concertedly. If I am not forward to enter into detail as to what may happen next month, or the month after, at this moment, it is because the nature of the case does not encourage confident predictions; and it is also because at the present moment it is not England, it is rather France, that is assuming the part, with our perfect and absolute goodwill, of offering suggestions intended in the common interest. All I can say is that I am very sensible of the great difficulties and serious dangers that may attend any serious miscarriage of this question. I know of no means of obviating those dangers, of diminishing the risk of those miscarriages, at all equal to the means which we have endeavoured heretofore to use—that is to say, to abjure all petty motives and all selfish interest in the honest effort to unite together those Powers, which we may fail to unite, but which, if we do unite them, will have at once the greatest right and the greatest force to give effect to justice and good policy in the East of Europe. My right hon. Friend passes very lightly over the rising in the Transvaal, and I do not wonder at it; but there is no reason why I should, I think, intrude into this debate comments upon that subject, inasmuch as the topics pressed upon us on that subject are so many and so grave. I pass on to the regret and surprise which the right hon. Baronet expressed that we should offer nothing more than a desire for an opportunity for friendly action in the matter of the Basuto War. Well, Sir, I do not know exactly what the right hon. Baronet would have us offer. Would he have us offer to take that war into our own hands? Does he think that that is what we ought to do? We, who, at present, have the honour to serve the Crown, have no responsibility whatever for that war—absolutely none; and the questions with which it is mixed are doubtful and difficult questions. But even if we had felt that we were more thoroughly associated than we do feel with the causes which led to that war, it would not be in our power either to relieve the Colonial Government of its responsibility or to interfere with its rights. We have endeavoured to do what justice requires. We have reserved our title, our free judgment, to do what justice to all parties may seem to require when that war reaches its issue. For the present, we believe we have done all that the case requires and all it permits in proclaiming our desire to be of use, and in expressing the obvious satisfaction we should feel to be of service when the opportunity presents itself. With respect to the Military Estimates for India, the Speech is of greater length than we have commonly advised to be delivered, and it was not thought necessary to do more than insert those few words which my right hon. Friend has rightly interpreted to mean that the subject of the expenses of the Afghan War will be introduced to the notice of the House probably before the Session is far advanced, and we shall then endeavour to redeem the pledge we have already given upon that important question. The right hon. Baronet, not unnaturally, passed over some parts of the Speech, and then went into that which fills all our minds and all our hearts upon this painful occasion. On one subject, indeed, I can set my right hon. Friend at ease. He referred again and again to the particular mortification which he considered that we who sit on these Benches must feel with respect to Ireland. Well, Sir, I assure my right hon. Friend that we feel no mortification whatever. We feel a great deal of pain—more grave than we can easily describe—but mortification absolutely none. The acts we have done with respect to Ireland in the Disestablishment of the Church—["Oh, oh!"]—Well, I am much obliged to the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gorst), whose stock of tolerance, I hope, is not quite exhausted yet, nor that of his Friends near him. [Mr. GORST disclaimed having interrupted the right hon. Gentleman.] I can give the hon. and learned Gentleman and his Friends an assurance that, so far from feeling mortified from believing what we have done has been falsified or condemned by events, on the contrary, I believe I may say that if we had to do it again to-morrow we should set about it with good heart, and only endeavour to do it better if we could. I will not follow my right hon. Friend through portions of his speech; but shall reply to it as a whole. The matter with which we had to deal was a most grave one, and we have had to deal with equally grave questions during what has been called the Recess. I do not deny the right of my right hon. Friend to challenge the manner in which we have endeavoured to deal with the questions to which I have referred; but it appears to me that his condemnations ought to be distinct and intelligible, so that we might know as to what we are arraigned upon. When we are told that what we do now we ought to have done sooner, we have a right to ask the right hon. Baronet—What ought we to have done, and when ought we to have done it? Upon that subject his speech is totally vague. ["No, no!"] His references to what we have done were totally misleading. What was the use of quoting the Charge of Judge Fitzgerald? It was delivered in December, after we had determined to call Parliament together. What was the use of quoting words which the right hon. Gentleman says were used by me in the end of March, when, he says, I said the state of Ireland was distinguished by a remarkable absence of crime and outrage? What I believe I really said was a description of the period which had elapsed since the passing of the Land Act. I do not believe that I spoke in the present tense, because, speaking in March, I had no Returns or information about outrages in Ireland. I am bound to say that I do not think there was anything in March to create great alarm on the subject of outrage. There was great distress; but I learn from the right hon. Gentleman that I ought to have taken alarm from the state of Ireland at that time. ["No, no!"] Well, then, what am I censured for? Either the state of Ireland gave cause for alarm, or it did not. If it did not, why are my words criticized? If it did give cause for alarm, why did you dissolve Parliament? When the late Government advised the Dissolution of Parliament, they knew perfectly well when Parliament would meet again. I suppose they did not think that they had obtained absolute fixity of tenure either by fraud, force, or folly. When they advised the Dissolution, they were bound to take into view the possibility that the Elections might result in the return of a hostile majority. They were bound to compute the time at which the new Parliament could go to work. I have never censured the late Government for not renewing the Peace Preservation Act; but we are now severely censured by my right hon. Friend. But if there be censure at all, it is to be retorted on the late Government. By their advice as to the Dissolution, they made it impossible for us to approach, before the 24th of May, the first attempt to introduce a law for the revival of the Peace Preservation Act in Ireland, which expired on the 1st of June. It was not possible for us to renew the law in the ordinary sense of renewal, because, by renewal, we mean renewal before expiring. All that was possible for us was to propose a revival of that law after an interval during which its provisions were not enforced; and we ought, according to my right hon. Friend, to have come down to Parliament and to have stated to the House that, although there was no large number of outrages in Ireland, there was vital necessity for preventing the entrance of arms into that country, and we ought to have done this within a week of the time when, in spite of whatever we could say, such entrance must be perfectly free, and those who would thus have been instructed by us as to the value of their privilege would have used it all over the country. I see no reason to believe that we arrived at a wrong conclusion when, on coming into Office in May, we determined not to make any request to Parliament, and not to raise the long, angry, and embittered controversy which we should have had before it would have been possible, with rather a slender case, to obtain a renewal of the Peace Preservation Act from the new Parliament. If, therefore, there be ground for condemnation, the condemnation falls back upon the head of the late Government. There is much in the consideration of the condition of Ireland which must make us feel ashamed and humiliated in the face of the civilized world; but when a Government like the present one is placed in a trying situation, when they have to deal with topics which are so serious, so painful, and so overwhelming, in my opinion the first duty of every man who enters into these discussions is to register for himself this resolve—that for his part he will not speak one word, will not deliver one accusation, will not indulge in one retort, and will not use one highly-coloured epithet beyond that which the absolute necessity of the case requires; but will address himself simply and solely to the attempt of finding the best solution which the situation demands. My right hon. Friend, I think, is not well informed upon some matters that are Ministerial. I shall not debate at very great length this question; but I shall endeavour to show, by reference to statistics and precedent, that we have not been careless in what was done, in circumstances and problems which are admitted to be problems of difficulty, and that we have endeavoured to act for the best, and we have acted for the best. We have been advised by our Law Officers. It is said that the meetings of the Land League were illegal; we have been advised no such thing; and, consequently, with that statement falls to the ground the most definite charge which comes from the opposite side, so far as the conduct of the Executive is concerned. We have been advised that the meetings would be illegal under certain circumstances, if attended with certain conditions; and I think I am right in stating that in every case where we found those circumstances and conditions existing, the meetings have been prohibited and prevented. I heard in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman a reference to "Boycotting." I heard also a reference to the Steamboat and Railway Companies; but Steamboat and Railway Companies are suffering, as far as I understand, mainly from a system of exclusive dealing. But is it intended that we are to legislate and give additional powers to the law in order to prevent exclusive dealing? Exclusive dealing is a most doubtful engine in all circumstances; but, at the same time, let us understand that these matters are brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition to heighten the colours, and let us understand whether it is really intended that we should legislate in order to prevent persons dealing with people whom they do not like. But my right hon. Friend says that we arrived at our decision on the 2nd of November. We did no such thing, Sir. We decided on the 13th of September, so far as we are concerned. My point is this—that there was nothing in the state of the country known to us which would have justified us in taking a decision earlier. What was the decision? The decision was to examine immediately the state of the law with a view to putting into full force all the existing powers of the law before making a fresh demand upon Parliament. I should like to know whether in that decision we were right or not? Does the right hon. Baronet think that before attempting what force there was in the existing law we ought to have come to Parliament for legal orders? No; there is no answer to that question; and it will be seen how much truth I speak when I state that it is the vagueness of the statement of my right hon. Friend of which I complain. He describes in high colours—and I cannot deny that high colours are warranted in the case of Ireland—and he mixes all the particulars together, and affirms that the whole of these things are due to the Government, and that Parliament ought to have been called together sooner. But when? Were we right in determining to try the existing law first? I must make an admission to my right hon. Friend. His own mode of trying the existing law was not a mode we are disposed to imitate. He charged four men, three of whom were utterly insignificant; one of them, indeed, has since proved himself to be a man of great ability, but his ability was not known at the time. He did not aim his weapons at the chief of the agitation, but he was content with these comparatively insignificant victims. Having charged them, what did he do? He did not bring them to trial. That is a mode of acting upon the existing law, and of exhausting its powers, which we have no inclination to follow. I am glad that the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gibson) is going to speak, and to give us some explanation of the course which was then adopted. The method of threatening without striking is, in our opinion, the worse course of action that could have been adopted. But what did we do? On the 13th of September we desired that the state of the law should be carefully examined, with the view to ascertain whether a statutable offence had been committed. Allow me to say one word of apology to the right hon. Gentleman. I shall avoid, as I am bound to do, with greater strictness than the right hon. Baronet opposite, saying one single word in reference to the trials that are now taking place in

Ireland; but what I have to say is this. On the 13th of September we desired that examination of the law to be immediately made, and the conclusion that was arrived at was that we could proceed against certain persons in respect of their actions. True it is that we might have taken the first step earlier if, instead of coming to Dublin to the Court of Queen's Bench, we had gone before the magistrates. There were, however, many reasons that led us to believe that it was wiser to come to Dublin, and one of those reasons the right hon. Gentleman will appreciate—namely, that by so doing we secured a more speedy determination of the issue raised. We had then hopes that by coming to Dublin the trials might be decided in December—certainly in January—whereas, had we gone before the magistrates, the probability is that they would not have been concluded until two months later. Therefore, let it be recollected that, although we might have proceeded before the magistrates a fortnight earlier than we could at Dublin, on account of our having to wait for the opening of term at the latter place, had we done so the real settlement of the decisive issue of the trial would have been considerably delayed. It was, however, later than that that we came to any further serious decision, and I will state why. I suppose that it will be obvious that when we had determined to institute these State trials it was our duty to watch their effect. Some effects they did produce; but I will not refer to them, because were I to do so I should be compelled to deviate from the rule I have laid down. Other effects they might have produced, not merely in the way of checking agitation, but in the way of the diminution of outrage. They did not, however, have those effects. Outrages rapidly increased, and assumed in November a more decided character than that which they had possessed in October, and consequently left us nothing to expect in the way of diminution. I am, therefore, totally at a loss to know how many days—for I can hardly say weeks — according to the right hon. Gentleman, we might have saved by calling Parliament together for the purpose of making the application which we now, with sadness, do make. The right hon. Gentleman says that the Speech from the Throne, or rather those of the Mover and Seconder of the Address, contain an indictment against ourselves, inasmuch as they endeavour to throw the responsibility which rightly attaches to us upon others. I assert that we have attempted nothing of the kind. We have simply stated what we believe to be the fact. It is not the fact that there has been less of Executive exertion on the present than on former occasions. I believe, on the contrary, that there has been much greater Executive exertion on this than on any other occasion. We have heard that protection has been given to life in 125 cases, quite independently of an amount of day and night, of domiciliary protection which is absolutely unknown on such a scale in the history of Ireland; and now the accounts which have been received by my right hon. Friend show that the number of such cases has risen to 153. It is quite true that the administration of justice with reference to agrarian offences has been frustrated. And why do we say that? We do so because if we ask for extraordinary powers it is our duty to state, in the most distinct form to Parliament and to the country, what is the real state of the case which constitutes our justification for asking for those powers. And our justification for asking for such powers is, not that we have not sufficient police and military forces at our command—because in that case we could increase those forces—not that the stipendiary magistrates are unwilling to do their duty; but that whatever is done by them to give effect to the laws for the protection of life and property and to prevent illegal meetings is frustrated, and that we are totally unable to restore life to the administration of justice in Ireland through, not the difficulty, but the impossibility of procuring evidence. I am not going to enter into proof of that. That will be for a later stage of this debate, or a later debate. I pass on to address a few general words, not controversial, to the right hon. Gentleman upon the subject of the supposed inaction—the supposed guilty inaction—of the Government in not making a much earlier appeal to Parliament. I will assume that what is meant by that expression is a considerably earlier appeal to Parliament. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman struck me as being that of a man who did not, in the slightest degree, think it to be worth his while to take into view that this is not the first time that Ireland has been disturbed. This is not the first time that violence has prevailed in that country, and on former occasions it has prevailed to a far greater extent than it does at present. The amount of violence that actually prevails does not constitute the hinge on which the case turns. What I wish to point out is this. I see opposite to me a Conservative Party—a Conservative Party, as I hope, regardful of its own precedents—and I should like to ask them whether it has been the practice of former Administrations—of former Conservative Administrations—upon the first appearance of a state of lawlessness in Ireland, at once to conclude that the case is hopeless, and to proceed to call Parliament together? I will refer to two cases. One of them will not, perhaps, have so much authority with hon. Members opposite; but still, for a Liberal Government, it will be admitted that the Government of Lord Grey was a great Government. The Government of Lord Grey asked Parliament for additional powers in January, 1833; and what was the case they showed? They proved that the most frightful outrages had prevailed throughout Ireland throughout the whole of 1831 and 1832; but, such was the sense that then prevailed among all Parties of the sacredness of Constitutional right and of the danger of passing beyond the boundaries of the ordinary law, that that Government waited for two years before they made their application to Parliament. I have read this very day the speech which Sir Robert Peel delivered on that occasion; I heard it myself in February, 1833, and have never forgotten it; a speech in which he described the horrors that were taking place in Ireland; but, although those horrors had continued for two years, that speech contained not a word of censure upon the Government for the lateness of the period at which they invoked the aid of Parliament. It may be said that that was the time of Reform agitation, and that, therefore, the case does not carry much weight with it. Well, I will go back further, and endeavour to please you by offering a precedent better suited, perhaps, to your tastes and inclinations. Will you be satisfied with the precedent of the year 1814? That was the year of the Corn Law. I do not know how far that may commend it. But I will take that case. In that year it was the misfortune of Sir Robert Peel to be obliged to describe the state of things in Ireland, and this case has some very significant features with reference to the present one. The case then was a double case—it was partly a case of direct danger to the State, but it also had that which is a more distinctive feature of the present case—it also had the character of a most extensive and organized interference with the exercise of private rights. The chief difference between the two cases is, perhaps, that the private rights then interfered with were those which existed among the people themselves, and not so much those possessed by the class possessing property in land. But what did Sir Robert Peel say on that occasion? Speaking on the 23rd of June, 1814—I am quoting from *Hansard*—Sir Robert Peel said—

> "The evil which it was now proposed to remedy had not, he was sorry to say, arisen on a sudden; it had existed for a considerable time, indeed, he might say, for the whole period that he had had the honour of forming a part of the Irish Government."—[1 *Hansard*, xxviii. 163.]

He said that in June, 1814, and he had formed part of the Irish Government since August, 1812, and this state of things he had allowed to continue for 22 months before he asked the House to go beyond the bounds of the Constitution in dealing with it. At the most, all that we can be charged with is a delay of a month or six weeks. Most certainly I am here to maintain that until about that time, until the middle of November was passed, the question had not become a question that any Government of any politics would for a moment undertake. Now, I have shown what wonderful long-suffering a Government had in times when the ideas of freedom and popular government were far less developed than now, and that long intervals were permitted to pass before appeals were made to Parliament. Perhaps it may be said I am proving too much, and I am showing that we are coming too soon to make this demand. When that charge is made we shall be quite prepared to meet it, and to argue the contrary. We think we have waited in difficult circumstances, and not pretending to any infalliable mode of solving the difficulty, a long time. We do not think we have waited too long. But I will point out very slightly some of the considerations which tend, within due bounds, to recommend the exercise of patience, and even to recommend encountering the evils—I quite admit they are most serious evils—that tend to delay. Having caused the trials to be instituted, and done everything to expedite them, it was our duty to see whether they afforded us, after a certain time—I am not speaking of their issue, but of their moral effect—any satisfaction. It will be remembered, I dare say, in the great case in Ireland in 1844, that the institution of the trial of O'Connell was of itself a political event of very great effect and consequence. We found, after a certain time, that nothing was to be expected from that source—nothing, at least, that was effectual for the purpose. It was also our duty to take into view the fact—I do not say it is without explanation—I am afraid it may be explained—it was our duty to allow a good deal for the fact that offences endangering life did not increase, but rather diminished in comparison with the preceding year. I am not putting that as a matter that should operate very long or very largely; but it was a point that could not be rejected from consideration of the Government, anxious to take into view all the circumstances of the case. It would have been of the greatest advantage, further, if we could have hoped that these trials could have concluded before we made application to Parliament. I think that everyone will admit that we have neither included in our proposals, nor excluded from them, that which must be regarded as a danger until these trials were concluded. We did entertain some hope that we should not put the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) in the painful predicament of working under conditions which would be destructive to his physical powers, and that we should have been able to see him brought to the conclusion of that great judical proceeding before we called upon him, or upon other Members of the House, to consider the precise proposal which we must submit to it, and for which we must be held responsible. But there is another consideration which appears to me to escape altogether the notice of most of those who discuss the conduct of the Government. One common phrase is to speak as if it were in the power of the Government, when they find that a judicial system will not work, to issue some ukase or decree that should supply the means necessary to make it work. The Government is the Government of a Constitutional country. All they can do is to make their appeal to Parliament. Do you think the duty of the Government is perfectly fulfilled unless they carefully and maturely consider, not merely the evidence that is before them as it impresses itself upon their minds, but the state of mind in which they have to meet Parliament? I contend that it was our duty to come here with such a case as would carry the points and spread conviction to the minds of the Members of this House, and yet representing the sentiments and the opinions of the people of this Kingdom in something like a united form, and with an authority which belongs to you. You will see that nothing could be more fatal to the cause of order, liberty, and life, and the cause of property in Ireland, than for us, by premature proposals, to have run the risk of producing serious divisions of Party in this House, and to have been engaged in a struggle in which, considering the nature of the proposals we might make, it would have been perfectly possible that we might have failed simply through our premature resolutions. I make the statement frankly and verbally, that when the Government had considered what was sufficient for itself, it also had to consider whether the case was in such a state that they could boldly come before Parliament, and expect Parliament, with what may be called something like moral unanimity, to give them support in the proposals they were to make. I was very sorry when the right hon. Gentleman said these subjects ought not to be dealt with by what is called tinkering with the Land Laws. Why did he use that, I think, unfortunate phrase? There was no proposal before him to tinker the Land Laws—that is to say, no proposal calling upon him at this time to proceed with any measure for the reform of the Land Laws. But he seemed to disparage altogether all attempts of Parliament to see whether they could introduce further improvements into the land system of Ireland. Well, if he did not, there could not be a more infelicitous expression than that of which he made use, and which was received with enthusiasm by his Friends, and with which, I must say, it appeared to me at the moment that he was himself particularly pleased.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I said that was not a remedy for the extent of the disorder prevailing.

MR. GLADSTONE: Well, Sir, neither can I say is your coercion. Coercion may be necessary; and we shall endeavour to show that protective measures are a necessary, and an absolute necessary, condition for producing a state of things in which remedies may be applied; but I differ from my right hon. Friend, and I am inclined to hold against him, that what he has unfortunately called tinkering with supposed, if not with real, grievances is the true remedy; and however necessary it may be to take repressive measures for the maintenance of law and order, Sir Robert Peel was justified when, in the year 1814 or 1830, I forget which—perhaps in both years—he most frankly and broadly declared that repressive measures could be no remedy for the wrongs of Ireland. And it would be totally out of place in this debate were I to enter into details on that subject. My right hon. Friend himself cannot be, I think, wholly acquitted of this disposition towards tinkering, because he says he appointed a Commission which recommended him to tinker. That is merely the sense in which it was appointed, unless it was appointed for the purpose of satisfying—as I am afraid Royal Commissions sometimes are—the wants of the moment, with a shrewd calculation that before the Commission is appointed it will not be wanted. We have endeavoured to describe generally in the language which the Crown has used the nature of the case in Ireland; and my hon. Friend who seconded the Address is not in his place, or I would say to him that I should not despair in bringing him to a more favourable view of the operation of the Land Act of 1870 than that which he gave. But, at any rate, we are not at all prepared to admit that the Land Act has been a failure. We are prepared to make admissions to a certain extent; but this would not be the time—it would be almost an offence against regularity and convenience were I to enter upon the consideration either of the repressive or protective legislation for Ireland, or the legislation we intend to propose with regard to the Land Question. But as in the Queen's Speech itself we have advised the Crown that the protection which the Land Act supplies has, in some respects, been found not sufficient either in Ulster or in other Provinces, there can be no reason why I should not briefly indicate in three or four sentences what amendments we are inclined to propose with regard to the Land Act. In the first place, there were some provisions in the Land Act which were adopted with the view of bringing about a reduction of exorbitant rents in cases where they prevailed. I do not wish at all to convey, by referring to these provisions, that it is my impression that rents in Ireland would, in general, be described with any fairness as being unfair or exorbitant. But these provisions have been insufficient, and almost entirely inoperative. We certainly have arrived at the conclusion that a very important provision of the Act, as it finally passed—I will not now go into the question of how it passed through Parliament—a provision which confiscated the whole of the tenant's right to compensation for disturbance, was a provision too severe in its operation, and one which, in our opinion, is a part of the Act requiring alteration. We are also obliged by the evidence to admit that the provisions of the Act—and this was an original defect of the Act—have not prevented undue and frequent augmentations of rent which were not justified by the real value of the holding, but have been brought in in consequence of the superior strength of the position of the landlord. That I conceive to be a serious matter; and in referring to it again, I do not intend to say—I am as far as possible from saying—that such has been the general practice of the landlords of Ireland. Next to that, we certainly think that new provisions of the law will be requisite respecting the assignment of the tenant's interest. I will not use the terms commonly current, but I use an accurate legal phrase; and the question, I think, is one of very great consequence, lying near to the root of the matter. That is one of the points on which the Bill was unfairly changed in its passage through Parliament, and one to which we must pay great regard. Lastly, there is the question associated with the clauses well known by the name of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), which were intended to give pretty full and free scope to the creating of a peasant proprietary in Ireland. They are known not only to have been insufficient, but almost wholly inoperative. These are the points in which the Land Act has been feebler than we could have desired. I will not refer to that subject on this occasion any further. We shall have ample opportunity of returning to it. We hope it may be in our power to propose to Parliament, and to obtain its assent to measures for the efficient remedying of the Land Act on all these points. I do not think I need detain the House further at this stage of the matter, except to say one word as to the Notice given of a question with regard to the Borough Franchise for Ireland. I will answer that question now, with the greatest pleasure. The Government considered whether they should advise the mention of that subject in the Queen's Speech, and they arrived at the conclusion that the pressure of subjects with which we had to deal was such that, on the whole, we thought it better not to hold out a promise that it might be very difficult for us to redeem. [*Murmurs.*] That is the sole reason for postponing the Borough Franchise Question. Those hon. Gentlemen who do not seem to be quite satisfied I must venture to remind that, though every Irish question is of great importance, yet there are the two other Kingdoms of England and Scotland, whose concerns cannot be totally and absolutely excluded from our consideration. There is another subject which I forgot to notice. Complaint has been made that we have omitted to recognize the brilliant march and victory of Sir Frederick Roberts from Cabul to Candahar. That complaint is entirely owing to an inadvertance on the part of the complainant. I do not imagine that it can be thought necessary that Her Gracious Majesty should repeat in January what she has already said in her Speech of September, when she used these words—

> "The prompt measures taken by the Government of India for the relief of the garrison of Candahar, and the conspicuous ability and energy displayed by my officers and troops in the execution of those measures, resulting in the brilliant victory recently gained by the gallant force under the command of Sir Frederick Roberts, will, I trust, speedily bring to an honourable termination this war."

I will only express the hope that approaching, as we have now to approach, some tasks that are among the gravest and most difficult which the last half-century has presented to the notice of Parliament, we shall be sensible of the great responsibility that weighs upon us, and shall, with a total disregard of every personal motive—be it what it may—as well as every Party motive, address ourselves to a task in which, through human weakness, we may fail, but which will redound to the honour and the happiness of us all if, by the blessing of Providence, we succeed.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR, resuming, said, that although he thanked his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) for having endeavoured to obtain him an audience of English Members, he was quite satisfied that his speech would have reached the Irish people to whom it was addressed, and on whom it would have some effect, whilst he was quite sure it would be quite lost in that Assembly. In speeches made that evening, and especially in that of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, a charge had been made that Her Majesty's Government at present was not the real Government of Ireland. That was an extremely strange charge; but it amounted to this—that the right hon. Gentleman recognized the Irish Members of the Land League as the only Representatives of the Irish people, as the only persons who were able to exercise control over them. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was not concerned to deny the charge; he gloried in it. If that were the case, then let Her Majesty's Advisers abandon their sham of government, and hand over the government to those who really exercised it. But he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) would qualify the statements made by the right hon. Gentleman. The Irish Members were not enabled to do that good for their country that they wished because of the action of the Government; but he would say that at a great crisis in the history of their country, at a great emergency, he and his Party alone did their duty. If a similar crisis had taken place in England, the Government would not have dared to act as they had acted towards Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said last year that 15,000 persons in Ireland were threatened with eviction, and that "eviction" was equivalent to "sentence of starvation." And yet the right hon. Gentleman had allowed Parliament to dissolve without taking means to save those 15,000 persons. That work was left to him (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) and his Friends. When the Government failed to provide any means, then the Irish Members stepped in, and they had fortunately been able to effect what the Government were unable to perform. In 1848, Sir Robert Peel, who had often been referred to in that debate, made a speech in which he drew attention to the conduct of Mr. Blake, an Irish landlord and magistrate, who had turned a family out of doors on a winter's night, notwithstanding that he had been told that some of the children were suffering from fever, and would die if exposed to the cold. The children did die, and he unhesitatingly said that Mr. Blake was guilty of murder. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) challenged the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) to deny that Mr. Blake was guilty, both morally and legally, of murder. Sir Robert Peel thought it would be sufficient to expose such cruelties to prevent their recurrence. But that had not proved to be the case. The heartless cases of eviction had been over and over again exposed, but they had not ceased. If there was nothing but the voice of the present Parliament to protest against the cruelties of landlords, they would never cease. He was glad to hear from the Prime Minister that all meetings for the discussion of the Land Question in Ireland were not illegal, but that peculiar circumstances had rendered many of them illegal. Now, he would invite the right hon. Gentleman to tell them what it was which made a particular meeting legal or illegal. He would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland why some meetings had been prohibited, while others had not been interfered with at all? Meetings had been prohibited for the most flimsy reasons, and he would call attention to the conduct of the magistrate at Drogheda, who had forbidden a meeting on his own mere *ipse dixit*, and without the production of any authority for doing so. The reason given for this meeting being considered illegal was because the trials were to be the subject of discussion; but was it less permissible for subjects of the kind to be discussed by the Irish people, who were most interested, than by the present alien Government? The charge that particular individuals were to be denounced at the meetings was false. The placard which had been complained of, calling a meeting at Drogheda, had carefully avoided any such intentions. He would challenge the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. W. E. Forster) to point out any illegal wording in the placards convening meetings. It seemed that all that was required to prevent the holding of a meeting was the *ipse dixit* of a magistrate, and he should like to know if the aspirations of the Irish people were to be thus stifled? Every one of these magistrates, with scarcely an exception, from the highest Judge to the pettiest magistrate, was an enemy of national aspirations. The whole body formed a conspiracy against any such aspirations. He would invite hon. Gentlemen to consider whether it was a proper state of things that the entire judicial functions of the country should be in the hands of a particular faction and caste? In Ireland they had on one side the landlords—on the other the Irish people; and the vast majority of the magistrates of Ireland belonged to the landlord class. They were the relatives or dependants of that class, and in the struggle between the landlord faction and the tenantry the magistrates were on the side of the landlords. The judicial Charges which had been referred to were couched in the language of passion and of Party feeling, and were degrading to the judicial ermine, which should be the symbol and type of judicial impartiality. Justice, in fact, which should hold the scales fairly, was blindly on the side of one class, and that class was the tyrannous minority of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland declared last year that the law with respect to the tenure of land in Ireland was a harsh and unjust law, and he pledged himself that if he found it necessary to enforce the carrying out of that harsh and unjust law, he would simultaneously introduce a Bill to modify the law. The essence of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was that a coercive measure should be accompanied by a remedial measure. That pledge had not been fulfilled, for Her Majesty's Government were now determined to force on coercion if they could, and not until coercion was within sight of harbour would remedial legislation be attempted. How did the right hon. Gentleman reconcile that with his former statement? The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government made allusion to the subject of the Irish Borough Franchise—one which was referred to in the Speech from the Throne last year. The Bill which was promised was not proceeded with, and the excuse of the Government for dropping it was that they were compelled to bring in the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill. But was it not the duty of the Government, when they failed to pass their Irish Bill No. 2, to have fallen back on their Irish Bill No. 1? At all events, ought they not to have placed the Borough Franchise Bill in the forefront of their measures for the present Session? The right hon. Gentleman, as a further excuse, reminded the House of the fact that not only had Ireland, but England and Scotland also, to be dealt with; but he might have made out a much stronger case by adding that the affairs of a vast Empire had to be dealt with. The right hon. Gentleman would then have made out the case of the Irish Representatives, which was, that the House could not give due attention to Irish affairs. No doubt it would be unreasonable in them to demand so much time, if they were there by their own wish; but their case was, that there was too much Business for that House to do, that it could not possibly attend to so much at once, and that the only proper plan was to give to each part of the Empire large powers of dealing with its own affairs. The English Household Suffrage Bill passed in 1867. They had waited for an Irish Household Suffrage Bill for 13 years, and for all he could tell they might have to wait for it 13 years more. It was all that time before it was decided to give to Ireland the same privileges as England possessed; while, at the same time, it was more necessary for Ireland, and the only chance Ireland had of getting the Bill passed in the present Session depended on whether the Government were able to wedge it in among other Business. The right hon. Gentleman in the course of his address had quoted from speeches made by Sir Robert Peel; but he seemed to have a shrewd suspicion that the arguments of the Conservative Minister made against his case, and he delicately suggested that he was proving too much. The right hon. Gentleman was, doubtlessly, proving too much. It took Sir Robert Peel 22 months to decide upon applying a coercive measure to Ireland; but a Liberal Minister in these more enlightened days made up his mind in two months to apply coercion. That proved that while the cause of progress and liberty had been advancing in England, it had been sadly deteriorating in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman also alluded to the case of Earl Grey, who, though convinced that an enormous amount of crime was committed in 1831 and 1832, did not seek to interfere with the liberty of the Irish people until 1833. The present Government, however, determined upon a course within two months which it required two years in the case of Earl Grey to decide upon adopting. The right hon. Gentleman, moreover, had carefully omitted to state what was the result of that legislation. From a pamphlet which he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) held in his hand, it appeared that in the year 1833 the number of offences against the person were 4,180; while in the year following, after coercive measures measures were taken, the number of the same class of offences rose to 5,547. The offences against property in 1833 were 2,177. In 1834 they were 2,752. The political offences in 1833 were 1,125. In 1834 they were 1,157. The miscellaneous crimes in 1833 numbered 3,962, and in 1834, 4,797; so that the effect of coercive measures was, that they got an increase of crime in 1834 of 24·5 per cent, seeing that in 1833, without coercion, they had 11,440 offences, and in 1834 they had, with coercion, 14,253. Now, he thought the right hon. Gentleman showed a large amount of rashness in appealing to 1833; for he had to confess that the Prime Minister of that day took two years to make up his mind to do that which the right hon. Gentleman had taken two months, and that the effect of coercion was to largely increase, rather than to diminish, the number of offences which were committed against both person and property, and also against the laws which had reference to what were called political offences. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition protested against "Boycotting." Why, did not the Conservatives of Rochdale some years ago "Boycott" a shopkeeper there, and drive him out of the town? In fact, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was not certain that the Liberals had not done the same. This was a matter in which the Irish had been initiated by the English masters of the art, the trades unions. Did not the English trades unionists "Boycott" all who disobeyed the societies' views? He contended that everyone had a right to a choice as to the person with whom he would or would not deal. What was the charge against the Irish people? They had in times past been disunited, they had been factious; but the Land League had got them shoulder to shoulder, and thereby had taught the people lessons of union, lessons of self-reliance, and lessons of independence, which would go far beyond the present struggle, and would have great effects upon the future of the country. The Leader of the Opposition said the Land League exercised tyranny over the Irish people. They could not exercise such tyranny when the Irish people showed they were willing agents and willing servants of the Land League, knowing that its members and leaders were men imbued with love of their country, and desired to add to its peace and prosperity. The Government could only put down the tyranny of the Land League by putting down the people. If the Government introduced coercive legislation twice as stringent as that proposed, it would fail to put down the Land League. They might pour into Ireland as many troops and sham policemen, who were really soldiers, as they choose; they might pass through Parliament any hasty measure for coercive purposes. The Land League was too strong for them. Nothing that they or any other Government could do would ever bring back the Irish tenants to the condition of absolute serfdom from which the Irish Land League had for ever released them. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Russell), who, no doubt, had the interests of Ireland at heart, warned the Government—as the Leader of the Opposition had—that no tinkering with the Land Question would settle it. That was true. It was a question which lay deep in the hearts and interests and conditions of the Irish people; and if they were going to deal with it effectually, the disease being radical, so also must the remedy be. With regard to the Land Act of 1870, although much had been said in its favour, he ventured to tell the right hon. Gentleman that those who knew most about it held that in many respects it had been a curse and not a boon to the Irish people. ["Oh, oh!"] He challenged contradiction whether, in the North of Ireland, it had not led to deterioration in place of improvement? In many cases, landlords who had previously been willing to behave kindly to their tenants, as soon as they found themselves face to face with legislation, tried to evade it. The landlords of Ulster, since the passing of the Act, had been more exorbitant, more tyrannical, and more encroaching on the rights of the tenants of Ulster. The object of the right hon. Gentleman was to make eviction a luxury, and an expensive luxury, and thus to decrease it. But, instead of that, eviction had largely increased. That day an hon. Member had received a telegram from Mr. Michael Davitt, asking what the legislation was proposed by the Government. The hon. Member felt justified, he said, in replying to that telegram — a fine, big Coercion Bill, and an extremely small and tinkering Land Measure. That was the way the Leader of a Liberal Ministry, a Ministry friendly to Ireland, proposed to deal with one of the most gigantic crises that had ever occurred in Ireland or any other country. Only 13 Irish Members voted against the second reading of the Land Bill of 1870; but everything they prophesied with regard to that measure had been realized. The late Sir John Gray said that the Bill would tend to the consolidation of farms, that it would not stop evictions, and that it would not finally settle the Land Question; and every foreboding as to the Bill which was pronounced by the Irish minority then had been realized by the events which had since taken place. It was a measure to which, in his (Mr. T. P. O'Connor's) opinion, the present Prime Minister ought to look back with a sigh, and think that it was simply a gigantic, and, at the same time, tinkering attempt to settle a question which fell far short of meeting the just demands of the people. And now, in 1881, they were about to repeat the things that were denounced by the Irish minority of 1870. The Bill of 1881 would not finally settle this vexed question; and unless the Irish Members could settle the question outright now their successors would be coming here in 1891, and begging the House to give the Irish people some settlement of this life and death question. In the last 11 years homes had been desolated, hearts had been broken, fathers and mothers had been separated from their children; and did the House think that the Irish people were going to wait for 10 years more in order that this Parliament might make up its mind? The Irish Members had done their best to make the question ripe for settlement; and he had no doubt that if they had the settlement of the question in their own hands they would be able in three months to pass a measure which would set the Land Question at rest. Instead of that, the right hon. Gentleman was about merely to tinker the Land Act of 1870. If the Government did not now completely and finally settle the question the responsibility would rest upon them, and upon them alone. Many hon. Gentlemen were enamoured of the three F's, and he understood the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Shaw) was of the number; but in the measure of the Government no provision was made for fixity of tenure, and all the schools of thinkers in Ireland were of opinion that fixity of tenure should, once for all, be granted to the Irish tenant. The right hon. Gentleman might make exorbitancy of rent one of the grounds which would give the tenant a right to compensation for eviction; but it would be impossible to constitute any Land Court for the decision of these questions which would command the confidence of the people of Ireland. That day must, he thought, be one of deep disappointment to the supporters of the Government. The Prime Minister might, if he liked, have settled this question; and he might, if he liked, have resisted the clamour of the territorial class on both sides of the House for measures of coercion. He need not have yielded to the clamour of manufactured outrages. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) denied that the outrages were so numerous as was alleged—in fact, he ventured to assert that there was not one well-authenticated case of mutilation of men or women. The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), who was the proprietor of a very influential and popular journal in Ireland, the other day pledged his credit, speaking in Dublin, that, although he had a large staff of reporters at his command, not one of them had been able to trace a single case of human mutilation which had been reported. It was reported that women had been carded, and that men's ears had been cut off; but no foundation could be found for the reports. With regard to mutilation of animals, he should show at the proper time that the reports on this subject had been greatly exaggerated; and he should also venture to show that such cases as had occurred could easily be paralleled in England. And now he would refer to a statement which the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) had ventured to make. He was not sure whether it was made to his Ulster friends in the Ulster Hall, at which meeting there were such cries as "Shoot Parnell;" "Shoot priests," &c. He did not know whether it was there the right hon. and learned Gentleman slandered away the character of his countrymen, or whether he had come to the country of the enemy to denounce and blacken the character of his countrymen. The right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of the tragic and terrible occurrences in connection with the murder of Lord Mountmorres. Another right hon. and learned Gentleman, who also came to the platform of the enemy to denounce and blacken the character of his country—he meant the right hon. and learned Gentleman's Colleague in the representation of the so-called National University (Mr. Plunket)—actually made this charge—that the leaders of the Land League, either at the central office or the local branches, deliberately planned and deliberately carried out the murder of that unfortunate Nobleman, in order to lend prestige to the movement. He

(Mr. T. P. O'Connor) appealed to the House, and asked them was there ever such an atrocious charge made against the character of public men, or against the character of a whole people, than that they actually conspired and planned together a brutal murder, in order to lend prestige to the movement? The right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of a woman having refused admission into her house of the corpse of the unfortunate Nobleman; and the comment of the right hon. and learned Gentleman was that the conduct of that poor woman showed that the Land League had unsexed even the women of Ireland. The right hon. and learned Gentleman ought to know the superstitions of the Irish peasantry as well as he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did, and ought to know that it was a superstition planted in their breasts under the misrule which had promoted the ignorance of the people—he ought to know that there was a superstition among the peasants that if you allowed under your roof a person who had met an untimely death, that within twelve months some of your own household would perish themselves. It showed the recklessness of those who would run away with the character of the Irish people in a charge of this gross and scandalous character brought against the women of Ireland. He thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman, with the gallantry which he possessed in common with all his people, should have investigated the facts before he had made such a reckless accusation, when he would have found that the Land League was perfectly innocent of having intimidated the woman in question. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did not excuse the superstition. He regretted and abhorred such a senseless superstition as much as anybody; but he asked right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench what had they been doing during the seven centuries they had held the rule of that country to eradicate the feelings which prompted such a superstition? Turning to the position of the present Government in reference to Ireland, he maintained that if the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, who he was glad to see now in his place, did not bring in a complete and satisfactory and final measure on this question the responsibility, as he had said before, rested upon him and upon his Ministry alone. There were plenty of Whig Members in that House, he had no doubt, who would be quite willing to play fantastic tricks with a large, permanent measure on the Irish Land Question, as they had done with the Disturbance Bill; but the right hon. Gentleman had behind him the English people on this question, who were now convinced that the wrong and the folly and the crime of the land system in Ireland had gone on long enough, and wished to be rid of the question once and for all. The right hon. Gentleman had thrown passion, energy, and enthusiasm into other questions; and he had only to show the same sympathy, the same energy, and the same enthusiasm for the peasant of Connaught that he had shown to the peasant of Bulgaria, to settle the question. And, finally, he told the right hon. Gentleman, and he told all his Colleagues, Members of the Liberal Ministry, that in this great question, oppression and injustice on the one side, and the liberty and rights of the people on the other, were defined by as distinct and plain and visible a line as ever they were in the war between the States of America, or in the great controversy in the East, for the glorious result of which the right hon. Gentleman was so largely responsible.

Mr. A. MOORE said, he had read with great anxiety that portion of the Queen's Speech which referred to remedial measures for Ireland in a weak and vague manner, while, side by side with it, that portion of it which referred to coercion assumed a most prominent position. It would have been wise, he thought, if the Government had reversed that order. Never had there been presented to a Government a more favourable opportunity for effecting the pacification of Ireland. The inflammatory language that had been used at certain meetings in Ireland by no means represented the real feeling of the bulk of the Irish people, who would be completely satisfied by a moderate measure, which would secure to them their rights. The condition of Ireland was, undoubtedly, very serious; still, there was no need for despair, and he believed that, by measures just, generous, and decisive, and by wise legislation, they might end the tumult. He did not for one instant believe that the bulk of the people wished to repudiate the payment of their just debts; and he thought they had been induced to join this agitation only as the last means, short of civil war and bloodshed, of bringing about a satisfactory settlement of this long-pending question. The people sought a settlement based simply on morality and justice, and the House should not hesitate to grant such a request as that. Coercion was proposed; but there was a much greater need for reform. He might be allowed to speak upon this question impartially, dependent as he was, perhaps as much as any man in the House, upon the produce of Irish land. He implored them to reform before it was too late. He was not there to defend hot words. He was not there to defend dark deeds of assassination and murder. Where, indeed, these things occurred, he thought, he was sure, that in many cases they were, if not manufactured, grossly exaggerated. Would coercion be successful? How could they coerce a whole people? They could not compel the people to bid at a sheriff's sale, nor to take land from which a tenant had been evicted; neither could they force a whole country to pay rent. In past times, when it was attempted to compel the people to pay tithes by sending soldiers to enforce the payment, the military expedition cost £15,000, while the sum collected only amounted to £12,000. He spoke not merely in the interest of the tenant farmers, but in the interest of the tradesmen and shopkeepers; and he was perfectly certain that he, to a considerable extent, represented the minds of many intelligent landlords. What was really important was, that they should not dally and tinker with this question, but that they should give them a just and speedy settlement. He did not fear that settlement, whatever form it took. He feared no just or fair settlement. What he did fear was a limp and faltering policy—a policy of hesitation on the part of the Government.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) said, that, having been pointedly alluded to by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), he felt bound to rise at that early stage of the debate. The hon. Gentleman had asked why the Government had not interfered with some meetings, and had interfered with others. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had already given an answer to that, in which he stated that the Government in Ireland believed that public meetings to discuss public questions might be perfectly lawful under certain circumstances; and that, under certain conditions, they would be so unlawful that it would be the duty of the Government to interfere. He (the Solicitor General for Ireland) could state that in no single instance in Ireland had any public meeting been prohibited in which information had not been laid before the Government, and almost invariably on oath, showing very strong and reasonable grounds of danger of violence, and possibly to life. The only exception to that was the meeting at Clondalkin, near Dublin, the placard convening which was sedulously silent as to the object of the meeting. A circular, however, was issued accompanied by a series of resolutions to be moved at that meeting, and one of them was to protest against the trial pending in the Queen's Bench at Dublin, and calling upon the people in numbers to assemble to do that, the real object being to overawe the jury, and prevent a fair and impartial trial of the cause, and interfere with the administration of justice. He apprehended that no Government would deserve the name of Government that would allow the law to be set at defiance in that way. The proposed meeting at Drogheda, again, was prohibited by his Excellency when he was assured, not merely on information, but from personal inquiry, that if that meeting were held the reasonable consequence would be danger of violence to person or life; and he apprehended that no Government would deserve the name of a Government if, under such circumstances, it allowed the meeting to be held. Other meetings had been called for purposes, not necessarily unlawful, and, it not being believed that they would be turned into illegal assemblages which should be prevented, there had been no reason for interfering with them. The hon. Gentleman had asked, when a meeting had been prohibited by a resident magistrate for one day by the authority of the Government, was the magistrate entitled to prohibit another meeting to be held on another and different day? He (the Solicitor General for Ireland) apprehended, if there was no connection whatever between those meetings, the resident magistrate would not take upon himself to prohibit the second meeting. But he had known this to take place—that a meeting which was illegal, and had been prohibited by the Government on proper evidence, was sought to be held, by an ingenious evasion of the prohibition, by holding the meeting for the same identical purpose in the same identical—or a neighbouring—locality, but on a different day. In such a case the resident magistrate, he believed, was perfectly justified in prohibiting the second meeting.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the hon. and learned Gentleman had mistaken his question. The question he had put was, whether a resident magistrate had a right to call upon a meeting to disperse without producing a written or other authority but his own *ipse dixit?*

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson), in reply, said, he apprehended that every magistrate was a conservator of the peace, and, as such, was charged with the lives and security of those under his supervision, and with the care of the property in his district. Of course, in such a case as that put by the hon. Member the magistrate would act upon his own responsibility. At the same time, he did not mean to contend that a man, because he happened to be a resident magistrate, had a right to act on his own *ipse dixit*, or to strain the law. There were one or two observations which he would have to make with great regret. The Amendment proposed—[*Cries of* "No, no!" "No Amendment!"] Well, he was out of the House for some minutes, and was under the impression an Amendment was moved; but the general scope and tone of the speech he had just heard endeavoured to create the impression that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland was such that no special legislation was required. Now, speaking from some knowledge of facts, and from the experience he had during the last few months, he must take issue with the hon. Member on that subject. Peace, no doubt, there was, in a sense; but it was that peace in the body politic which might be compared to the peace which mortification produced in the body corporal. The peace which existed was largely due to intimidation. He disliked to appeal to personal experiences; but he could not forbear stating that when in the South of Ireland, prosecuting in an important case, it was found impossible to submit the case to the Court, or to expect a jury to impartially consider the issues; those facts were deposed to on oath, and on those affidavits the Judge acted. How, in such a state of things, could it be contended that peace and tranquillity prevailed in Ireland? He knew, from official experience, that there were assemblies of persons in Ireland purporting to be connected—he would not say they were—with the central association of the Land League, which purported to usurp the Prerogative of the Crown, and to pronounce sentence, and enforce that sentence by means within their reach. He did not wish to go further, in anticipation of a debate that must arise hereafter; but, knowing these facts, he would ask the House to come to the conclusion that he had stated sufficient *primâ facie* ground for saying that peace and tranquillity in Ireland was not the peace and tranquillity that showed a healthy vitality among a free people.

Dr. COMMINS said, he had listened with interest to much that had been said, but largely mingled with disappointment. He had been disappointed exceedingly when he found that in the Queen's Speech precedence was given to coercion over remedial legislation. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister to quote a single instance of a coercive measure producing the effect anticipated by its promoters in the whole history of coercion since the Union, and there had been in 57 years out of the 80 Arms Acts, suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and other Acts various in title and powers. He would give the same challenge to the Party opposite the Government, who were more in favour of coercion, and who now attacked the Government for not proposing coercion enough. Could they give one single instance supported by facts, and not general declamation, where coercion was effectual in producing the object sought for? It was a saddening reflection for Irish Members to find no fulfilment of the grand promises held out as to the willingness of that great House to entertain Irish questions with spirit and earnestness. Instead of that, they found threats of coercion of a stringent kind, with the lame and impotent conclusion of a promise to redress grievances. Fortified by past experience, he would say that not only would this coercive measure not diminish what were called outrages, but instead of these sham outrages, instead of threatening letters—which, in most instances, were written by those receiving them or their abettors—instead of sham attempts at shooting at ladies and gentlemen; instead of all these manufactured outrages to satisfy the pabulum of readers of a certain class; instead of these, the attempt at tyrannically repressing the liberties of the people would probably produce real and serious outrages, instead of shams. The people would find that when they agitated for redress of grievances they got coercion; instead of bread, they got a stone; instead of fish, they got a serpent. In Connemara, as in Bulgaria, human feelings of resentment were much the same, and on the mind of the ignorant peasant the effect would be such as to create those outrages which now did not really exist. It was a commonplace of politics, more especially among those professing Liberal opinions, that the law which did not embody the wishes and will of the people was unsound and tyrannical, and that resistance to such a law was necessary in the ordinary course of events. The Representatives of Ireland were crying out for reform; and it was an unfortunate fact that reformers, whether on the platform, in the Press, or in the House, before having gained their ends, were held up by monopolists and selfish politicians as revolutionists who wished to overturn all authority. Those who offered such resistance in the Turkish Provinces were held up as patriots and reformers, and as the salt of their country; yet here the House was told it was the first duty in Ireland of Her Majesty's Government to enforce a law against which the moral sense of the people revolted, and under the administration of which they had been so ground down, that they were worse fed, worse clothed, and worse housed than any other people in any part of Christendom, and that no other remedy should be tried. Legitimate complaint must be met with coercion; and when the people were crushed into abject submission then it was said that superior wisdom and civilization would probably consider whether the law should be amended or not. Could it be maintained that agitation in a way recognized and practised, and which had been successful in England, could not be tolerated in Ireland, and that the condition of existence in Ireland was absolute submission? In reference to Irish misdeeds and outrages the House had been treated to many generalities during the debate. They had been told that "law and order" did not exist in Ireland. The fact was, there had been a great deal too much "law" in Ireland, such as it was, in the sense of unnecessary force and restrictions; and they would be better without the order maintained by proclamations and the presence of 30,000 soldiers in red and 12,000 in blue uniforms. If the population of the Sister Isle had a little less of the kind of law they had they would do a great deal better. As to "order," when it meant coercion, and military force, and keeping up inequalities between England and Ireland, there was plenty of that kind of "order." If the law and order were good, support them; but if bad, why should they have popular support? Another matter he commended to the attention of those who went in for coercion, and that was, that if a comparison were made of outrages in the United Kingdom it would be found that Ireland had less than other portions. He had the figures to support that. Take any crime dealt with by prosecution and punished by gaol, crimes as he understood them, not merely wild assertion of outrages, and it would be found that in England they far outnumbered those in Ireland. In the face of those hard facts they were told that these things could not be found out in Ireland. But did Parliament think that a Coercion Act would produce evidence? How was this evidence proposed to be got? It was admitted that no Act of Parliament could compel a person to deal with or speak to another if he did not choose to do so. Again, the House had not been treated to any figures that would show there was a larger amount of actual crime in Ireland than at any former period. That was not what he should have expected from a Liberal Government, or from the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. The Government ought to have shown that crime did actually exist; but it had not done so, He hoped the House would be treated to substantial figures to show the real nature and extent of the outrages in Ireland, for the outrages were very seldom properly particularized, and when particularized were not proved. The most unfounded and wildest reports appeared in the London newspapers; and when the time came for the contradiction to be made arrived, the fallaciousness of the stories were not so extensively published as were the false rumours when set afoot. Those allegations should be proved, especially when the liberties of the people of Ireland were at stake; but no proof was forthcoming. With reference to the Land Laws, what was the nature of the proposition of the Government? He should have expected something higher than what had been proposed by the Government. That the Act of 1870 had done some good he admitted; but, on the other hand, it had produced an exorbitant increase in rents in the North, as well as the other parts of Ireland. It had led to evictions to a large extent, and to the consolidation of farms, so as to enable the landlords to compel their tenants to contract themselves out of the Act. He should like to know whether those who proposed to amend the Irish land system expected to be able to do so by simply tinkering up the Act of 1870? Indeed, he should have expected that the present Government would have been able to rise above the low level from which they now proposed to deal with this question. The question here was the *status* of the people, and the relations between the landowners and the occupiers of the land would have to be considered. Yet the Government were dealing with it as if the whole knot could be cut by making a simple alteration. Here they had practically a whole people aggrieved, because in Ireland the cultivator of the soil in scarcely any instance was a free agent. He was no more a free contractor than the black slave in Virginia before the Civil War. The question would never be solved by applying the laws of free contract to the relations of the Irish landlords with their tenants. A higher principle must be here adopted, and a wider view taken. Under these circumstances, he felt very much disappointed with Her Majesty's Speech, and he would ask the House to consider whether it must not take broader views, instead of those narrow ones which prevented it from remedying, once for all, a system which had not only made Ireland miserable, but had even threatened the integrity of this great Empire. He held that any mere tinkering with the Land Act of 1870 would never solve the difficulty with which they had to deal.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that what had struck him particularly in Her Majesty's Speech and in the debate of that evening was the fact that the case which they understood was to be made against Ireland on the head of the Irish outrages had utterly broken down. For weeks and months past the British Press had had not one agony column, but several agony columns, containing lists of outrages, some of them, perhaps, real, but most of them imaginary. This had been kept up day after day for the purpose of pervading the minds of the people of England with the idea that the state of Ireland was one of anarchy and bloodshed. He, however, had long been aware of the explanation of this cropping up of outrages in the British Press, and of the great prominence which they had received. He found that in England there had been from time to time not merely many outrages and crimes of an ordinary and extraordinary character, but that sometimes there had been great outbursts of crime; but on no one of these occasions had any British statesman ever come to the House of Commons, and founded upon those crimes—numerous as they were—a claim to have the Habeas Corpus suspended in England. He would tell the House how the British Press set itself to find excuses for this great outburst of crime. Some years ago all the London papers were dealing with an exceptional condition of crime in England; and *The Times*, commenting on that state of things, wrote—

> "It is a strange and by no means agreeable reflection that the principal product of the present day should be murders. That such, however, is the fact must be plain enough from the aspect of our columns during the last few days. Murders in some shape or other, assumed or established, have been every day the chief subjects of reports, discussion, or inquiry. The Stepney, the Road, the Wakefield, the Durham, and the Aldershot murders have all been detailed and discussed in terrible succession; and no sooner is one report concluded than another is commenced."

Yet, although this was written in *The Times*, no Minister came to the House and piled up the agony, and asked that the ordinary liberties of the British subject should be suspended. There was then, and there was now, one law for England and another for Ireland. Another London paper, *The Globe*, of the same date, accounted for the great prominence given to crime in England at certain periods. It explained that the reason why they were all reading so much about murders at that particular time was, not because more murders were committed then, but because in that dead season, when Parliament was not sitting, the papers could afford to give a larger amount of space to the chronicles of crime, and that there were on the average as many murders committed when Parliament was sitting as during the Recess, but that during the Recess they heard more of murders because they heard nothing of Parliament. Perhaps that explanation went far to account for the great prominence given in the dead season just past to the chronicles of Irish crime, real and imaginary. They heard much about the outrages perpetrated on dumb animals in Ireland; but no cry was raised about the outrages perpetrated on women and children in this so-called peaceable and civilized country. In the speeches which had been delivered on both sides of the House that night, there was a complete shirking of that great outcry which had been raised in regard to the criminal condition of Ireland, and for this reason—hon. Gentlemen knew that it would never suit them with a Coercion Bill on the stocks to enter upon a comparison of the crime in Ireland now with that which prevailed at former periods when Coercion Acts were in full swing. He could, however, well understand that there was no desire for any comparison to be made between the crime of England and that of Ireland. They were told from the Ministerial Benches that there were not so many murders in Ireland of late; but there were many people placed under the protection of the police. It was the game of a certain party in Ireland to pretend that they were in need of such protection, and they addressed their applications to the only too willing ears of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. It was not an unpleasant thing for gentlemen to be posing before the country as martyrs, and to send letters to the London *Times* and other newspapers describing the hardships of their condition. Furthermore, it was argued that the country was subjugated, and that that was why order reigned in Mayo. It was his firm opinion that if the measures about to be adopted were put into force they would very soon see not order, but disorder, in Mayo and elsewhere. The Leader of the Opposition might have received letters from landlords and others in Ireland describing the terrible state of the country; but he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) was in possession of letters from tenants far more numerous than the lamentations which had been sent to the right hon. Gentleman. Allusion had been made to the murder of Lord Mountmorres, and accusations based on that crime had been made against the character of the Irish people by Gentlemen on both sides of the House, one of whom took it upon himself to describe the people of that country as being in a very degraded condition owing to the manner in which some of them had acted after that tragic occurrence. Exception had also been taken to the refusal of the people to take in the corpse of Lord Mountmorres. That there was that refusal there was no doubt; but then the fact was owing to some superstition common amongst the people. He was sorry there should be superstition amongst his countrymen; but then he could point to many superstitions which were entertained by people in Dorsetshire and Somersetshire, which were as debasing and as ridiculous as any existing in Ireland. It had been denied that some young men had walked through and actually dabbled in the blood of Lord Mountmorres. He believed it to be true, for he had a letter from a witness of the scene, and he should read an extract to the House. The writer said—

> "I arrived on the scene of Lord Mountmorres' murder on the day after the crime. The actual spot on the roadside was marked by a large mass of congealed blood. While I was making my sketch (the writer was an artist for a London publication) a party of men approached, whom I afterwards found to be members of a band in the temporary employment of Lord Ardilaun, who was entertaining company. The party included some members of the Guards' band on leave, and one, the leader I think, was a foreigner. They all watched me working for some time, and, growing weary of doing so, they took to rooting up the blood with their sticks and canes. One of them took out a penknife and cut a square piece of the blood, and, calling out to a companion, said—'Bill, 'ave a bit. I shall take a bit home to the old woman just to show I have been to Hireland,' while another took up a bloody stone from the road. They all walked on laughing. This was witnessed by the representative

of an English news agency and by a gentleman from Ballinrobe. When any of the natives chanced to pass they went on the opposite side of the road, and did not even look at it."

Mr. W. C. Mills was the name of the gentleman who was a witness to that scene; and he told him (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) that the men who were meddling and fiddling in that way with the blood on the road were not Irishmen, but Englishmen. He told him also that whenever the country people passed by the blood-stained spot where Lord Leitrim was murdered they eyed it furtively and went to the other side of the road. So much for the allegation that they were Irishmen who acted in this disgraceful manner at the scene of the murder of Lord Mountmorres. As to the refusal of the poor peasant woman in Connaught to admit the dead body of that Nobleman, he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) thought he could instance much worse cases which had occurred in England. Some time ago a poor woman in the town of Sheffield was taken in the pangs of labour. She went from door to door, but was refused admission. A mob collected about her, not to pity her, but to feel amused at her condition. A policeman came up, and by great difficulty kept the crowd clear, and finally the poor woman was delivered of a dead child in the streets of Sheffield. He considered that Sheffield case a much grosser case of inhumanity and cruelty than the alleged refusal of the poor peasant woman in Mayo to let into her house the dead body of Lord Mountmorres. The House had that evening an admission from the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that there were such things as exorbitant rents. The words were very easily uttered; but how much suffering and misery did they not cover? Exorbitant rents ground the people to the earth, and sent them exiles from their native country. An eminent member of the Legal Profession in Ireland, describing the condition of the Irish tenants, said that their landlords extracted almost all the produce of the land. The tenants lived only on turf and potatoes, and when those failed they became paupers, and their children became beggars and prostitutes. The gentleman he referred to was Mr. Serjeant Heron, who was now prosecuting the traversers in Dublin. It would appear from a list of rents and valuations affecting tenants in Galway that the operation of the system which permitted them to be so trampled upon had become absolutely intolerable in Ireland. The Land League had been charged there to-night with being the real governors of Ireland. What a confession it was from England after its rule of Ireland for five centuries that a few men who had nothing at their disposal but the public sense of injustice and oppression had become practically the rulers of Ireland. All that they had resolved to do was to go as far as they could by peaceable means to prevent such a state of things. They did not intend to employ force. They had not swords, and did not possess bullets for the furtherance of their cause. They simply relied on the hearts of the people, on a sense of justice, and on no other force than that of reason. The old rude and worthless remedy of coercion was again about to be tried, and all he could say in conclusion was that whilst such a state of things lasted Ireland would fail to improve. He would simply warn the Government that at the expiration of that coercive legislation Ireland would be in a worse state than she was in to-day.

Colonel COLTHURST said, that the reference to the Land Question in the Queen's Speech he heard with a feeling of disappointment, which, however, had been somewhat diminished by the speech of the Prime Minister. If any redress was proposed for admitted grievances, he was sure that many of the people of Ireland would be ready to give up the agitation now in existence, especially if they could see a hope that the Land Question would be satisfactorily settled. He spoke from personal knowledge. There were those who had great influence in Ireland over the people; and though they had not joined it, many of them, in fact most of them, had refrained from opposing openly the present agitation. They had never approved its worst features, and only joined it as a means of obtaining redress for admitted grievances. He referred to the clergy of Ireland. He believed the great majority of them had never lost faith in the will and also the power of the right hon. Gentleman to settle the Land Question; and they were only waiting for the enactment of a measure giving the only remedy asked for, and which, although decried, was well described as fixity of tenure, fair rents, and free sale. They were only waiting for that to call upon the people to abandon the agitation, and ask them if they would throw away for the shadow what was the substance? But what announcement was there in the Queen's Speech? He must say he had been disappointed. There was absolutely nothing in the Queen's Speech but a promise to amend the Land Act of 1870. He looked upon that as a good and noble measure, and one of inestimable benefit to the tenants of Ireland. The blots and defects in the Bill the Prime Minister had promised to remove, and, no doubt, that in itself would be an enormous improvement, if nothing else was done; but that would not go to the root of the question. That would not close the Land Question, and it never could be closed unless the power of eviction was taken away, and it was enacted that so long as a man paid a fair rent he should not be disturbed in his holding. There was nothing in the Speech which would preclude such a settlement; and he implored the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister not to consider that his announcement of what was going to be done would settle the question.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON thought the hour had arrived when a change should take place in the tenour of the discussion. They had never met Parliament under more sad and serious circumstances, and there was very little to re-assure them in Her Majesty's Speech. It was bad enough to have 30,000 troops employed in keeping down our fellow-subjects in the Sister Isle; but much worse was it to see that all hope of reform for England, Scotland, and Wales was likely to be abandoned, and that the time of Parliament was likely to be devoted to that country entirely. It was something, too, to think of the weary nights and days which Parliament was destined to spend over Ireland before the end of the Session. But there was another pressing question besides Ireland, there were other people in the world who had wrongs and sufferings. There were our fellow-subjects in South Africa who were being ruthlessly shot down at the present moment. He was considerably astonished at the tone of the right hon. Gentleman in referring to that subject, which he rather seemed to wish should stand over. Well, if the right hon. Gentleman did not wish to speak on it, why did not his hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) give them his views upon it? It would be very satisfactory, and he (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) would await the statement with pleasure and anxiety, for he saw by the newspapers that the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department had exactly the same views on the Transvaal Question which he stated two years ago. [*Laughter.*] Well, if the hon. Member for Liskeard had those views, of course the Government had them also. He was positively horrified at what was going on. They were sending out a small army to Africa. What to do? To crush an independent Republic, which they had no more right to do than they had to put down the French Republic. ["No, no!"] The only difference was the one was weak, the other strong. Then there was the Basuto War, in which our troops were shooting down and destroying the houses and homes of the most loyal, the most civilized, and, as far as it went, the most Christianized of the tribes of South Africa. That was most unjustifiable. It was very well for the Prime Minister to say the Colonists were responsible. An hon. Friend had suggested to him that there was one word in the sentence of Her Majesty's Speech referring to this subject which should be altered. The Speech said—

> "I regret that the War in Basutoland still continues, notwithstanding the efforts of the Cape Government."

The word "notwithstanding" should be left out, and the words "in consequence of" should be inserted. While the Colonists were fighting with their troops and raising their levies, we had 5,000 soldiers in that country, and these soldiers were aiding in putting down the Basutos. It was not possible for us, therefore, to say that we were not responsible. If it was a just war, we were bound to aid the Colonists; if an unjust war, we ought to try to put a stop to it, and not to pass it over in that way and say the Colonists were responsible. If we allowed injustice to be done to these poor people in South Africa, was it likely that the constituents of the Irish Members would believe that we should do justice to them? If these poor South Africans had Representatives in that House, the House would be discussing their rights and wrongs at as great a length as it was now discussing the rights and wrongs of Ireland. But of one thing he was sure, whether they discussed them or not, the people of this country would discuss them. They were already looking into this question, and a great feeling was rising in the country on the matter. Who placed the right hon. Gentleman in power nine months ago? Why, the people of this country. It was a popular triumph if ever there was one. Why did they place the right hon. Gentleman in power? Because they had read his eloquent denunciations of the Afghan and Zulu Wars, and speeches in which he left it to be understood, if he did not distinctly state, that he did not look with approbation on the proceedings in the Transvaal. He (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) believed that that memorable triumph of the right hon. Gentleman was due more than anything else to the statements he made in some of his eloquent speeches in Scotland, that he was in favour of equal rights for all nations. But the conduct carried out in South Africa was utterly opposed to the policy advocated in Scotland by the right hon. Gentleman. If Russia were to do what we were doing now in South Africa his Friends on the opposite side would denounce it; and if Turkey were to do it the right hon. Gentleman would go through the length and breadth of England denouncing it. He remembered one of the right hon. Gentleman's speeches in which, speaking of what Lord Salisbury had said about asserting our rights, the right hon. Gentleman said that these were sentiments only worthy of a political bandit. He (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) would like to know where was the political bandit now? There were hundreds and thousands of people who to-morrow would read with regret that nothing was to be done to put a stop to the British atrocities which were now going on. He had seen lately, even in Radical papers, that the quarrel was atrocious, and that we had no business to make this war; but they went on to say—"Oh! our arms have met with a reverse, and we must go on until we wipe that out." That was a sentiment worthy, not of a civilized people, but of the greatest heathens; and unless the Government did something to put a stop to what he had described the result would be most disgraceful to the honour of England, and, he feared, would leave a stain never to be effaced upon the reputation of those statesmen who, having the power, had not put an end to this war.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, his hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) had spoken of the annexation of the Transvaal in terms which showed that he was hardly acquainted with the circumstances of the case. The first speech which he (Mr. R. N. Fowler) himself made in the House 12 years ago was against the system of slavery carried on by the people of the Transvaal. They were in the habit of sending parties among the tribes around, murdering the men and women, and carrying the children into slavery. Mr. Monsell, now a Member of the other House of Parliament, who then represented the Colonial Office in that House, admitted, on that occasion, that every word he uttered was true. A Republic which committed such atrocities was not entitled to sympathy in that House or out of it. The result was that the Transvaal Republic, had it been suffered longer to exist, would have been attacked by the Native Tribes, and the peace of South Africa would have been seriously endangered. It was in such circumstances as he had described that the Transvaal was annexed by Lord Carnarvon, who, in doing so, had carried out a policy of humanity. He could not conceive a greater misfortune to humanity than the restoration of the Transvaal Republic. The history of that Republic was a history of rapacity, cruelty, and murder. But he was glad to be able to agree with his hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle in his remarks on the Basuto War. On the first evening last Session open to a private Member he had called attention to the subject, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite would recollect, because he took the opportunity of his (Mr. Fowler's) Motion to inform the House that it was not the intention of the Government to recall Sir Bartle Frere. [Mr. GLADSTONE: Not at that moment.] He had listened with surprise to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman in the early part of the evening that the Government were in no respect responsible for the present war. The Government kept Sir

Bartle Frere in office two months after his Motion. Though the disarming policy of Sir Bartle Frere was originally permitted by his right hon. Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire, it was carried out with the sanction of Her Majesty's present Ministers; and, therefore, it could not be said that the Government were not responsible for the war now being waged in Basutoland. He hoped that Sir Hercules Robinson, who had just sailed for the Cape, would be able to carry out a policy which would result in the restoration of peace in Basutoland.

MR. LABOUCHERE remarked, that in November, 1879, the present Prime Minister had said of the late Government that they had annexed "a territory inhabited by a free Republican, Christian community," although 6,500 men protested against the act. Those were the circumstances in which we had transformed a Republic into a Monarchy. He believed he expressed the feeling of many hon. Members on that side of the House when he said that, in supporting the clause in the Address which related to the Transvaal, they did so without prejudice, and declined to recognize that Her Majesty's Government had any legal authority in the Transvaal. For himself, he did not regard the inhabitants of that territory as rebels, but as independent Republicans, who had never given their assent to the annexation; but regarded it as one of the grossest frauds ever committed in a country similarly constituted to the Transvaal. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would not provoke a collision in the Transvaal till the subject had been discussed, but would send Commissioners to look into the question and give due weight to the wishes of the Boers, as to whether they wished to remain Republicans or become subjects of Her Majesty. If they wished to remain Republicans, it would be but an honourable act to withdraw our authority from that country. ["No, no!"] At any rate, they ought not to be coerced for a just, an honest, and an honourable act.

MR. FINIGAN said, he had anticipated that, with a Liberal Government in Office, they should have within that House the same enunciation of principle as they had had out of it. He thought that as a Liberal policy was based on the principle that force was no remedy, that the Irish Members would not have been compelled to listen to such illiberal principles as those enunciated by Her Majesty's Government. He felt with the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) that it was a great inconvenience that Irish questions should occupy so much of the time of the House; but it was an absolute necessity that they should do so until the House had brought itself to reason, and had passed a Resolution by which all purely Irish Business should be settled by a Local Parliament in Ireland. He thoroughly sympathized with the unfortunate people of South Africa who, under a Liberal Government, were experiencing all the tyrannies inflicted by a Tory Ministry. He should certainly give his name and vote in favour of the independence of the Transvaal, because as he recognized in Ireland the right of the people to self-government, so, to be logical and just, he must, and did, grant the same right to others outside this Imperial Kingdom. He had hoped that Her Majesty's Speech would have contained a message of true peace towards Ireland; but he found that the Liberal Government of to-day were merely repeating the Whig tactics of 1870 and 1871. As in 1871, they had to-day no message of peace for Ireland, but rather of war; and a Liberal Ministry in Office had departed from the lines adopted by them when in Opposition. The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle had alluded to the absence of a Member of the Government whose eloquence had always been heard on the side of oppressed nationalities. Perhaps the hon. Member in taking Office had lost his voice; and the same thing, he (Mr. Finigan) feared, might be said of several Colleagues in the Ministry. He regretted that in that Government there were men of whom he had hoped for better things. There were men in that Government from whom Ireland had reason to expect some fair measure of reform, some fair promise of justice. If one had trusted to the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the present Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), one would have thought that when the Liberal Government came into Office they would have brought peace and true concord to Ireland, and would have bound Irishmen and Englishmen of Liberal principles in one solid union. But the Irish people, who believed in reasonable speeches, had trusted to men out of Office, who, when they came into the present Ministry, found their words were merely uttered for political purposes, and to mislead the Irish people. He (Mr. Finigan) did not belong to either one Party in the State or the other; but he was always ready to vote upon English measures as he considered the English people thought and wished. He maintained that on matters concerning Ireland it ought to be the policy of the House to govern Ireland, not according to the opinions of the English Representatives, but according to the exigencies and the opinions of the Representatives of the Irish people. He must say that Her Majesty's Speech was totally opposed to this Constitutional right—the right of one part of the Empire to govern itself, and to endeavour to rule Ireland by Irishmen and England by Englishmen. The Queen's Speech alluded to the diminution in distress; but that diminution was not owing to the "abundant harvest," which had not been too abundant, or to the action of the present or of the late Government, but to the action and exertions of the hon. Members for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), and all the members of the Irish National Land League, who had organized Ireland, and had prevented the people paying exorbitant rents. If the people of Ireland had been compelled by the bayonet, by the bullet, by the buckshot to pay their rents according to law, Ireland to-day would have presented a sad and very different appearance. He considered that Ireland owed by accident to the Conservative Party much more than she did to the Liberal Party at that moment, as the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in the House of Lords last Session led the Irish people to take the whole of the Irish Question into their own hands, being convinced that neither the Liberals nor the Tories in that House could ever deal effectively with Irish grievances. In his opinion, it was an insult to the Irish people to tell them that the great diminution of distress was to be traced to the abundant harvest. With respect to agrarian crime, he would remark that it must always result from unjust agrarian laws, and it was an absolute necessity where the law had not that respect amongst the people which a just law ought to have. Law could only be morally respected when that law was made in the interests of the people; but when the law was tyrannous and unjust, then outrage and crime must follow its administration. In point of fact, however, a great number of the reported outrages were mere *canards*, and nothing more than the gossip of newspaper correspondents. But it mattered little whether the outrages numbered 100 or 10,000. Outrages must and would happen so long as that House and that country were determined to carry out an unjust law and the policy of coercion. The administration of law in England was pure, and Englishmen had rightly perfect confidence in it; but the administration of justice in Ireland was wholly corrupt. The way to the Judicial Bench in that country lay through the slimy paths of Party politics; and there was not a Judge on the Irish Bench who had not gained his position by illegitimate, not to say politically immoral, means. Not only the Judicial Bench, but the whole judicial administration of Ireland was one piece of political corruption; and until Englishmen understood this, and dealt with it accordingly, the administration of justice in Ireland would always be a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. With regard to the policy of coercion, the Government ought to know that if they deprived men of the right of free speech they would drive them into joining secret societies. If it were just or courteous, he would like to say a few words on the conspiracy trials going on. He did not wish to imitate the language of the retired Chief Justice; but he would only say it was not one individual or 14 placed on trial—it was the whole Irish nation. Whatever the result, those people personally interested were indifferent; but it could have no result but one—that of discrediting the Government. If a verdict of acquittal was returned, they would be condemned in the eyes of both Liberals and Tories; and if the contrary event happened, they would be execrated by the Irish people. The Government were ruling Ireland with the rod of tyranny. They were not governing her. Until the Irish people were governed accord-to their wishes, the Members representing them must continue to oppose Governments whose Liberalism was mockery, and who re-introduced tyrannous measures under the disguise of reform.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 7th January, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) (2); Judicial Committee (3).

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

BURIAL AND REGISTRATION ACTS (DOUBTS REMOVAL) BILL. [H.L.]

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in bringing in the Bill, said, its object was to remove certain doubts caused by a clerical error in the clause of the Burials Act of last Session relating to registrars' certificates, the word "that" by accident being used instead of "this."

Bill to remove doubts as to the operation and effect of so much of the Burial Laws Amendment Act, 1880, as relates to the Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1874—*Presented* by the LORD CHANCELLOR; read 1ª; to be *printed.* (No. 2.)

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE BILL. [H.L.]

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in bringing in a Bill to amend some matters in connection with the appointment of members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, said, he could not omit reference to the loss that Committee and the Public Service had sustained by the recent sudden death of the very eminent Judge who for many years had served the country most efficiently in that tribunal—namely, Sir James Colville. The business discharged by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was of the greatest possible importance. Upon it depended the contentment of Her Majesty's subjects in India and all the Colonies with the administration of justice. That Court was not conducted with so much ceremony as some other Courts, nor was it so much in view of the public; but he said with confidence that there was no Court in the Kingdom where business of greater judicial importance, affecting a larger number of subjects, or such momentous interests, was discharged. Nor to those who really understood the administration of justice was there any more calculated than this to secure universal recognition and respect. Among the Judges who, for years past, had administered justice in that tribunal, none was more eminent either for legal learning—bringing with him the practice in the Courts of Equity, of which he became a Master, confirmed by a service of many years as Chief Justice of Bengal, and afterwards for many years more in the Judicial Committee—than Sir James Colville. He was distinguished also for his courtesy, his unvarying patience and temper—everything, in short, that could constitute an excellent man and a first-rate Judge. That tribunal had suffered an irreparable loss in his death, and it was partly on that account he asked their Lordships to supply the defect in the recent Judicature Act, which omitted to include among the members of the Judicial Committee those of Her Majesty's Privy Council who were Judges of the Court of Appeal without having first been Judges in a Court of First Instance, now called the High Court of Justice. For that purpose, and that only, this Bill was introduced.

Bill to further improve the Administration of Justice in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—*Presented* by the LORD CHANCELLOR; read 1ª; to be *printed.* (No. 3.)

SOUTH AFRICA (MISSIONARIES IN BASUTOLAND).

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

THE EARL OF BELMORE moved an Address to the Crown praying that a Copy of the Memorial addressed to Her Majesty's Ministers by the Committee of the Paris Evangelical Alliance on the present position of the native churches in Basutoland and the missionaries sent out by the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society be laid on the Table.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, that there was no objection to the production of the Papers in question.

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 7th January, 1881.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland, esquire, *for* Evesham.

SELECT COMMITTEE — Standing Orders, *nominated;* Selection, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered—First Reading*—Banking Laws Amendment* [46].

Ordered—First Reading—Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) [1]; Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment [2]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Wales) * [3]; Industrial Schools and Reformatories (Ireland) * [4]; Newspapers (Law of Libel) * [5]; Free Education (Scotland) * [6]; Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal * [7]; Removal Terms (Scotland) * [8]; Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1877) Amendment * [9]; Agricultural Tenants' Compensation * [10]; Clerical Disabilities Act Repeal * [11]; Volunteer Corps (Ireland) * [12]; London City (Parochial Charities) * [13]; Church Boards * [14]; Patents for Inventions * [15]; Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment * [16]; Corn Returns * [17]; Reformatory Institutions (Ireland) * [18]; Limitation of Costs (Ireland) * [19]; Municipal Franchise (Ireland) * [20]; Burial Fees * [21]; Medical Act (1858) Amendment * [22]; Marriage Law Amendment * [23]; Thames Steam Navigation Regulation * [24]; Municipal Corporation Act (1859) Amendment * [25]; Markets Regulation * [26]; Capital Punishment Abolition * [27]; Irish Railways Purchase * [28]; Tithe (Extraordinary Charge) * [29]; Church Patronage * [30]; Agricultural Tenants Compensation (No. 2) * [31]; Poor Law Guardians Election (Ireland) * [32]; Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) * [33]; County Courts * [34]; River Floods Prevention * [35]; Parliamentary Elections (Expenses) * [36]; Parliamentary Elections * [37]; Highways * [38]; Boiler Explosions * [39]; Infectious Diseases Notification (Ireland) * [40]; Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) * [41]; Teachers' Registration * [42]; Free Libraries * [43]; Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment (No. 2) * [44]; Married Women's Property (Scotland) * [45]; Churchwardens Admission * [47]; Judgments (Inferior Courts) * [48]; Salmon and Fresh Water Fisheries * [49].

EVESHAM ELECTION.

The Clerk of the Crown, attending according to Order, amended the Return for the Borough of Evesham, by substituting the name of Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland for Frederick Lehmann as the Member returned to serve in Parliament for the said Borough.

QUESTIONS.

ARMY — ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND — REPORT OF 1879 — APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the last Report of the Commissioners of the Royal Patriotic Fund, he will appoint a Committee of Members of this House, or a Special Committee similar to that appointed in 1878 on the system of management of Greenwich Hospital and Schools, to investigate and report upon the financial and general administration of the Fund, and the manner in which the Royal Patriotic Schools at Wandsworth are conducted, both as regards the election and education of the Children and the keeping and auditing of the Accounts of that establishment; also to report as to the salaries and pensions paid to present and past Officers in the service of the Commissioners of the said Fund; and, in case he does not intend to appoint such Committee, whether he will state to the House what steps, if any, he proposes to take in order to remedy the present state of the affairs of the Royal Patriotic Fund, as disclosed in the Report referred to?

MR. CHILDERS: Sir, I stated last Session, in reply to the noble Earl the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy), the proceedings I had taken in reference to the Patriotic Fund. I have not since heard from the Commissioners; but I have reason to believe that the question has been and is receiving their careful attention. Until I learn from them what measures they propose to take to extricate the Fund from its very unsatisfactory condition, I cannot say what steps I should consider it my duty to take in the direction indicated by the hon. Member. I have recently again requested the Commissioners to inform me what action they propose to take in the matter.

CROWN RENTS, TITHE RENT CHARGES, AND INCOME TAX, &c. (IRELAND).

MR. TOTTENHAM asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, in view of the present repudiation of contracts connected with land in Ireland, and the total suspension of the payment of rent in many districts, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to instruct the officials charged with the collection of Crown rents, tithe rent-charge, income tax, and re-payment of loans under the Land Improvement Acts, not to press the persons liable for payment of such until order has been re-established and the payment of rents resumed?

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH: Sir, the questions raised by the hon. Member have been already considered by the Treasury; and, without going into particulars, I may say that every consideration will be shown in cases in which such indulgence is clearly proved to be necessary.

MINES ACTS—REPORTS OF INSPECTORS OF MINES.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Seeing that now the Reports of the Inspectors of Mines by being all published together, the cost is such that they cannot be purchased by a class that ought to be able to read them, viz., those employed in and about Mines, and, considering the great value of the information they contain, he will cause the individual Reports to be published in a separate form, with their relative summaries, and thereby put them within the reach of a greater number than can be the case at the present time?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that he had caused inquiry to be made, and was happy to say that he had been informed that these Reports could be printed at a cost not exceeding 1*d.* per sheet of eight pages; and, that being so, he would take care that the Reports should be issued separately instead of together, as at present.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT—CONTRACTS.

MR. MACDONALD asked Mr. Attorney General, If his attention has been called to, or if it has come under his observation, that a large number of employers throughout the country have compelled, or are about to compel, their employés to sign contracts to evade the provisions of the Employers' Liability Act; and, if in the case of large bodies of employers following such a course, jointly or in combination, they are not conspiring to evade the Law or break it; if so, whether he will consider it desirable to prosecute all those who are parties to such a conspiracy; and further, if, seeing the extent to which the employers of labour are forcing their employés to contract out of the Act, the Government will bring in a Bill this Session to prevent such being done?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in reply, said, the attention of the Government had not been called to any cases where employers had combined together or intimidated the men in their employ so as to force them to enter into contracts evading the provisions of the Act. During the progress of the Act through the House the question was several times asked whether it would be lawful that such contracts should be made. Those who had charge of the Bill replied that such contracts would be legal, and the Bill passed without the insertion of any words rendering the making of such contracts illegal. It was not contemplated to request the Government to take any legal proceedings against anyone in consequence of such contracts. Whether fresh legislation would be necessary would depend upon the experience of the working of the Act; but it was not at present contemplated by the Government.

AFGHANISTAN (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—REWARDS FOR SERVICES.

MR. ONSLOW asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is his intention to propose a Vote of Thanks of this House for the gallant exploit of General Sir F. Roberts, and the officers and men, both European and Native, in the recent march from Cabul to Candahar, and subsequent events?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I have been asked by my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister to reply to the Question of the hon. Member opposite. The question of the rewards and honours to be conferred upon the officers and troops engaged in the campaigns in Afghanistan following the Treaty of Gandamak are at present under the consideration of the Government of India. As soon as the recommendations of that Government are received at the India Office they will be considered by the Home Government, and the course necessary to be taken will be decided upon.

ARMY — THE VOLUNTEERS — SPEECH OF LORD LYTTON.

Mr. GORST asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, a Copy of the Letter addressed by him to Lord Lytton relative to a speech made by Lord Lytton, to which a number of volunteers had listened, and of Lord Lytton's reply thereto; and also a Copy of the General Order issued on the recommendation of the Secretary of State by His Royal Highness the Commander in Chief to regulate the behaviour of volunteers in whose presence a political address may be delivered?

Mr. CHILDERS: If the hon. and learned Member thinks the Correspondence worth printing as a Parliamentary Paper, and will move for it, he may have it as an unopposed Return.

Mr. GORST: And the General Order?

Mr. CHILDERS: Yes.

Mr. GORST: Then I beg to give Notice that I will move for Copies of the Correspondence and the General Order.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.

Mr. CHAPLIN asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it is true that the recent outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease, which has occurred in many parts of England, has been traced by the Privy Council to a cargo of foreign animals imported into this Country; whether it is increasing or decreasing at the present moment; and, what steps the Government have taken or are taking to prevent the further spreading of the disease?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, so far as we are aware, this country was free from foot and mouth disease from the middle of January in last year till the beginning of October. A serious outbreak of this disease occurred in the North of France during the month of September, and very shortly afterwards three cargoes of French animals were landed at Deptford suffering from it. These animals, like all others landed at Deptford, were slaughtered at the wharf; and, therefore, there was no immediate contact between them and any home stock. Such contact is not, however, necessary for the propagation of the disease, which can be conveyed by persons or animals frequenting the infected premises. Within a few days after the arrival of the diseased cargoes, cases of foot and mouth disease were reported in a London dairy. It soon spread in the Metropolis and the surrounding districts, from which it speedily reached the Eastern Counties. The Privy Council took immediate steps to check the progress of the disease. They ordered their Inspectors round the coasts to see that all diseased animals arriving at the foreign animals' wharves should be slaughtered without any delay. They issued a Circular to local authorities calling their attention to the fact that an outbreak of foot and mouth disease was probably impending, and urging them to be on the alert. As the disease began to spread, the Privy Council, watching carefully the daily returns, declared infected areas around the infected places; and, in order to render the limits of security as wide as possible, they comprised large districts—in most cases whole counties—in the infected area. Under these regulations, the whole of the Eastern Counties, together with Northampton, Huntingdon, Derby, Surrey, Kent, and Sussex, are now infected areas. It is satisfactory to note that in these districts the spread of the disease has been checked when the regulations have come into full force in a manner in which it was never checked before; and the Privy Council have been thereby encouraged to anticipate the outbreak of the disease, and to endeavour to save those parts of the country which are at present unaffected. Under the regulations hitherto existing, we were unable to deal with the disease until it had appeared in a locality, and, possibly, after it had been disseminated through the district. We have now determined to try whether by a sharp measure, limited to a few weeks' duration, we cannot arrest the disease, and finally exterminate it. By an Order passed last week we have prohibited, for a period of six weeks, the holding of any fair or market, or public sale of animals, throughout England, except by licence of the local authority, and then only for fat stock for slaughter. No sale of store stock is to be permitted, except by licence of the Privy Council. By another Order, all animals sold in an infected area by public sale must be slaughtered within that area. A third and most important Order prohibits, for six weeks, the movement alive out of the Metropolis animals that have been exposed for sale in the Metropolitan Market. No such stringent measures have ever been adopted before in dealing with foot and mouth disease; but it is, as yet, too early to give a decided opinion as to their ultimate success. I think it right to say that the credit for these measures is entirely due to the Lord President (Earl Spencer), who has given the subject most anxious and unremitting attention.

ARMY—THE VOLUNTEERS—CUSTODY OF ARMS.

MR. GOURLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will be good enough to inform the House, under whose instructions and for what reasons large numbers of Volunteer Corps have been nominally deprived of the custody of their rifles, and why the order has been issued to officers commanding rifle regiments only and not to those commanding artillery?

MR. CHILDERS: If the hon. Gentleman will permit me, I will reply to his Question in place of my right hon. Friend. I appeal to my hon. Friend not to press me for an Answer to his Question. The precautions taken were deemed expedient by Her Majesty's Government.

CONSTITUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.

MR. GOURLEY asked the President of the Board of Trade, When he anticipates being able to place upon the Table of the House the Return ordered in 1879 showing the constitution together with the names and duties of the Members of the Board of Trade?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir, Returns as to the constitution, as well as the duties, of the members of the Board of Trade, although not in exact accordance with the terms of the present Question, were moved for in the last Session of Parliament before the present Government took Office. The Order then made dropped through, in consequence of the Dissolution; but if it be considered necessary or desirable that they should be given, it will be necessary to make a new Motion. If the hon. Gentleman is prepared to do that, I shall be glad if he will speak to me beforehand as to the terms of the Motion.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATION OF MEETINGS AT BROOKBOROUGH—ORDER—QUESTIONS—MOVING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

MR. O'KELLY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the proclamation of a meeting at Brookboro', county Fermanagh, on the 7th December 1880; and, if so, whether he has ordered any inquiry into the circumstances which led to the proclamation of said meeting?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, the Irish Government are in full possession of information as to all the circumstances under which the proclamation of the meetings at Brookborough was made. The hon. Member is in error in supposing that there was only one meeting announced to be held at that place the fact being that two meetings were to be held, one being called by the Land League, and another by the Orangemen, both to be held at the same time and place. The magistrates of the district received information that if the meetings were permitted to be held the public peace would be endangered, and in these circumstances they were, in our opinion, fully justified in prohibiting them from being held. It is not necessary for any inquiry to be instituted with reference to this matter, inasmuch as every step which was taken in relation to it by the magistrates was taken with the full concurrence of the Irish Government. The information which was laid before the Government was to the effect that a great Land League meeting was intended to be held at Brookborough, and that the Orangemen had been invited to assemble in their thousands for the purpose of giving Parnell and his associates a warm reception. The information further stated that if these meetings were permitted to be held, the public peace would be seriously endangered, and, probably, bloodshed would ensue. In these circumstances, in our opinion, the magistrates did quite right in prohibiting the meetings.

Mr. O'KELLY said, the Answer he had received from the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland was calculated to mislead the House as to the circumstances under which the meeting at Brookborough had been proclaimed. [*Cries of* "Order!"] With a view of putting himself in Order, he would conclude with a Motion. There never was any intention to hold a counter-demonstration in the district in opposition to the Land League meeting. The real fact was, that the meeting which was proclaimed was the only one announced to be held, and it was a meeting called by the Land League. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. WALPOLE: Sir, I rise to Order. It has been a Rule in this House which has been laid down for more years than I have had the hononr of a seat in it, that when Questions are put and Answers are given, they must not be put in such a form as to lead to a debate; and the successive Speakers of the House have, time after time, prohibited a discussion arising upon any Answer given to a Question, because it would necessarily provoke a long discussion, and would lead to grave inconvenience. In this case the hon. Member has, no doubt, announced that he is about to terminate his speech by making a Motion; but it does occur to me that if this course is to be pursued, the object of the ruling of the Chair, to which I have referred, will be defeated, and will prevent, in future, any regularity and order in our proceedings in regard to Questions and Answers. In these circumstances, I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. Gentleman is to be at liberty, at this moment, to enter into a full discussion of the matter to which the Question refers?

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is aware that the practice of the House is this—that when a Question has been put and has been fully answered, it is supposed that the whole of the matter is then at an end. But I am bound to say this, that it is open to an hon. Member, if he thinks fit to conclude with a Motion, to bring the subject of his Question under the notice of the House. I have, however, already, on several occasions, expressed to the House my sense of the great inconvenience of the practice, and I have often stated from this Chair my opinion that the House will be obliged to take steps to put an end to the abuse of the privilege.

Mr. NEWDEGATE also deprecated the practice referred to by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. O'KELLY: I am very sorry, indeed, to inconvenience the House, or to depart in the slightest from the usage of this House; but the Question is one which affects the Constitutional rights of the Irish people, and when the Constitutional rights of the Irish people are at stake even the convenience of this House must give way. The information upon which the meeting at Brookborough was proclaimed was well known in the neighbourhood to have been the work of bailiffs and understrappers in the service of the very men who proclaimed the meeting. What are the facts in connection with the proclamation of this meeting? They are that it was proclaimed by three gentlemen in the commission of the peace, who are themselves landlords and agents over property in the district; men who had resolved in any case to shut out the Land League, and who had publicly declared their intention to use violence, if necessary, to keep them off what they considered their territory. The question which vitally affects the Irish people is this, and it is one which must be answered—whether it is legal that any three magistrates can come together and conspire, and, as a result of their conspiracy, deprive the people of Ireland of the right of meeting constitutionally to seek redress for their grievances? The meeting was a perfectly peaceable one; it was called together not by the Catholics of the district, but by the Orangemen and Protestants of the district, and two-thirds of those present at that meeting were Orangemen. That was the very reason why these gentlemen made a special effort to suppress it. It is quite true that a proclamation was issued calling on the Orangemen to interfere with the meeting, but that was without signature and without the support of any party in the district. In fact, it was well understood to have been issued in order to give grounds for proclaiming the meeting. That appeal was succeeded by an appeal from the Protestant rector of the district asking the Orangemen of that district to stay at home, or to come peacefully to that meeting and act in concert with their Catholic fellow-countrymen. The immediate result of that action on his part had been that that gentleman had been "Boycotted" by the landlords and agents of the district. He has been punished for doing his duty like a Christian minister—for asking the people to keep the peace and abstain from violence. This Question was brought up last night in an indirect manner by the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), and then, in reply to another Question, the Solicitor General said that the magistrate was a conservator of the peace, and had the care of the life and property of the district, and could act on his own responsibility. Now, what was the fact? His experience was, that the only persons who created disturbance at their meetings had been what the Solicitor General for Ireland had called "the conservators of the peace." The only men who had committed acts of violence at the public meetings held during the Recess in Ireland had been the magistrates, or policemen acting under the authority of the Government. This was an important Question, and one which involved the rights of Englishmen as well as Irishmen—whether a precedent was to be established in this Empire that one or two magistrates, of their own will, without any reasonable pretext, could suppress a public meeting because they chose to pretend to be alarmed for the public peace—because they pretended to see dangers that nobody else could see, and dangers that disappeared the moment they were approached? With regard to the Brookborough meeting, they tried this question with the Orangemen, and what did they find? They found, instead of hostility, friendship and warm greeting. In all my experience of the agitation in Ireland, I have met in no place, not even in the county which I have the honour to represent, a reception so warm and enthusiastic as I met from the Orangemen of Brookborough; and these are the men who are supposed to be thirsting for our blood. The fact is, that there never was the slightest danger of violence; and the proclamation of the meeting was the act of those gentlemen who are resident magistrates, who are paid agents of the landlords, and who have the whole control of the political power of the district. I have great pleasure in moving the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. Member for Roscommon resumed his seat without concluding with a Motion. ["No, no!"] If the hon. Member assures me that he concluded with a Motion, I shall take his word.

MR. O'KELLY: I assure you, Sir, I moved the adjournment of the House.

MR. MARUM, in seconding the Motion, begged to state that, as the action of the Government had been complained of in the North of Ireland, he felt obliged to complain likewise of the action of the Executive in the South. A meeting had been called at a place called Cullohill, in Queen's County, by a placard nominating certain parties. It was proclaimed; but he did not complain of that, and, on the contrary, he, as a local magistrate, advised that the proclamation should be respected, and that no meeting should be held. He told the resident magistrate that he (Mr. Marum) was senior magistrate himself; but, under the circumstances, he would not act in such capacity. He also told the magistrate that another meeting was to be held at a place four miles distant, called Durrow, for purposes different from those of the Cullohill meeting and by a different body; but no sooner had he arrived there than he found the military were there before him, and the magistrates told him that it was their intention to disperse the meeting, though it was not held for the purpose mentioned in the proclamation. He pressed that fact upon the attention of the magistrates, and that they could test the question by issuing summonses for an unlawful assembly, but that it was illegal to disperse by force a lawful assembly then and there assembled; but they refused to allow him even to address his constituents. He thought that a great hardship, especially as one-half of the people there present were his constituents. He told them that he was in a position to guarantee the peace of the meeting; but he did not wish to hold a meeting in contravention to the law. He thought that was an invasion of the privileges of Members of Parliament, and a very humiliating thing that a Representative of the people should be prevented from addressing a peaceable, intelligent meeting anxious to hear him. It was with great pain that he, simply in his magisterial capacity, saw the privileges of a Representative of the people set at naught and, as he held, illegally. He did not complain of the conduct of the local magistrate, who had received a proclamation that such a meeting was not to be held there or elsewhere. That "elsewhere" was an expression that extended there was no telling how far; but he complained that, by an Order of the Government of that vague and indefinite character, he and his constituents should be subjected to tyranny.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. O'Kelly.*)

Mr. SEXTON, in supporting the Motion for the adjournment, said, that the meeting called at Brookborough was met by an anonymous proclamation calling upon the Orangemen to meet; but those who knew the feeling of the rural Orangemen knew how heartily they sympathized with the Land League, and that they had in many districts given valuable aid to the movement. The best proof of this was that an Orangeman occupied the chair at Brookborough. The Question was one which affected the dearest interests of the Irish people, who were engaged in a struggle for their lives under circumstances of extreme difficulty. It was a struggle against a class which, besides holding the land, had in its hands the administration of justice and the whole machinery of the local government of the country. This class had every interest for using its power against the people, and in this instance it had used that power for the purpose of suppressing a meeting called for a constitutional purpose. The Orangemen's proclamation calling the Orange meeting, no doubt, emanated from two or three agents of landlords, for the Orangemen of the North were the friends of the Land League; and why should they not be? The Protestant as well as the Catholic farmers recognized that it was not their interest to pay rack-rents. The question was, whether a meeting called for constitutional discussion should be prevented because a clique of magistrates abused their power and chose to forbid it? What he wanted to know was, whether the landlord class, against whom the Irish people were now engaged in a life and death struggle, should be able to abuse their power to suppress the rights of the people? From the indications they had already had of the temper of the House and of the intentions of the Government, it was clear that the Irish Representatives must not be squeamish or be deterred by an adherence to etiquette or to musty traditions from performing what they deemed to be their duty in protesting against invasions on the liberty of their country. He called on the Government to say whether a fictitious appearance of opposition to a meeting constitutionally called was to be sufficient to bring the police force into the field for the suppression of such a meeting?

Mr. GRAY said, that, although he also recognized the great inconvenience of raising a somewhat irregular discussion on this matter, it appeared to him quite impossible that Irish Members, now that that question had been raised, should permit it to rest without some answer from the Government. He confessed himself he was astounded to see the Chief Secretary and the Premier let this very grave charge pass without a single word of reply. He said that this afforded another exemplification of the differences which existed in the governing of Ireland as compared with the governing of England. He appealed to a full House of the Representatives of English and Scotch constituencies to say if a question of this importance were raised with regard to meetings in England and Scotland, was it conceivable that the Government would allow it to pass without a single word of reply? Whether the charge was accurate or inaccurate, he thought it involved a question of the very greatest importance—namely, the right of public meeting. It also involved, as his hon. Friend the Member for Kilkenny (Mr. Marum) had stated, the question of the privileges of the Members of that House; and yet, forsooth, because it was a "merely Irish" question, the Government would have permitted it to pass without the slighest word of notice. Complaints were made about wasting the time of the House; but if the time of the House was now wasted in a prolonged and acrimonious discussion, he thought the responsibility did not rest with the Irish Members, but with the Government in the attitude they thought proper to assume. They should have a reply and a definite reply, and it might be better to do it at once before they got into an angry mood; but the

Government must be aware of the fact that hundreds of meetings had been held throughout Ireland, and every one of them had been peaceably conducted, conducted in such a manner that the Government had not thought it necessary to have at any time a police force present to preserve order. Therefore, they should have very strong evidence, indeed, to justify the course they had taken to proclaim meeting after meeting. As his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) had stated, there was no doubt that the entire administration of the law was invested in the landlord class and their nominees, and if, on secret information sworn by two or three of those gentlemen a public meeting was to be suppressed, then the right of public meeting in Ireland was at an end. That was really the question. The Government now seemed to have adopted the system of proclaiming meeting after meeting. It had been stated by a Member of the Executive yesterday that they never did so without sufficient cause. Were they to understand that secret information of three or four landlords or their nominees was in their opinion "sufficient cause?" If not, they were entitled to fuller information than they had yet received.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I did not answer the speech of the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly), or that of the hon. Member who supported him, because I thought I had done so by anticipation. I thought I had given the ground on which not one meeting, but two opposing meetings, were prohibited at Brookborough. The hon. Gentleman says there was no foundation for that proceeding, nor any ground for supposing that a disturbance would have taken place. That was not my opinion on the information I had received, nor that of those whom it was my business to consult, and the Executive Government in Dublin undertook the responsibility of stopping both of those meetings at Brookborough on that day. We had reason to expect that opposing meetings would be held in the same place, and that there might be a very considerable breach of the peace and bloodshed. The hon. Member says he is sure that nobody would have opposed his meeting; but we cannot take his assurance now in regard to what might have happened at the time; and, probably, nobody would have blamed us more than the hon. Member himself if a large body of Orangemen had broken in upon that meeting, and we had not taken steps to prevent it. He says there were only anonymous placards issued; but he must know that the meetings he is in the habit of attending are often called by anonymous placards. I am surprised that he thinks it impossible there should have been such an interruption; because, only the day after that meeting, I received a telegram, signed by the hon. Member himself and also by the hon. Members for Tipperary and Cavan, about another meeting in that neighbourhood, in which they said they were informed on good authority that armed Orangemen intended to attack a meeting at Scottstown next day, and they called on the Government to protect the people in the exercise of the right to hold public meetings for the discussion of their grievances. Well, we gave that protection; and what I maintain is, that it is our business to use our best discretion as to the way in which we shall prevent breaches of the peace, whether, as we did in this case, where it manifestly looked as if there would be a disturbance, by prohibiting two meetings from being held precisely at the same time and place, or, if we do not stop a meeting, by taking care that a large force is present to prevent disburbance. The hon. Member for Kilkenny (Mr. Marum) made a remark about another meeting. It is inconvenient to have these matters sprung on one and to be expected to give an answer without Notice; but I am prepared to reply to the hon. Member for Kilkenny. He complained of a meeting in Queen's County being stopped. Well, my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Ireland stated yesterday that, while we did not think we should be acting legally if we stopped the meetings generally held by the Land League, yet we believed that we were bound to stop meetings upon two grounds if they appeared to exist. First, that there was likely to be a breach of the peace. And I may observe here that I think two magistrates have a perfect right to stop meetings on that ground. In this case at Brookborough there were four magistrates and one resident magistrate; and if the magistrates had not done it, it would have been done without them. Another ground for stopping this meeting was that individuals were in danger. Here is the placard of this meeting. I said the placards were anonymous. This one is anonymous. [The right hon. Gentleman here read the placard, which convened a "monster indignation meeting" for Sunday, December 19, at 1 o'clock, at Cullowhill; stated that trains would run to suit those wishing to attend; and expressed a hope that the members of the Irish Party would be on the ground to lift their voices to Heaven against the cruel injustice inflicted on the children of the soil ever since the Saxon first set his foot on their shores. It then went on to denounce a certain person, whom it named, "Bob Owen."] The right hon. Gentleman continued: I believe, from information I have obtained, that Mr. Owen would have been in danger from that meeting. Consequently, we thought it was our duty to stop it. The hon. Member for Kilkenny, I suppose, read this placard; I suppose that he knew what kind of a meeting he was going to take part in—he, a magistrate. On the meeting being proclaimed, the resident magistrate was informed that, instead of being held there, it would be held at a place two or three miles off, professedly not for the purpose of denouncing Mr. Owen, but for entering into the question of the Land Laws generally. Can anyone suppose that that was not a meeting for the same object as the other, or that the same language would not have been used? Lord Cowper and I myself felt that the law would have been made a fool of, if that meeting had not been stopped.

Mr. MARUM wished, as the right hon. Gentleman had introduced matters of a personal kind, to make some explanation. It was true that the placard quoted was the placard of the Cullohill meeting, and it was equally true that he had objected to that placard, because it nominated parties. In consequence of the proclamation and of his objections, the meeting was abandoned, as he had stated; but he attended to see that there should be no disorder. But it was of the interference with the Durrow meeting—a lawful assembly—he complained of. ["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to remind the hon. Member that he is travelling beyond the grounds of an explanation.

Mr. DAWSON invited the attention of the House to the fact that it would not be possible to hold any meeting, however regular or however constitutional, if it was put an end to because another meeting of a hostile character was announced to be held at the same time. He wished to know from the Chief Secretary if the Land League meeting was called first and constitutionally, and upon legal notice, and if another meeting was called afterwards, which was illegal, should not the powers of the Constitution be brought into exercise, not to interfere with that which was legal and constitutional, but to put down that which was illegal and unconstitutional? The Land League meeting had not been proved to have been illegally called; and, upon the admission of the right hon. Gentleman himself, the other meeting was the one which he should have set his foot upon and suppressed. He arraigned the right hon. Gentleman for having unconstitutionally exceeded his duty in putting down the first meeting; and he charged him with having failed in his duty, no matter how influenced by anonymous communication, in not putting down the illegal meeting, and allowing the people to pursue their legal course and exercise their legal rights without interruption. If it was possible that the liberties of the people could be infringed in that manner, no public meeting could take place in the Empire. He asked the Chief Secretary to state to the House, without introducing any irrelevant matter, which was the first meeting; and if the first meeting was legal and the second illegal, why did he interfere with the former, and why did he not prevent the latter, and allow "law and order" to take their course in the country?

Dr. COMMINS said, the House had sufficient proof now of the oppressive powers which the magistrates of Ireland possessed, and of the fact that they misused those powers in curtailment of the rights of the people. If the powers that had been exercised for the suppression of the land meetings were legal, certainly no stronger powers were necessary. If the magistrate, upon the inspired affidavit of his rent-warner or bailiff, could suppress a public meeting by force, then it was quite unnecessary to pass a new Coercion Law for the country. He confessed his ignorance of the laws of Ireland; but he maintained that, according to the law of England, no such power could be exercised. The power exercised by the magistrates was not the power arrogated by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. It was not the power arrogated by the magistrates of Ireland. The power they arrogated was to bring a military force upon the ground, and, without reading the Riot Act or resorting to the usual forms for the protection of personal liberty, to use physical force, to use military force, to use bullet and buckshot, in defence of the proclamation issued by themselves. He questioned the legal authority for the exercise of that power, and maintained that if it could be supported by a reference to the Statutes, no further coercion was necessary for Ireland.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN considered that the right of public meeting in Ireland rested upon a very narrow and insecure foundation if it rested upon the will of the Irish magistrates. The Irish magistrates were nearly all either landlords or land agents, and, of course, they had no sympathy with the meetings which were being held in Ireland for the procurement of a reform of the Irish Land Laws. No sooner was a man appointed to land agency in Ireland than he was forthwith made a magistrate by the Irish Government; and he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) was of opinion that a very large share of the hatred and detestation with which British rule in Ireland was regarded by the people was owing to the fact that they always chose for their agents in Ireland the landlords of that country, who were an unpopular class, and who were known to the Irish people only as oppressors. It seemed to him that if the magistrates of Ireland, who were themselves the evictors of the people, could, upon the representations of their bailiffs or understrappers, put an end to the Land League meetings in Ireland, then the whole of the work was done for the British Government. They had heard a good deal of intimidation, and they had heard a good deal of "Boycotting." He thought the magistrates of Ireland had very successfully intimidated the Chief Secretary, and he was aware that they had very successfully "Boycotted" him. He was told the most gloomy and funeral scenes witnessed in Ireland for some time were the dances endeavoured to be got up by the Chief Secretary in Dublin Castle. He understood from gentlemen of the class invited that that was the course they intended to pursue, and he believed the Chief Secretary might as well "call spirits from the vasty deep" as to ask them to come to his festivities in Dublin Castle. But the serious part of this matter was that the right of public meeting in Ireland was being grossly interfered with; and when Irish Members in this House complained very little regard was shown to their feelings, though if English Members were to be treated in like manner their blood would be up at once. But he could tell hon. Members and the Government that by no means, legal or illegal, would the feelings which were now aroused in the hearts of the Irish people be suppressed. They were determined to make a radical change in the system of landlordism. This he had proclaimed on Irish platforms, and he now proclaimed it in the British House of Commons.

MR. LEAMY said, the course taken by his hon. Friend the Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) might be an inconvenient one; but let the House consider the inconvenience of summoning the Irish Party at this early period of the year to Parliament, to listen to a Liberal Government which had a Coercion Bill as one of its modes of dealing with the grievances of Ireland. The conduct of the Chief Secretary with regard to these meetings had been most unconstitutional. What had the right hon. Gentleman done? Why, he had sprung a mine upon the people. He had deprived portions of the Irish people of their liberties without even 24 hours' notice, for meetings legally convened had been prohibited on the shortest possible notice. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that meetings called to denounce private individuals should be suppressed; but in reference to the second reason put forward—namely, that he apprehended a breach of the peace—he wished to ask the Chief Secretary, if a meeting were called in England tomorrow for the purpose of discussing land reform, and if some of the landlord class of England were to incite certain persons to attack that meeting, and if the Government were made aware that it was the intention of certain men opposed to land reform to interrupt that meeting, would it suppress that meeting constitutionally called for the purpose of discussing land reform? It would do nothing of the kind; it would protect it. He wished to know if a meeting was called for Sunday, not to denounce any individual, but to advocate the programme of the Land League, and supposing that meeting was proclaimed by the Government, and supposing certain gentlemen were to hold a meeting on the previous Saturday, would a magistrate, without any authority from the Castle, be justified in going to that meeting on Saturday, and saying, "If you don't disperse I'll fire on you?" If there was anything more than another calculated to provoke a breach of the peace it was the sending a number of armed men to disperse a number of unarmed men, assembled for a legal object, under the threat of shooting them. That was the way the peace was preserved in Ireland. In Waterford they had a great meeting, and though a representation was made to the Government by some anonymous coward that it would be the occasion of disorder, yet the meeting was not proclaimed. But why was that? Because the magistrates at Waterford knew the people better than to anticipate a disturbance. Though the meeting was one of the largest which had ever been held, there was no disturbance. In order to put down a meeting it seemed that it was only necessary to work up feeling and to say that there was a probability of disturbance arising. The only reason why the meeting at at Waterford was not put down was that the public feeling of the place would not have allowed such a proceeding.

Mr. CALLAN said, as regarded the Brookborough meeting he knew nothing; but he knew something about other meetings, and he should like to know whether a meeting could be suppressed in opposition to the desire of the local magistrates? The Chief Secretary knew so little about Ireland, and had won so little respect from any part or section by his conduct, that his appointment had been a sad disaster to a Liberal Administration. ["Oh!"] In the course of these debates the Irish Members would prove this. Now, he would not spring a mine on the Chief Secretary by alluding to the Drogheda meeting, where a pugnacious little stipendiary magistrate named Captain Keogh summoned together the magistrates to consider——

Mr. Leamy

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has given Notice of a Question with respect to that meeting, and he is altogether out of Order in anticipating the Question.

Mr. CALLAN bowed to the Speaker's ruling, and observed that his object was to save the time of the House. In conclusion, he asked the Solicitor General for Ireland whether it was legal to disperse the meeting at Drogheda under the circumstances which attended its dispersion?

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY was surprised that the Solicitor General for Ireland had not answered the Question of his hon. Friend. He thought it was a very important matter, and one in which he wished the occupants of the Liberal Benches could be prevailed upon to interest themselves. It was a question which concerned that right of free public meeting, which was one of the first articles of the Liberal creed. He had never heard anything less satisfactory than the explanation of the Chief Secretary. However, one should make some allowance for the difficulty which the right hon. Gentleman must feel, if he were to be called upon to explain every anomaly which had arisen under his system of government. He supposed one should make some allowance, too, for the frame of mind of a right hon. Gentleman who had been placed in so undesirable a position as that described by the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. T. D. Sullivan). After the long hours of disappointed expectation spent by the right hon. Gentleman in gazing upon a deserted ball-room floor, it would be almost unfair to expect him to pay too much attention to mere matters of liberty and law in Ireland. Hon. Members would observe that this question seriously affected the present agitation in Ireland, as they had been told by the hon. Member for Carlow City (Mr. Dawson). If such a system was carried on it would be impossible to hold any meetings, for any purpose, so long as anyone opposed to the meeting felt inclined to send to any magistrate a representation that a disturbance was likely to take place. The meeting in this case was perfectly lawful in its purpose; and because somebody saw a placard inviting the opponents of it to assemble in the same place, the law and order of the country were put in force for its prohibition, and the people were deprived of the right of free speech. From the Chief Secretary's own admission, a person had nothing to do but to get up a trumpery placard, announcing that a counter-meeting would be held, and the meeting was at once to be proclaimed. According to that principle, no meeting could be held, and no freedom of speech could exist. Some time since, in Hyde Park, when a Tory Government was in power, which accounted, perhaps, for a more liberal opportunity being then given to discuss public questions, two meetings of an opposite character were held, and they were not prevented. Though he disapproved of interposing a debate like this during the regular Business of the House, he was of opinion that there was justification for the course taken by the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly). In the ordinary course, he might not have an opportunity of raising the question for two months; and, in the meantime, the right of public meeting in Ireland would be at the mercy not merely of the magistrates, but of any person who chose to announce some ridiculous counter-demonstration. It was highly important that some better assurance should be given that the Government did not intend to countenance the idea that on the faith of some trumpery story, meetings, lawful in themselves, to be addressed by persons who had hitherto spoken only as the law allowed them, were to be deprived of the protection of the law. If they did not do that, he could only say, slightly altering the words of a great living statesman, that a Liberal Government henceforth, at least, in Ireland, was "an organized hypocrisy."

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) said, that the reason why he did not reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) was not out of any disrespect to the hon. Member, but because Notice had been given of the Question, and it would be answered in due course. It was an irregular proceeding, and one which was certainly not calculated to expedite the despatch of Public Business, to anticipate Questions in that manner.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that he quite sympathized with the difficulties which hon. Members preceding him had had to encounter. That sympathy must be extended to the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly), who had, at the right time, availed himself of the auspicious occasion which had presented itself to discuss the question now at issue. Why was this so? Because the First Lord of the Treasury would in a few days bring in a measure with regard to the Common Law of Ireland; and the Irish Members were going to show what the Common Law of Ireland was. He thought that they had even now succeeded in showing that there was no necessity for the suspension of the Common Law, if that Common Law was properly interpreted. What was the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland? According to the right hon. Gentleman, any meeting in Ireland could be put a stop to at the caprice of two magistrates appointed by the Government. And who were those magistrates? They almost invariably belonged to the landlord class. Now, what was the meeting at Brookborough, to which reference had been made, and from the subject of which they had wandered a little. It was to be a meeting of the Land League; and it was prohibited by the magistrates because, it was said, another meeting was convened for the same time and place. The magistrates, in fact, thus constituted themselves the protectors and patrons of rowdies. It was, he admitted, a fair proposition that each meeting should stand on its own merits; and he did not deny that it was the right, and even the duty, of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to put a stop to the meeting at Cullohill, at which a particular individual was to be denounced. But the meeting at Brookborough did not come under that denomination. He could assure the House that on all occasions the placards announcing the various meetings in connection with the Land League had been submitted to the necessary authorities of the League before being published. The League had insisted that anything like an allusion to individuals should be avoided, as otherwise it would establish the right of the authorities to interfere. It had been said that the Orangemen would interfere with and break up the meeting at Brookborough; but what occurred? The meeting actually took place within two miles of Brookborough; it was conducted and passed off peacefully, and was presided over by an Orangeman—Mr. Little—who, he believed, was a high official in the Orange ranks. Did not these facts show that the statement of the magistrates could not be borne out by the facts, and that the information on which they acted was a lie and a slander, so far as the loyal and peaceful Orangemen of the district were concerned? Her Majesty's Government now said that they required extraordinary powers to prevent the holding of meetings; but if they had the means of doing so already, why did they require exceptional powers? If they were right in their contention, any set of rowdies in Ireland could stop a perfectly lawful meeting, and deprive the people of their Constitutional rights and privileges. When meetings upon Party questions were held in London, and when much opposition and antagonism was known to be manifested, no steps were taken by the authorities to stop them; and there was no reason that Ireland should be treated in any different manner.

Mr. BYRNE observed, that the Prime Minister had, in his speech last night, intimated to the Irish Members that they were, so to say, to be "Boycotted," which was equivalent to the old saying that "no Irish need apply." They were told, and pertinently, that there were other places to be legislated for besides Ireland, and that they must be good boys or they would not get anything. He gathered from that statement that the Irish people had very little to expect from the present Government. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had said that no Government had been so pledged—in fact, he stated they were pledged up to the lips—to legislate for the wants of Ireland, and to apportion to her due justice, as the present one. With respect to the question which had been raised, he admitted the right of magistrates, acting on proper informations or affidavits, to prohibit meetings; but what right, he asked, had two magistrates, acting without such affidavits, to prevent the holding of meetings? Such affidavits were usually made by rent-warners, many of whom were outcasts of society, who were not fit to be trusted with a fourpenny loaf, and some of whom he had known to levy and to accept, bribes. He had known deputy-agents accept bribes of £20 and £50 at a time; and he had known the bailiffs of earls and lords accept smaller bribes, down to a turkey, a goose, a pair of fowls, or a piece of tobacco. ["Oh!"] No doubt, many of the landlords were respectable men, but many were not so good as they ought to be—not as honest magistrates, or even as good men. A lady had stated publicly that she paid her bailiff £5; and, of course, he made up his income by levying black-mail on the tenants. These were the sort of people brought forward to swear informations of what they heard. The question was—Is Ireland, or is she not, a free country? ["No!"] Does the British Constitution exist in Ireland, or has it done so for the last 80 years? He was greatly afraid that the English Government would not be able to govern Ireland five years from now, unless a different course were pursued. They would not gain the support of any class of people in Ireland if they did not render that country due justice. As to coercion, had it settled anything in the years past? No; and it would not settle the present difficulties or those which might arise. The Irish people were tired of listening to talk about law and order; they did not want English law or coercion. They did not want a military police, such as they had—men acting as spies on all their movements—but they would be satisfied with a police such as that of London, Manchester, or Glasgow. They wanted a police that would look after the lives and property of the people. They wanted liberty, but not such liberty as was promised by the Queen's Speech. Of this he was sure, that the affidavits which had been made with reference to the speeches delivered could not be accepted as evidence by any impartial or unprejudiced jury. The Irish people had a right to complain of the way in which they had been treated, and they had also a right to express their grievances with the view of obtaining justice. Until something more was done than was promised in the Queen's Speech, Ireland would never be satisfied, He hoped the Government would well weigh the remarks he had made. They had many followers, but not so many friends as they thought. Many of their followers were disgusted with their proceedings. Let them pause before they pushed the Irish people to defend their liberty.

MR. GILL said, he believed that every right-minded man felt that the greatest curse to Ireland was the religious animosities and feuds which were raised. If, then, the stopping of this meeting was to be taken as a precedent, it would act as one of the greatest levers in the future for stirring up religious animosities. Wherever religious feeling was the strongest, and a legal meeting was advertised, it would only be necessary to issue a placard and say that the Orangemen were preparing to stop it, and upon that the meeting would be proclaimed. What greater lever than this could be placed in the hands of those who desired to stir up and continue religious animosity? This, however, was the precedent which a Liberal Government prepared to lay down. He could understand that a Conservative Government, if in power, would sanction such a plan; but he could not understand how the Party which prided itself upon its liberality and its love for religious toleration could do so. There had been many cases in which properly organized and legal meetings had been prevented; and he might say that when he addressed his constituents at Mullingar the members of the constabulary who were Roman Catholics were withdrawn from the town, and their places were supplied by Protestants. These were matters which the Government ought to inquire into, with a view to prevent a recurrence of them in future. It was only right they should be assured that when a meeting was legally convened, and was not contrary to law, it would be protected just the same as meetings in England were protected; and if this was not done, especially in the North of Ireland, it would be impossible, for the reasons he had stated, to hold a meeting at all.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, that the circumstances fully justified the course taken by the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly). He had, no doubt, taken an exceptional course; but he was strictly within his rights. The power of moving an adjournment at Question time was one of the few privileges left to private Members, and its object was to put the necessary pressure on a Minister who might be too reticent, or more than ordinary evasive or offensive, in answering a Question. He rose to put a Question to the Solicitor General for Ireland which he hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would not decline to answer. He wished to ask—Was the proceeding of the magistrate strictly legal; did the Government ascertain that before they sanctioned it; and was it legal for a magistrate in Ireland to proclaim a meeting, and then to disperse and shoot the people who came to attend it, and so prevent it being held? If that was the law in Ireland, it was totally different from the law in England, which enabled a magistrate to proclaim a meeting, and left the people free to attend it at their peril. But the magistrate in England could not prevent the people assembling, and could only disperse the meeting in case of riot, and after the Riot Act had been read.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) said, he did not think it quite right that he should be called upon to answer Questions in that way. Every Question put to him in the way authorized by the House he would answer to the best of his ability, and he never attempted to evade answering any Question.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, he certainly thought that, under the circumstances, he might ask the Questions without Notice, because it was to be supposed that the Government would not sanction a course without having ascertained its legality.

MR. FINIGAN said, if the great Statesman now at the head of the Government could apply to Ireland the same reasoning and logic he formerly applied to the Sublime Porte, under what he called the "bag-and-baggage" policy, he would do much to recommend himself to the Irish Representatives. Until the "bag-and-baggage" policy were applied to Ireland, Ireland and England would never be at peace. The office of Chief Secretary was often, very properly, called the office of Chief Persecutor. The Chief Secretary, instead of preserving the Constitution, had directed his efforts against the Constitutional rights of the Irish people. The Castle of Dublin was a perfect Augean stable, and must be thoroughly cleansed. It was filled, not with the Representatives of the people, but of the landlords and governing class alone. It must be swept away before they could hope to have any official or unofficial information respecting Ireland on which they could rely. He had a deep respect for the legal knowledge of the Attorney and Solicitor Generals for Ireland; but if the conditions in England and Ireland were equal, if the political franchise was the same in both countries, neither of those Gentlemen would have a seat on the Treasury Bench, and if the Irish people had any voice in the election of their Chief Secretary, certainly their choice would not fall on the right hon. Member for Bradford. They had had pledges from Ministers that if the meetings in Ireland were properly conducted they would not be interfered with; but now the utilization of military forces was contemplated when there was not the slightest need for such measures. The efforts of the Irish people had been directed, and successfully directed, towards thoroughly peaceful meetings. On some occasions language was certainly made use of which many men might find reason to complain of; but extreme circumstances necessitated extreme language. It should be remembered that men who had suffered were apt to speak their feelings plainly. But the fact was, there had been remarkable toleration at these meetings, which must not be judged of in the light of many expressions made use of by Members of this House. The meetings ought to be judged of by the general average of the different speeches delivered, and by the words of the chief speaker. In no meeting throughout Ireland had there been said things so harsh as had been said during this debate by the Leaders of the Government. The Premier he had always regarded as a man of fearless courage, whose opinions were worthy of the utmost respect; but he was sorry to find him speaking so ill of the Irish agitation. The right hon. Gentleman had once concluded an address to the electors of South-West Hampshire with the memorable sentence, "Be just, and fear not." The Irish Members, in remonstrating with the Government, wished to be just, and, therefore, they feared not. It was a lamentable thing when an Executive Government could be found weak enough to suspend a meeting on the mere evidence of two or three interested magistrates. If the Government did not know, it ought to know, that the magistracy of Ireland—indeed, the whole administration, the whole bag and baggage—was simply one great mass of class interest against the national interest. That Government was not liberal, and that Administration was not just, who lent itself to such measures as were contemplated. He could tell both Tories and Liberals that the great religious curse of sectarianism, which had formerly been upheld in England by this House, was now being buried by the hatchet of this Land League in Ireland. The time was coming when those across the Boyne and those in the South of Ireland would deeply regret that they had ever taken up the sword for the miserable Stuarts. The Irish people would have cause to teach the English, in the future, the lessons which they had been taught by the English in the past. The Irish would teach the people of England their own practices and preach their own principles. They would speak out in the open, and be just and would fear not. If any attempt was made in that House to fetter the Irish people more than they were already fettered, and to suspend the Constitution, he could only repeat the words of the illustrious Grattan—"Peace with England with liberty, but withal liberty."

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY thought the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland might have answered the Question which his hon. Friend had put to him. He must have been considering the right of the people to hold such meetings, the right which the Crown had to prevent them, and the punishment that might be inflicted on those who held them, and yet, in the middle of a debate lasting over an hour and a-half, when he was asked a broad and simple question as to the right of the people to hold meetings, and the course pursued by the Government, he had virtually admitted his inability to answer the question. Such a confession had not been made for a long time by a Law Officer of the Crown for Ireland. He did not attribute that to want of capacity or knowledge on the part of the hon. and learned Gentleman, for he knew that the hon. and learned Gentleman possessed both. But it showed that the Government which the hon. and learned Gentleman represented did not know the ground on which they were standing, or whether they were violating the rights of the Irish people or not. It was evident that the affidavits forwarded by those Orange magistrates had not been submitted to the Law Officers of the

Crown. They could picture affidavits constantly reaching the Chief Secretary, and then—what no one could picture with regard to England—the right hon. Gentleman, without consulting the law of the land, directing those meetings to be put a stop to. The hon. Member for Roscommon was to be thanked for bringing forward this subject, because it was shown that the people of the North of Ireland, who were said to be opposed to this movement, were really in its favour. But there was more that had been shown by the clear evidence which the actor in the scene had given—namely, that the Chief Secretary had been grossly misled in this transaction. The right hon. Gentleman had yet to learn that he could not trust the Orange magistrates, who were too much bound up with the land system to be relied on. The best thing the right hon. Gentleman could do was to reject evidence coming from such a quarter, and to send down 50 or 100 soldiers to protect the meetings as he had done on another occasion.

MR. BARRY rose to emphasize the Question put by the hon. Member for Galway. That Question was, whether for the present and the future the right of public meeting was to be at the disposal of magistrates, no matter how prejudiced and bigoted they might be? That was the constitutional doctrine uttered from the Treasury Bench that night. It should be borne in mind before the Irish Government proceeded to disperse public meetings that hundreds of those meetings had been held in Ireland during the last twelve months without the slightest disorder or violence. There was no period in history telling of an agitation of the kind which showed so little disturbance; the discontent in Ireland was grievously well-founded, and there had been little law-breaking. When he himself had attended a meeting in Ireland, and when looking at the hungry, pinched faces around him, he was astounded at the moderation and toleration displayed. These facts were not acknowledged or taken into consideration by the Government. It was of the utmost importance that before Ministers turned to the consideration of coercive measures, they should fully understand what measures came under the scope of the law and what did not. It was a shameful thing to talk of utilising the soldiery for purposes of oppression. But coercion had been tried before and had failed. He could imagine no method so likely to create tumult and disorder as that supported by the Chief Secretary It was of the utmost importance before proceeding to the consideration of coercive measures that the House and the country should fully understand the nature an d powers of the law as it existed in Ireland at this moment. Before the constitutional doctrine laid down by the right hon. Gentleman was accepted, he hoped the dumb Benches on the opposite side would give some expression to their opinion as to the right of public meeting in Ireland. It should be clearly understood that if that was accepted, the principles of liberty and freedom would be outraged and the right of public opinion in Ireland denied.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR wished, before the conclusion of the debate, to draw attention to the attitude of Her Majesty's Government towards the Representatives from Ireland. Member after Member had risen to complain that the primary rights of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland were entirely disregarded, and the Government had not offered a word in explanation of their conduct. The Irish people were told that they were under the same law as the people of this country. But, according to the Common Law, no public meeting could be interfered with unless on the ground of blasphemy, sedition, intimidation, defamation, or such like cause. The Irish people claimed to use the same rights which the English people had, and to hold their meetings without apology or notice or asking the leave of any man. But, as a matter of fact, they did not allow Irishmen that liberty. In 1975, Mr. Fox was severely attacked in the House for attending public meetings, and his vindication of himself might be read with profit by Her Majesty's present Advisers. An English writer had well said that Governments in every stage of barbarism hated freedom of speech; and it was precisely because the Government in Ireland was so much worse than it was in England that those charged with the administration of the law in that country were much more hostile to public meeting than they were here. The right hon. Gentleman said last night that the situation of Ireland was a situation of shame beyond that of any other country. But the right hon. Gentleman knew well that there was not another Government in Europe which would attempt to govern by force as it was now proposed to do. It was not because Ireland was dragooned and coerced as Bulgaria used to be that the right hon. Gentleman ought to hang his head for shame; but because, having vindicated the rights of the Irish people when in Opposition, now that he was in power he condescended to receive his policy from his opponents, and from the most determined, systematic, and irreconcilable of them, the Fourth Party. His object was, not to discuss the propriety of holding meetings, but to call attention to the attitude of the Government towards Ireland, and to express his opinion that the majority of the Irish people would think it impossible to obtain justice from the British Ministry.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 38; Noes 301: Majority 263.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATION OF "DISTURBED" COUNTIES.

Mr. GIBSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, How many counties in Ireland are now proclaimed as "disturbed," giving the dates of the first and last of the proclamations issued for the purpose; also, how many agrarian outrages were reported to the constabulary between 1st January 1880 and 31st December 1880; how many cases of absolute and partial "Boycotting" were similarly reported between same dates; in how many cases is police protection now given for the protection of life; and, in how many cases are people specially looked after for protection purposes?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, five counties had been proclaimed—namely, Galway, Mayo, Kerry, Limerick, and Leitrim—also the West Riding of the County of Cork, and the Barony of Inishowen, in the County of Donegal. The first proclamation was issued on the 7th of October, and the last on the 18th of December. Yesterday he presented and laid on the Table of the House Returns of the outrages, and he hoped they would be in the hands of hon. Members almost immediately. Those Returns stated the number of persons to whom police protection was given, and how many cases had to be specially looked after for protection purposes. As to the question of "Boycotting," that was not an easy matter on which to make a Return, as "Boycotting" was not yet a regularly ascertained legal offence. But, no doubt, there were several cases which might be considered to come under the class of agrarian outrages.

Mr. GIBSON said, that, no doubt, the right hon. Gentleman had laid the Papers on the Table; but they would not be in the hands of Members until this debate was nearly over.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER hoped they would be in the hands of Members very soon.

Mr. GIBSON remarked, that the debate would be going on. Would the right hon. Gentleman at once give them any of the figures he had asked for?

Mr. W.E. FORSTER said, he thought they were given last night. The number of persons under protection had now, he was sorry to say, increased to 153. As to the number of persons looked after by the police, it was a very unpleasant looking after, inasmuch as it meant a constant finding out where they were going in order that they might be protected, the looking after their houses at night, and, in fact, giving them a general protection, which would be more obnoxious and more distressing to most hon. Members than a great deal of danger. Personal protection was a matter on which he did not know how he should feel unless he were tried; but he almost felt that he would rather be in considerable danger of his life than be accompanied by two armed policemen from morning till night, and have them in the house from night till morning. The number of agrarian outrages to the end of December was 2,573. He believed the Return would be in the hands of hon. Members on Monday.

Mr. BIGGAR inquired whether that number included threatening letters?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, it did. He thought he could show, when the proper time arrived, that threatening letters meant a great deal in many parts of Ireland, although they might not mean much in many cases. As for himself, he was in the position of having received letters threatening his life, from both sides at once, on the same morning. Threatening letters received by persons like himself were not included in the Returns. Those mentioned in the Returns were letters which would very much alarm the hon. Gentleman himself if he received them while living in the West of Ireland. Independent of threatening letters, the number of agrarian outrages was 1,246.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—THE PROHIBITED MEETING AT DROGHEDA.

MR. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the conduct and language of Captain Keogh and Mr. Clifford Lloyd, stipendiary magistrates at Drogheda, on Saturday last, as reported in the "Freeman's Journal" of the 3rd inst.; whether it is true that, when the local magistrates summoned together for consultation declined to stop the meeting or interfere with it, "Captain Keogh said he would take it upon himself to disperse it," and thereon "wired for instructions to Dublin Castle, when a reply came to stop the meeting;" is it a fact that Mr. Clifford Lloyd, in answer to the chairman of the meeting, called upon to disperse at the point of the bayonet, refused to show his authority, stating "I have none and will show none;" whether those magistrates acted upon sworn information or with the sanction or concurrence of their brother magistrates; and, whether their course of procedure was authorised by the Chief Secretary?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: It is utterly impossible for anyone in my position to answer these Questions without first having an opportunity, by more adequate Notice, of inquiring into the facts; and I cannot but think the hon. Member must have been perfectly conscious of that when he put his Question on the Paper. I must ask the hon. Member to be good enough to postpone his Question until I can communicate with Dublin in reference to it.

MR. CALLAN: I very willingly accede to the right hon. Gentleman's request; but perhaps he can inform the House in the meanwhile whether the dispersal of the meeting at Drogheda was authorized by himself by telegram?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I may state, in reply to this Question, that I left Ireland two or three days before the meeting in question took place; but I have heard no reason whatever why I should dissent from what has been done by the authorities in Ireland. I sent no telegram in reference to this matter. I think it not unreasonable I should ask for time to ascertain the facts before I give a reply to the Question in this House.

AFGHANISTAN AND TURKEY—THE PAPERS.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether he could produce on an early day the Papers relating to the affairs of Afghanistan, and when the Government would be able to produce any of the other Papers promised in Her Majesty's Speech, especially those relating to the affairs of Turkey?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The Papers relating to Afghanistan are in the printer's hands, and I hope they will be in the hands of hon. Members in a very few days. I cannot give any information as to the other Papers which have been promised.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE WAR IN BASUTOLAND—THE INSTRUCTIONS TO SIR HERCULES ROBINSON.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked the Prime Minister, Whether he has any objection to lay on the Table of the House the instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson with a view to the restoration of peace in Basutoland?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir Hercules Robinson has taken his departure for Cape Town at a recent date, and cannot arrive at the seat of Government for nearly a fortnight from the present time. There is a serious inconvenience in the publication of his instructions before his arrival. There is a general rule against the publication of such instructions until the person to whom they are addressed is on the spot and prepared to act upon them. These instructions are generally given in great detail, and if insufficient extracts only are telegraphed from this country they may produce an erroneous effect by misleading, more or less, the public on the spot. I hope, therefore, there will be great carefulness exercised by any persons who may telegraph portions of these instructions to the Cape to avoid the difficulty I have alluded to. I am sensible that this is a very special case, and I have been pressed by the Leader of the Opposition to give an opportunity for an early discussion of it. I have reason to believe that a Member of this House may give Notice of an Amendment on the Address, and may produce that discussion in the course of the debate in which we are now engaged. We feel so much the strength of the appeal made in these circumstances, considering the great importance of the questions relating to the Transvaal and Basutoland, that we shall produce the instructions at once for the information of the House, in order that the House may be able to criticize the policy of the Government.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON was much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for this information; but he desired to know whether he understood him to say that so far as the Government were concerned if any Motion relating to Basutoland were discussed they would desire it to be brought forward as a distinct Amendment to the Reply to the Address? Would it be convenient to have the discussion in this manner, or to take it on a special day?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH expressed the hope that the right hon. Gentleman's answer related rather to the Transvaal than to the Basutoland Papers, because the premature publication of the instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson as regarded Basutoland might really be fraught with danger to his influence with the Cape Government on the subject.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am not aware that there is any greater objection in the case of the instructions in regard to Basutoland than in regard to the instructions relating to the Transvaal. It is only on very special grounds that there is any justification for departing from the general rule. With regard to any discussion in the case of Basutoland I must leave my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) to exercise his own discretion; and I will only say on our part that it is not in our power consistently to depart as to any arrangement for the assignment of any special day for any subject whatever, except that subject to which, so far as depends on us, we desire for the present, and in the interest of all parties, to give exclusive prominence.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE.

The O'DONOGHUE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he could give particulars of the arrest of a member of the Land League at Tralee?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER appealed to hon. Members not to put Questions of that kind without affording him time to obtain the information required. It was quite impossible that he could acquaint himself with every individual case of arrest as it arose.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, that considering the matter involved the liberty of the individual, if even so insignificant a one as the Irish individual, he trusted that the Government would take steps when there was any interference with a person's liberty in Ireland to acquaint the House with the matter forthwith.

The O'DONOGHUE said, he had given the right hon. Gentleman Notice of this Question at noon that day.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. PARNELL: Before proceeding to move the Amendment of which I have given Notice, I may be permitted to say that it would have been exceedingly convenient for us to have had more detailed information as to the measures of coercion which the Government propose to introduce for Ireland. We are speaking to a certain extent in the dark, and I could have wished that the Prime Minister had extended the scope of his observations and have given us the same information in regard to coercion as he did with respect to the proposed Land Bill. In the absence of such information we must do the best we can; but I trust the Chief Secretary will be able to inform us this evening of the general nature of the measures of coercion which he proposes. I want to assume at the outset that there are many Members of this House, and I hope the result may prove that it is the majority, who are desirous of being informed on the question of alleged agrarian crime and outrages, and are desirous of giving fair play to Ireland. In looking at it in this point of view, I think it is our duty to do all we can to remove the prejudices, the misconceptions which have arisen with regard to the state of affairs in Ireland. I have occasionally come over to this country since Parliament last met, and I have been myself alarmed by reading the English newspapers, and I have almost at times been tempted to think that some sudden change had arisen in Ireland during the few days of my stay here, and that instead of a state of disturbance and outrage below the normal condition of the last 30 or 40 years, as I shall prove by statistics, some extraordinary epidemic of crime had arisen there. I am not at all surprised that Englishmen and foreigners should have been led away by the deliberate conspiracy which the Press of this Metropolis has set on foot against the good name of Ireland. I do not mean to say that many things have not occurred in Ireland which we must deplore; but, unhappily, things have always occurred which we must deplore. This conspiracy on the part of the guides of public opinion in England is a very hard thing for us to meet. We have not usually the opportunity of appearing on your platforms, and of speaking to large English audiences; and when we find ourselves face to face with a persistent and repeated attempt to mislead public opinion with regard to Ireland it almost makes one despair of demonstrating the real truth. The difference between public opinion in England and Ireland is really the clue to this. Our people understood thoroughly their own wants and wishes when we set on foot an agitation to carry out certain reforms. If that agitation was proceeding in England the English people would be well acquainted with it; but because it takes place in Ireland an opportunity was afforded for the grossest misrepresentation, and it becomes almost impossible to set public opinion right. I was glad that the Prime Minister said that there had been considerable exaggeration of the actual amount of crime in Ireland, and that he did not base his claim for exceptional legislation entirely on the existence of outrages, but rather on the difficulty of obtaining convictions against persons and of getting evidence. Perhaps I might, before going further, quote the object and explain the purposes of the Irish National Land League. In doing so, I shall not in any way prejudice the trials which are now proceeding. Adverting to these trials, I may say in passing that this is the first jury which has ever been empanelled to try a political cause in Ireland which the Crown has not succeeded in packing. The objects of the League are very simple—1st, to prevent rack-renting; 2nd, to enable tenants to become owners of their own farms by paying a fair rent for a limited number of years; 3rd, to facilitate the working of the Bright Clauses of the Land Act—those are the objects which we have been working to bring to a successful issue. Hon. Members will admit that there is nothing so very dreadful in those objects; but they may say we have sought to carry out those objects by improper means; that we have incited to outrage, or, if we have refrained from outrage, we have not sufficiently reprobated it. I can only say that, for my part, I think at every meeting at which I spoke in Ireland up to the time when the Chief Secretary sent extra constabulary into the starving localities of Galway and Mayo, that I took care to reprobate outrage and to point out that we did not wish outrage, but we wished to act in a peaceful and Constitutional manner. The other prominent members of the League acted in the same manner, and even exceeded me in the vehemence with which they denounced it. My friend Mr. Davitt, immediately on his return from America, pointed out that nothing would so much go against our cause as the commission of outrages; and although some members belonging to the League may have said incautious, foolish, and hasty expressions calculated to mislead the people to whom they were addressed, yet I believe such occurrences were very exceptional, and wherever they did occur the speakers were always reproved for their incautiousness and took care to remedy it. The course the Land League recommended was agitation by means of public meetings throughout the country; that the people should be recommended to organize themselves, to unite together, and to refuse to pay more than a fair rent, and to refuse also to take farms from which another tenant had been evicted in consequence of inability or refusal to pay more than a fair rent.

Some of the apparent accompaniments of that agitation are very much to be deplored; but the agitation has consisted, up to the present time, of something like 200 land meetings, attended by crowds unprecedented in number since the time of O'Connell. Undoubtedly the heart of the Irish people has been stirred in a way that has not occurred before in our generation; and the fact that, although excited and just emerged from a state of famine, during which the landlords took the opportunity to carry out evictions in an unprecedented manner, the facts, as seen in a Return laid on the Table last night, show that the number of outrages is below the averages during the years comprised in the Return, is a striking testimony to general peace and tranquillity of the country. During the first six months of the year 1880, the landlords took advantage of the opportunity which distress and famine afforded them in many parts of Ireland to execute ejectments against 1,696 heads of families, involving probably 8,480 persons. Of these 268 were re-admitted as tenants, and 1,355 as care-takers. Are we not entitled to assume that very much of the sudden increase of the crime during the four months which elapsed since the Summer Assizes arose from an attempt on the part of the landlords to turn out the people who had been admitted as care-takers, and whom they could eject by a summary process, which required neither notice to quit or to bring persons before a Court of Quarter Sessions? The amount and character of the crime has also been enormously exaggerated. The Chief Secretary stated to-night that the number of agrarian outrages in 1880 was 2,573, and of these nearly half were threatening letters. Letters of that kind are very common. I believe the people often write them to themselves, and a country should not get a bad name because of such letters. If a country in which such letters are prevalent deserves a bad character, England is certainly worthy of blame, for numberless letters containing threats are sent to me and other members of the Land League from this country. I received a number of them to-day; but, of course, nobody in his senses takes any notice of them. The man who writes a threatening letter is not the man to act up to his words. In 99 cases out of 100 he is too great a coward. The other day I was travelling to London, and a man who sat beside me, but did not know me, said—"I tell you what ought to be done to that Parnell; he ought to be shot for the way in which he shoots the landlords in Ireland." I am sure the Prime Minister would have been surprised if I had applied for protection when travelling on the North-Western. Threatening letters, no doubt, are foolish and wrong; but I do not think they should be taken much notice of. Well, I find by the Returns just issued that the average number of outrages reported by the Constabulary since the year 1844, including the year 1880, amount to 5,000 per annum. In 1880 the number of outrages reported to the Constabulary only amounted to 4,654. Compare this with the year 1845, when the number was 8,104; or the year 1846, when the number was 12,382; or with the year 1847, when the number was 20,986; or with 1848, when it was 14,480; or with 1849, when it was 14,980; or with 1850, when the number was 10,639, and you will see I can fairly claim that the year 1880, with 4,654 outrages only, is, at all events, among years of peace and order in Ireland. The year 1870 is a favourable one to compare with 1880. We had not then the distress, and, therefore, there was the less cause—I will not say reason—for outrage than to-day. 1870 was one of the years chosen by the English Minister of the day for bringing forward coercion. We find in that year there were 1,359 agrarian outrages, of which 624 were threatening letters, or about half. In 1870 there were only 549 ejectments; in the year 1880 there were 1,696 ejectments. If that ratio had been kept up, it would have given us 2,360 ejectments instead of 549 in 1870; but, owing to the action of the Irish National Land League, they only amounted to 2,000 for the first half of the year, thus leaving only 400 for the six months during which the League had got into operation after the failure of the Chief Secretary and the House of Commons to deal with the question. We find in those two years that the ratio of agrarian crime to ejectments was 2½ to 1; while in 1880—a year of unprecedented agitation, following a year of famine—the ratio was something like 1 of agrarian crime to 1½ of ejectments. In other words, there was 2½ times as much agrarian crime in 1870 in proportion to the ejectments as there was in 1880; but if I compare the year 1880 with 1871 and other years, I find a still more remarkable difference, and I will ask hon. Members to mark well those figures. We find there is an enormous improvement in these days as compared with those old times in 1831 and following years, when the tithe agitation was in full swing. The tithe agitation was an agitation of a very similar character to the present anti-rent war agitation. It was an agitation directed by O'Connell for the purpose of preventing the people from the necessity of paying about £750,000 towards the income of the late English Establishment in Ireland; that was a smaller sum of money. The people were agitated in very much the same way; but they were not organized. The anti-rent movement of the present day is directed to prevent the people from the necessity of paying about £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 in the year. So that you will see that there is about five times the amount of money in question in these days that there was in question in 1831. Now, what do we find with regard to 1831? We find that Petitions were sent in to the House of Lords, complaining that there existed in Ireland a systematic opposition to the payment of tithe, just as they complain today that there exists a systematic opposition to the payment of rent, which I deny. I admit there is a systematic opposition to the payment of more than a fair rent, and the people have taken the Poor Law valuation as the most convenient standard of what a fair rent ought to be; but I deny that there is a systematic opposition to the payment of all rents, and that it was impossible to collect them without having recourse to the aid of constabulary. This systematic opposition took the form of organized intimidation, just as they complain to-day, and we are told that the Government found it necessary to introduce a Bill to prevent and punish this rising by what they called the Whiteboy Act; but we have got the Whiteboy Act in full force to-day, and the Act which was put in force to repress the tithe-rent agitation is in full swing in Ireland at the present moment. The Act, though it repeals the punishment of death in certain cases, was, nevertheless, a penal statute. You ask for exceptional powers, and I dare say a great many in this House hardly know the extreme stringency of the exceptional measures that already exist in Ireland in the shape of the Whiteboy Act. But, in spite of this Whiteboy Act, the agitation against tithes increased in violence and extent, as every agitation in Ireland will increase in spite of any coercive measures this House may think proper to pass until the cause of the agitation has been removed. In Kilkenny during that period there were, as stated by Mr. Stanley in the debate on the Address in 1831, 32 murders and attempts at murder, 34 burnings of houses, 36 assaults of a dangerous character. Contrast the condition of Kilkenny, as depicted by Mr. Stanley, with the condition of the Kilkenny of the present day, or rather, I will say, contrast one of the worst Provinces in Ireland, so far as the commission of outrages—the Province of Munster—contrast the whole Province of Munster with the condition of that day. I have not given the contrast from Judge Fitzgerald's Charge. With regard to the condition of Munster, I regret exceedingly that Judge Fitzgerald's Charge has been relied upon as a reason for coercion. Yet this is the state of Munster, consisting of four counties—Clare, Limerick, Kerry, and Cork; Cork being, as the House is aware, the largest county in Ireland—threatening letters, 287; shooting into houses, and malicious injuries, 18; maiming cattle, 33; arson, 69; therefore, taking the whole Province of Munster, the worst Province in the point of outrages in Ireland is not so bad to-day as the county of Kilkenny in 1831. In Ireland, which has, unfortunately, an unhappy history, the people have been driven to rely too much upon murder and outrage for the redress of their grievances, and to feel there is nothing to keep them in their homes but the fear that may be inspired by threatening letters, or the shooting of landlords or agents, or the burning of some of their outhouses or haystacks; and the politician who attempts to originate a movement in Ireland might do so with the knowledge that there will be crime and outrage wherever there is disturbance and eviction, and that he will be accused and made responsible for the result of the unhappy history of the country in which he has organized this movement, as I have been in the present instance.

I have not been able to do away with the usual condition. I wish it had been otherwise; but there is an enormous improvement. I have shown you that, as compared with the number of evictions, the statistics of crime show that there had been in 1870 two and a-half times as much agrarian outrages and crime as we have now in 1880; and recollect that this was a time when there was no distress or famine—when the people had not come through a terrible year of misfortune and oppression, and when there was no agitation or organization. I claim for the organization that it has been most effectual in preventing crime in Ireland. I feel convinced that if it had not been for our exertions the ratio of evictions, which commenced in the first half of 1880 at 1,600 and odd, would have gone on increasing, and that you should have murder and outrage on the scale of some of those unhappy years about which I have just quoted; and I warn the Government that if they attempt to put down Constitutional rights in Ireland—if they take away from the people the right of meeting publicly and discussing their grievances—if they prevent them from organizing—if they prevent them bringing to bear the strong force of public opinion on individuals who defy the public opinion of their neighbours, they will see murder and outrage walking abroad through the land, notwithstanding all their constabulary, and all their police, and all their Coercion Acts. They may strike down the leaders who are using their influence, and I am thankful to say they have effectually used their influence, to prevent crime and outrage up to the present moment. If they do these things they will have murder and crime. The landlords will be encouraged to evict, and they will grind them down as they ground them down before. The spirit that has been aroused in Ireland will not be willing to submit to this tyranny, and what I have stated will be the result. I think it right to state what I know must happen even from the prospect of coercion as encouraging the landlords to evict. We had yesterday, as the ill-omened accompaniments of the Queen's Speech, the news that the police had fatally injured two men in attempting to carry out an eviction or process-serving, and that several persons were seriously hurt. This is the beginning of what we are going to have. You may take away the arms from the people; but never yet was an agrarian murder prevented in Ireland for want of a blunderbuss to shoot the landlord. Now, the choice that we have before us is this—whether you will have an open organization, which, undoubtedly, has committed some mistakes, whose action in some respects is open to blame and criticism—I do not wish to deny for a moment; this action is being very fast modified by experience and by advice in such a way as to make it exceptional—whether you will have such an open organization, or whether you will have a secret conspiracy. Secret conspiracies do not now exist in Ireland. I used to hear of the secret conspiracy of Ribbonism—a most powerful organization—an organization which, I have been informed, had its head-quarters in Manchester; but if you crush down the people with coercion the result must be that you will have Ribbonism and kindred societies for the purpose of doing that by secret conspiracy which you prevent them from doing by open organization. The majority of the inhabitants of Ireland—the agricultural labourers and farmers of Ireland, who constitute, practically speaking, with their wives and families, 5,000,000 out of the population, or five-sixths of the populace—this class has been stirred in an unprecedented way. They have been taught to rely upon open agitation and organization, to rely upon combination amongst themselves, and upon the force of public opinion to prevent persons from offending against the unwritten law of the majority of the people of Ireland; and when I say the unwritten law, I wish to point out to you that the majority of the people of Ireland do not make their laws themselves, that they are made for them by a nation outside themselves, entirely unacquainted with the wants and wishes of the people of that country. The result is that if there are unjust laws pressing upon them, as the agrarian laws of Ireland are admitted to be, the only way the people can protect themselves from them is by their own unwritten laws, which they have striven to enforce, and have successfully enforced, so far, up to the present occasion, by the strong force of public opinion. I agree that in a well-ordered community, existing under normal conditions, responsible for its own prosperity, with its Representatives entirely responsible to those who elected them, and no others, and with power to do everything for themselves, the invocation of public opinion against the law of the land would be a most criminal proceeding; but I deny it is the case in Ireland. It has been at times recognized in every country which has not had the privilege of self-government that resistance to unjust laws is sometimes legitimate; and I can conceive no higher duty of patriotism on the part of the Irish tenant than the willingness to go to gaol and suffer hard labour rather than surrender his right to feed his family and support them by the produce of the soil he tills. We have, undoubtedly, called upon them to resist by organization and without violence, and by passive resistance, by refusing to take a farm from which another had been evicted, by refusing to deal with the person who takes his farm, or with the person who supplies him with provisions. We have, undoubtedly, organized the people to resist in this way those unjust laws which are the result of the legislation of this House; but the emergency was such that there was no other resource open to us. We had been left defenceless after the close of last Session by the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. During the passing of the Act I voted with the Government on the second reading. It was not until they had spoiled their Bill by striking out a vital portion of it, by the introduction of a limitation, that I felt it to be my duty to walk out of the House; and when it came to the third reading I also abstained from voting. But so long as the Bill remained in its original shape, so long as it embraced the first intentions of the Government, I supported it, and was willing to do that which would have undoubtedly very materially injured the agitation in Ireland by facilitating the passing of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last Session. Mr. Speaker, let me, in conclusion, give a very brief history of coercion for Ireland. From 1796 to 1823 nine different coercion measures were passed, including three suspensions of the Habeas Corpus, one Martial Law, and five Insurrection Acts. From 1830 to the present date 48 different coercion measures, including seven suspensions of the Habeas Corpus, were passed by this House. The Government tell us that they cannot get evidence, and that they want measures for the purpose of getting evidence. This reminds me of the saying that one man can take a horse to the water, and 40 cannot make him drink. It is not intimidation prevents witnesses coming forward and giving evidence. It is not intimidation prevents the tenants from paying rent; but it is the public opinion of the majority of the people. I regret that some ground has been given for that charge of intimidation with regard to the payment of rent. I regret that tenants have not yet sufficient moral courage to go to the landlord and say—"We won't pay you more than the Government valuation, because by doing so we believe we shall injure the settlement of the Land Question." I regret that, on the contrary, many of the tenant farmers go and say—"If we paid more than the Government valuation we should have our houses burned down, our cattle houghed, or ourselves injured." But where is the intimidation? The intimidation is on the part of the landlords, to whom the tenant is afraid to speak the truth. The intimidation is not on the part of the Irish National Land League. It is simply because the poor wretched creatures, many of them recollecting so much of their own unhappy history, have not the moral courage to go to the landlord and tell him—"We won't pay you what we believe to be an unjust rent." This question, Mr. Speaker, is a question of money, not of saving lives; it is a question of saving £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 a-year for the landlords of Ireland; and if the Government succeed in passing a Coercion Bill, it will be because they were driven to it by the landlords, who desire to obtain this sum of money, and not because there is any danger to life, and the immediate sum in dispute amounts to £4,000,000 or £5,000,000; and the question on the part of the landlords is one of cupidity and a desire to reap that which they have not sown, to get more than they are entitled to for their land. The tenants think—and rightly think, in my opinion—that it is enough for them to pay the Poor Law valuation; that after they have made the lands what they are, after they have reclaimed them from a state of nature, they are justly entitled to some of the profits, and they have fixed upon this Griffith's valuation as being that on the average which they can afford to pay. It would amount to something like £10,000,000 on the agricultural holdings in Ireland. The landlords claim something like £15,000,000, and the Government have been asked to introduce coercion for the purpose of putting into the pockets of the Irish landlords £15,000,000 instead of £10,000,000. I ask, is that a worthy use to make of a Liberal Party of unexampled strength and liberality, that they should allow themselves immediately on coming into Office to be made the catspaw of a minority over in Ireland? Not even of a minority in your own country; for a minority in your own country could not so hoodwink and blind you as to speak of force. I entreat the House to pause before it plunges into the abyss before it, and enacts coercion for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had a chance of propitiating Ireland. He was nearer it than he thought; he had, perhaps, the best chance of persuading the Irish people that this House was desirous of making good and just laws for them; but if he brandishes the weapon of coercion at these people, the result will be that he will make it still more impossible for him to do that. He will never do it by coercion or terror; he might have had a chance of relieving Ireland by goodwill—a generous, a true, and a noble policy. But you have never been able to rule the Irish people by terror and coercion, and you never will be able to so rule them. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. TOTTENHAM said, they had heard a statement from the hon. Member for the City of Cork which anyone acquainted with Ireland knew was the most misleading statement and most incorrect representation that had ever been laid before the House of Commons or the English public. The hon. Gentleman said there had been the greatest possible exaggeration on the subject in the English newspapers. On the contrary, he emphatically stated that the English public had no conception of one tithe of what was daily and hourly occurring in Ireland. The hon. Member said there had been no objection to pay what he called a fair rent, and he made the Government valuation the measure of its fairness. Now, he could quote numberless instances in which tenants whose holdings were valued at or below Griffith's valuation had refused to pay any rent at all. He knew of one case in which the rents were below Griffith's valuation, and a meeting was held on that estate at which a resolution was passed declaring that Griffith's valuation was a most exorbitant amount, and no man could afford to pay it. The hon. Member said that there were no secret societies existing at present in Ireland. Anyone who had anything to do with the administration of justice in that country knew that that was not the fact. The hon. Member also said that the majority of the Irish people only refused to pay more than what was called a fair rent. That was not the case. The majority of Irishmen were still honest and wished to meet their obligations; but they were under the influence of the system of intimidation practised in the country, owing, in a great measure, to the action of the hon. Member and his Colleagues. The Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant last Session repeated, from time to time, his opinion that it was the clear duty of the Government to enforce the law, and that that was their primary obligation which they intended to carry out. The Prime Minister, both in Parliament and at the Guildhall and elsewhere, and various other Members of the Government at different times and places, endorsed that statement in the most emphatic manner. In fact, such an obvious proposition hardly required the ostentatious reiteration which was accorded to it. Now, he charged the Government with the most distinct and open violation of that pledge, and with having for four months permitted a state of things to go on, daily increasing and getting worse, under their eyes, which had resulted in reducing Ireland to a Pandemonium of crime, outrage, and chaos, which was a disgrace to a civilized nation, and had made England the laughing-stock of the civilized world.

Could a more damning indictment be framed against an Executive Government than that which, within the past week, had proceeded out of the mouth of their own Colleague, the Attorney General for Ireland, who, in a speech lasting three days, had conclusively shown that a more utter collapse of Executive authority than had been exhibited by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland was not to be found recorded in history? Step by step he had shown the progress of the country from bad to worse, and from one crime to another, resulting in total insecurity of life, property, and comfort, till at last the Government, goaded on all sides into doing something, did—what? They instituted a State prosecution, which would cost the country a large sum of money, but with what result to the future of the country was a matter of grave question. They had proclaimed four or five counties as being in a disturbed state and requiring additional police. They had sent four or five extra regiments to aid the civil power, which was rather a mockery, as the civil power was seen to be in total abeyance; and, lastly, the Chief Secretary had issued his famous Circular reminding magistrates of their duties under certain practically obsolete Acts of Parliament. Some of those magistrates had pointed out to the right hon. Gentlemen that it was utterly impossible for them to enforce the administration of the law, as in the case of the magistrates of the county of Cavan, who had replied that they were perfectly aware of the powers and duties under the Acts referred to, but that the law was at present powerless to enforce any orders made by them. A friend of his employed a small number of labourers, who, at the bidding of the Land League, were desired to quit his service, and other means were taken of annoying him in various ways. That gentleman was neither a magistrate nor a landowner, but the renter of a small shooting-lodge in a mountain district. He applied to the resident magistrate of the district to know whether, in the event of informations being sworn by him of the facts of the case, the Crown would proceed under the Acts referred to in the right hon. Gentleman's Circular and take action against the parties, whom he was prepared to swear that there were reasonable grounds to believe were acting on the orders of the Land League? After an interval of a week, the resident magistrate replied that he had applied to the authorities of Dublin Castle, and had received for answer that unless the witnesses came forward and gave sworn testimony in the usual manner the Crown would not proceed. That was the only result of which he had heard from that Circular. Had the crimes and outrages which were of daily occurrence diminished in the slightest degree? On the contrary, in his closing address to the Grand Jury in the county of Cork, Mr. Justice Fitzgerald told them that he had been at pains to ascertain whether any diminution of crime had taken place since the Assizes began; but that he regretted to inform them it was rather on the increase than otherwise. The Judges had one and all described the state of things as intolerable in a civilized country; and there could be read in the impartial and straightforward statements of these, the highest officials of the law, the strongest condemnation of the inactivity of the Government. The right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon gave the House last night an extract from the Charge of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald to the Grand Jury of Cork at the Winter Assizes last month; but what said the other Judges of Assize in corroboration of Judge Fitzgerald's estimate of the state of the country? Mr. Baron Dowse, on the Connaught Circuit, said—

> "If this state of affairs is allowed to continue much longer immediate danger to Ireland will be the consequence, and ultimate disgrace to the Empire of which she forms a part. I fervently pray to God that the cloud of discontent and crime which is brooding over this Province may be speedily removed, and that peace and happiness, truth and justice, may be once more established within its borders."

The Prime Minister had spoken as if the present state of things had only recently culminated; but what said Judge Barry at Waterford on December 9?—

> "There has been for some months past prevailing in many parts of this country a determined spirit of lawlessness and insubordination, and defiance of and contempt for the law have been manifested in offences against the person and property, more or less serious and aggravated, and of the class commonly known as agrarian."

The learned Judge went on to observe—

> "Some people say that in the accounts of these matters that reach us there is much ex-

aggeration, that some of the reports are mere inventions, mere fabrications, or that the offences are not of the agrarian class to which they are attributed, and that the accounts given of them are the result of heated imagination or credulity stimulated by panic. This may be so; but, making every allowance for exaggeration, still, if one-tenth of what we hear and read be true, no sane and candid man can deny that there exists in many parts of this country a state of things demanding grave and anxious consideration."

Judge Lawson, speaking on the North-East Circuit on December 13, said—

> "I have known this country now for nearly half a century, and never in the course of my experience do I remember any state of things at all parallel to that which is now existing. A system of intimidation on a large scale, perfectly unconcealed and openly avowed, is practised, and those concerned in the administration of the law, from the very Judge on the Bench down to the bailiff serving an ejectment process, are all sought to be made subject to this system of intimidation. . . . . Is that a state of things to be tolerated? I should be glad to know whether all the people of the sister countries, all the people of England, are aware—because, if not, it is high time they should be—that while you and I are here administering law under the Queen's commission, there is, at the same time, another system of law being openly executed and carried out, which threatens to supersede altogether the operations of Her Majesty's Courts of Justice."

From North, South, East, and West they had there the most unimpeachable testimony as to the state of things which had existed for months, of course with the full knowledge of the Government. He might refer to a remarkable Memorial lately sent to the Prime Minister signed by 700 magistrates, chairmen of counties, and other persons charged with the administration of the law, and describing the terrible state into which the Government had allowed the country to drift, and to a Memorandum which accompanied the Memorial, stating that time had only permitted it to be sent to those whose names commenced with one of the first eight letters of the alphabet, and that had there been time to send to all those on the official lists the number of signatures would have been trebled. The hon. Member the Mover of the Address had told the House that the increase of crime had been six or seven-fold above the fair and ordinary rates. If he had studied the statistics of crime he would, unfortunately, have seen that the increase had been a far higher percentage In the Province of Connaught and part of Munster, included within the Connaught and Munster Circuits, and embracing only nine counties out of the 32 in Ireland, there were within the four months between the Summer Assizes in July and the Winter Assizes in December, 1,110 indictable offences reported; but there were only 36 cases for trial. Worse than all, there were 580 persons who refused to give any assistance or information in bringing criminals to justice. The 1,110 cases were only, he believed, about one-half of the indictable offences committed, for the same influence which prevented the 580 persons from giving information deterred people from reporting outrages, fearing that worse might happen to them. He hoped the Chief Secretary would not spring the Returns he had promised upon them as he sprung the Returns over the Disturbance Bill of last year, when, at the close of the debate, the Prime Minister quoted an entirely new set of figures and statistics, altogether different from those previously produced, and which he said he hoped would be in the hands of Members the next morning, after the debate was over. If the Chief Secretary had the Returns, and he must be in possession of them, as he had already given some of the figures in reply to questions by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin, it was his bounden duty to produce them for the general information of the House. Extracts had been given from the addresses of Judges; he wished to read to the House the statements of the sheriffs of counties in the South and West of Ireland. He held in his hand letters from eight sub-sheriffs of different counties, which were practically identical in their opinion that the law was in abeyance, not only as regarded the levying of debts due for rent or recovering the possession of land, but that ordinary decrees for debt of other descriptions could not be executed. One sheriff stated—

> "As far as the execution of decrees is concerned, whether for possession or for rent, the law is now totally in abeyance. With a large police force only would I attempt a seizure on a decree for rent; and if I succeeded, such is the state of terror, I would not get a place to keep cattle seized if I were to pay ten times what the law would allow for their sustenance between seizure and sale. I drove 15 miles on Friday last to execute a Superior Court writ, but did not succeed, and my horse would not be admitted into any stable in the village—in fact, having put my horse up where I had been in

the habit of stopping, he was ordered out at once, the Land League, I was told, having given instructions to that effect, and I had to move off at once."

Another sheriff wrote—

> "I am sorry to inform you that the present state of the county is such that the execution of even a 5*s.* decree is an impossibility where a sale has to be resorted to. At the present time no one can even be induced to bid or buy at our sales when in any way connected with land."

Another said—

> "I am decidedly of opinion it would be unwise to proceed to obtain decrees at present for rent. It would be impossible to realize."

Another sheriff wrote—

> "I have received your letter in reference to the 41 decrees you lodged with me for execution against the tenants on above estate. I regret having to inform you that at the present juncture these decrees are worthless, as it is quite impossible that I could realize 1*s.* under any of them. I dare not go on the lands on such a mission without being accompanied by a force of, at least, 150 police. It is idle to disguise the fact—the law in this country, so far as landlord and tenant are concerned, is a dead letter, in illustration of which I may mention that for the last two months in this large county not a single decree or writ for rent could be levied for the reasons I have mentioned."

MR. JOHN BRIGHT: Nothing has been said as to the execution of ordinary decrees, not connected with land.

MR. TOTTENHAM said, he had forgotten to read the extracts referring to that part of the question, one of which was as follows:—

> "They are now opposed to even levying ordinary debts, and shout and cheer myself and bailiffs as we pass along the road. The moment we are seen entering any locality with the view of executing a legal document, a signal is given, and it runs along so that is impossible to make any levy."

Let them compare this picture with the one which the Prime Minister drew in Mid Lothian of the state of Ireland some eight months ago. The words which were read to the House last night by the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon, and which the Prime Minister seemed to question the accuracy of, but which he had taken the trouble to verify for himself to-day from *The Times* newspaper of the 1st April, 1880. The Elysium he then spoke of had been turned into a howling wilderness of crime, outrage, and terror. The right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues had, indeed, permitted the country to come within a measurable distance of civil war; and in this they had been vigorously assisted by those who, remembering his words and advice, had striven in the most unprincipled and criminal manner to bring it within the range of practical politics. They had been gravely told by the Chief Secretary that if the Disturbance Bill did not pass the Government would not be responsible for the peace of the country during the winter owing to the large number of evictions which might be expected.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Will the hon. Member be kind enough to quote the words?

MR. TOTTENHAM said, he had not the extract there; but if the right hon. Gentleman referred to his own speech, no doubt he would find the words there. The Prime Minister had stated that it might be expected that 15,000 people would be turned out homeless and helpless on the road-side; but what had the evictions to do with the existing lawlessness? And he challenged either of the right hon. Gentlemen to say whether it was not the fact that they had not been up to the usual average of ordinary years? It had been said that the late Government did not intend to renew the Peace Preservation Act; but the fact was the new Bill lay already drafted in the Office when the right hon. Gentleman entered it; and the best refutation of these insinuations was the words of the late Prime Minister, who, on the 15th March last, in "another place," and in reply to a Question from Lord Oranmore and Browne, said that it was prudent to assume that the new Parliament would re-enact the Act, and, if necessary, support it with stronger measures, should such be required; and, again, on the 20th of May, during the debate on the Address to the Crown, he strongly animadverted on the decision of the Government in allowing it to drop, and stated that had he remained in power it would have been the duty of his Government to renew it. It had been stated also by the Prime Minister that there was no time for the Act to be renewed between the time of their coming into Office and the expiry of the Act on the 1st of June; but he would remind him that the Peace Preservation Act of 1870 was only introduced on the 17th March, and had passed through both Houses by the 31st, receiving the Royal Assent on the 4th of April. Following this precedent, therefore, there was no reason why a renewal of the Act should not have been passed by the 4th or 5th of June, and in the three or four days' interval between expiry and renewal it was not very likely that there would be any considerable increase of crime, or large importation of arms. He would ask whether the warnings received by the Government from all the permanent officials and from their Predecessors who were best qualified to judge of the state of the country had not been realized? And he would say that a more fatal mistake had never been heedlessly committed in the face of warnings and remonstrances, the neglect of which had left the right hon. Gentleman hopelessly floundering in the mud. On the 7th of October, exactly three months ago, a deputation of Peers, landowners, magistrates, and others, both Liberal and Conservative, waited upon the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, urging upon them the necessity of taking immediate steps for the protection of life and property, and placing before them facts of the strongest character. The Lord Lieutenant, in return, asked for the sympathy of the deputation, and the Chief Secretary asked for suggestions. Sympathy they had none to give, but suggestions were freely given, though it was no part of their province to give such, and those suggestions were unanimous in their character; but no more had been heard from that time till the Gracious Speech from the Throne, in which had been foreshadowed the very measures suggested to the Chief Secretary three months ago. Meanwhile, the Government had sat still apparently in a state of coma, silently and indifferently regarding the ruin and chaos they had permitted, and utterly indifferent to the interests of all law-abiding classes of the community in Ireland who were crying to Heaven for vengeance upon them. Ruin, absolute ruin, had been brought upon hundreds of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland; widows were reduced to beggary, tradesmen brought to bankruptcy, enterprize checked, property rendered unsaleable, securities depreciated, children removed from school because parents were unable to afford the expense of education, servants discharged, and labourers sent home. Capital and employers of labour everywhere leaving the country. That was no fancy picture; but similar instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely. One case he would give in illustration. A gentleman of his acquaintance, who received some £500 or £600 a-year from his property, and whose tenants were rented at 10 per cent under Griffith's valuation, and who, in order to secure something, authorized his agent to offer a further reduction in cases of prompt payment of 15 per cent, had been unable to get 1*s*. of his rents, and he had written to his agent appealing to him to send him something, as he could no longer get credit or bread for his children, and the agent had to send him £10 out of his own pocket. That one case illustrated sufficiently the state of things that he had described. Feelings of hostility had grown up between landlord and tenant, master and servant, and next door neighbours who had, up to that time, been the best of friends. Such a state of lawlessness existed throughout the land as had never been paralleled in the present generation. A statesman had not thought it beneath the dignity of a Cabinet Minister to sneer at the misfortunes of those who were now suffering from the effects of his advice, in the contemptuous remarks in his recently published reply to a justly merited rebuke. He ventured to say also that no English man or woman had read the cruel and heartless reply of the Prime Minister to Captain Boycott without a blush of shame. ["Oh!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] That gentleman had been ruined by the political inaction of the Government; and yet he had received, in response to his appeal for assistance, an answer which was practically to the effect that he had already given too much trouble. He had no hesitation in saying that there was no exaggeration in the accounts which came from Ireland on the state of things existing there. Not a hundredth part of the actual facts reached this country. The sentiment of every honest man in Ireland, whether landlord or tenant, merchant or trader, magistrate or professional man, he believed, was that no Government was worthy of the name that would permit such a state of things as existed in Ireland for even a week, much less for four months. Notwithstanding the accumulated proofs which were presented in October, no less than now, the Government had ruthlessly sacrificed the interests of a large class of Her Majesty's subjects to their political needs, and for such conduct they deserved the reprobation of every law-abiding citizen. There was but one opinion among Liberals and Conservatives alike about the delay and inaction of the Government. The only reason for that inaction, they were told, was that the Government might bring an unanswerable case before the House. That was but small comfort to those who were suffering from that inaction. He would certainly support the long-expected measure for the maintenance of peace in Ireland—a measure which was rendered absolutely necessary by the state of affairs in that country—which he understood the Government were about to bring forward; but with the full conviction that had Ministers not allowed the Peace Preservation Act to expire they would not have seen this degradation of the country, and the Government would not have been under the necessity of asking now for additional powers.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, those whom he had the honour of representing had the fullest confidence in Her Majesty's Government being able to deal successfully with the questions which had arisen in Ireland——[*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell).

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD, continuing, said, he did not agree with the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Tottenham) in thinking that there was any question of a laughing-stock in the matter. He thought it was a very grave and serious matter indeed both for this country and for Ireland. He thoroughly agreed, however, with what was said by the hon. Member for Cork City, when he declared that the circumstances of the present time were very much less grave than they had been at former times when coercion was suggested and recommended by the Government. He regretted to say that he, for one, could not accept the speech they had had from the hon. Gentleman, eloquent and able though it was, as an acquittal of himself and Colleagues, and an excuse for the conduct of the Irish National Land League, whose proceedings he (Mr. Arnold) condemned. In 1848 a much more serious condition of affairs existed in Ireland, civil war being openly advocated in almost every meeting; and the late Mr. Sharman Crawford, who was considered a moderate man, when the Government of that time were bringing forward coercive measures, proposed an Amendment very similar in terms to that of the hon. Member for Cork City, to the effect that the discontent in Ireland was owing to misgovernment, and no coercive legislation would avail and to bring peace and tranquillity to the country. In doing so, that hon. Gentleman declared that he could not occupy a seat in that House without recording his opinion upon the inutility of coercion. When it was an established, though not legalized, practice throughout the South of Ireland that a tenant should purchase and sell the goodwill of his holding at an average of five years' purchase, which was about the average under the Land Act of 1870, was it reasonable to say that because a tenant was unable to pay a year's rent he should lose the five or six years' rental value to which he might otherwise be entitled? That was so clear and palpable an injustice that it was not surprising that the liability to suffer it had produced agitation. One injustice led to another; but with regard to the recommendation of the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) that men should not pay debts they had contracted to pay until there was a just settlement of the Land Laws, he, for one, could have no sympathy with that teaching. Tenants ought to pay what they had contracted to pay; but when the law affecting the tenure of land was so unjust, he was not surprised that, as a consequence, 10,000 acts of injustice should arise throughout Ireland. The circumstances now were not nearly so grave as in 1848, when the late Prime Minister said that if he thought the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was occasioned by political and social evils, he should view the proposition with the greatest jealousy and distrust. They knew perfectly well that the circumstances of the present time proceeded from social and political evils; and, therefore, he viewed the proposal of the Government with some jealousy and distrust. As to the statement that the real object of the agitation was separation from England, he never heard but one man, Feargus O'Connor, advocate that; but if any policy was likely to contravene such advocacy, it was a policy of justice rather than of coercion. He desired to retain Irish Members in the House, and to listen to every plea from Ireland with a sincere desire to do that country justice. It might be that the Government would be able to assign far better reasons than he had yet heard for persevering in a policy of coercion; but at present he considered that if they did persevere in that policy they would so infuriate and exasperate the Irish people that they might expect, not open, but secret crime, and crime of the worst and the most malignant and cruel character. When it was said that in nine-tenths of the crimes reported nobody was made amenable, that betokened the terrible security of criminals. They ought, however, not to place incautious confidence in the Charges of Irish Judges as to the conclusions to be drawn from the statistics with which they were furnished. The learned Judges referred to threatening letters as "extraordinary" crime. But were threatening letters extraordinary? That view could not be maintained by anyone who had read in a recent Return that in 21 months, ending with December 1879, there were 156 cases of threatening letters in the county of Mayo, for which no one was made amenable. The way to stop threatening letters was never to publish them. In his opinion, nothing stimulated the writing of threatening letters more than the publication of them. With regard to the offence of firing into dwelling-houses, the House would bear in mind that such a crime was one that specially indicated some inefficiency in the police. In recently addressing his constituents at Salford, he expressed his regret that the Constabulary had not succeeded in arresting, on the scene of their crimes, the ruffians who fired into dwellings; and he regarded that fact alone as a sufficient proof of the incompetency of the Constabulary for the purposes for which they were required. In England, even poachers hesitated to fire their guns. The question of the Constabulary would be a fit subject for future inquiry by a Select Committee. They were brave and faithful; but they were soldiers rather than policemen. The crime of killing and maiming cattle, which, more than any other, had impressed the feeling of the English people, had been described by the Irish Judges as extraordinary. He could not, however, consider it as extraordinary, for he found that in the Province of Connaught, within 21 months ending December 1879, there had been 72 cases of killing and maiming cattle, of which only 20 were reported by the Constabulary to have an agrarian character, while 52 were reported to have no agrarian character whatever. Such crimes unquestionably marked the degradation of the people, and the only possible mode of exterminating offences of that kind was by raising the moral standard of the Irish people. How could they do that, if they withheld a policy of justice, and if, when a policy of justice was demanded, they substituted a policy of coercion? The hon. Member who had just sat down had referred to the magistrates of Ireland; but he confessed he was not inclined to expect too much from that class. From much observation of the magistracy of Ireland he did not believe that they had done their duty; nor was he surprised. They had been reared on coercive measures; they had always displayed an indecent haste for the suspension of the Constitution; and it was remarkable that these were always the men who were loudest in declaring their admiration for the British Constitution, which they were ready to throw overboard on the first outbreak of disorder in their country. An expression upon this subject was attributed to a right hon. Friend of his, which he thought had been misreported. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster was said to have used the phrase that "force was no remedy for lawlessness." He (Mr. Arnold) knew no other remedy for lawlessness than force. He fancied, however, that what his right hon. Friend really said was that force was no remedy for injustice, and if those were his words he should agree with him.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT did not know whether he had been so reported; but his hon. Friend had entirely misunderstood him.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD thought he had correctly interpreted the meaning of his right hon. Friend to be as he had stated, that force was no remedy for injustice; and it was because he entirely agreed in that sentiment, and considered that force was no remedy for injustice, that he appealed to his English Friends to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City, for which he would undoubtedly give his own vote. Language had been used in Ulster which, he thought, showed a disposition to forget the benefits which Ulster had received from a custom which he hoped would be extended over the South of Ireland. With regard to the non-payment of debts and the decline of credit which had been referred to by the last speaker, he wished to lay before the House some figures which had an important bearing on the question. He held in his hand evidence which he regarded as irrefragable on the subject, bearing, as it did, on the present position of the credit of the banks of Ireland. He had taken the pains to compare the price of £100 capital in each of the Irish banks on the 1st of January, 1880, and the 1st of January, 1881. The following was the result:—Bank of Ireland, January 1, 1880, £300; January 1, 1881, £310. Belfast Bank, January 1, 1880, £400; January 1, 1881, £400. Hibernian Bank, January 1, 1880, £178; January 1, 1881, £172. Munster Bank, January 1, 1880, £220; January 1, 1881, £195. National Bank, January 1, 1880, £197; January 1, 1881, £222. Northern Bank, January 1, 1880, £227; January 1, 1881, £222. Provincial Bank, January 1, 1880, £269; January 1, 1881, £235. Royal Bank, January 1, 1880, £300; January 1, 1881, £315. Ulster Bank, January 1, 1880, £440; January 1, 1881, £415. The result was that in 1880 the average was £281, and in 1881, £276. The Provincial Bank alone showed a considerable falling off. Every Irish Member was aware that the Provincial Bank was the bank of the landlords; and the falling off in the value of its capital was, doubtless, due to the forced sale of a few shares. The most striking fact to which this comparison led was that on the 1st instant the average value of £100 capital in the banks of Ireland was £276, while on the same day the price of £100 Bank of England Stock was £280. He asked his right hon. Friends whether they were prepared to propose a measure of coercion for Ireland—to suspend the Constitutional rights of the Irish people—at a time when, as regarded the state of credit in that country, £100 Bank Stock was close on the value of a similar sum in the far-famed Bank of England. That fact shattered completely all that had been said of the destruction of credit. The entire capital of these nine Irish banks represented a market value of nearly £19,000,000, held by all classes of Irishmen and women, except the poorest. The price afforded a barometer of the secret thoughts of about 20,000 shareholders, possessing an average invested property of nearly £1,000. They included magistrates, landowners, land agents, clergymen, professional men, tradesmen, and farmers. If those persons thought the condition and prospects of Ireland such as was represented by the hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham), was it not certain that the shares of the banks would have been thrown upon the market, and that there would have been a heavy fall in prices? Upon what was the confidence of these Irish shareholders based? They did not look for profit from coercion. It was based, he (Mr. Arnold) said, upon the belief in their minds that the Government both could and would legislate for the benefit of Irish agriculture, and would thus increase and insure the general prosperity of Ireland, and, consequently, that of the banks. He believed, further, that the object which all parties had in view was the welfare of Ireland, although they might be guided by different lights. Coercion, he had no doubt, would intensify the evil; nothing but justice would be a remedy. He confidently hoped, in conclusion, that the majority of the House would bring to the consideration of the affairs of Ireland knowledge, well-placed sympathy, firmness, and patience, and that by a wise and just legislation they would succeed in laying so firmly the foundation of peace, contentment, and happiness, that the voice of sedition should be heard no more in Ireland.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, that he was sure he only expressed the general feeling of his Irish Friends and Colleagues when he prefaced the observations he was about to make by thanking the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) for the very candid and honest support he had given the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell). At the same time, he wished to guard himself from endorsing every expression he had used. The hon. Member for Salford had quoted that famous saying of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in reference to the application of force. As he (Mr. O'Connor Power) endorsed the sentiment which the right hon. Gentleman uttered, he was anxious that it should not be misunderstood. When the right hon. Gentleman used that expression he had been discussing the whole question of Ireland. He had been discussing the position of Ireland as a whole, and, in passing, he said—"Such is a diagnosis of the situation, and for that situation I say force is no remedy." He was surprised that the hon. Member for Salford should think it necessary to notice the accusation of anyone who was dishonest enough to torture that honest and manly declaration of statesmanlike policy. The right hon. Gentleman did not say that force was no remedy for lawlessness; but he said that force was no remedy for the existing condition of things in Ireland, and certainly the whole history of Ireland was sufficient to support him in the declaration that force established no principle; it had no argument, but only stimulated in the minds of people to whom it was applied a desire to rebut force by equal force, and it only prolonged the bitter struggle which might exist between a disaffected population on the one hand, and a tyrannical Government on the other. It was his (Mr. O'Connor Power's) duty, at the opening of the present Parliament last Session, to move an Amendment to the Address, and he then described the programme of Her Majesty's Government as "a meagre programme." The Prime Minister objected to the description, and said he would have more correctly described it as "a modest programme." Be that as it might, he was bound to say that the programme for the present Session was neither modest nor meagre. It was not meagre in the catalogue of measures the introduction of which it contemplated; and he could not recognize the features of modesty in any speech which not only contemplated, but recommended, an attack on Constitutional liberty. There were one or two mis-statements in the Royal Speech which he felt called upon to notice. In the second paragraph they were informed that—

> "The anticipation with which I last addressed you of a great diminution of the distress in Ireland, owing to an abundant harvest, was realized."

It was a mis-statement to say that the distress in Ireland had been considerably diminished owing to an abundant harvest. It had been diminished because the people held the harvest. They had not been afflicted with the spectacle of distress bordering on famine since the harvest, because, owing to the agitation of the Land League in the country, the people had held the harvest, and declined to pay it away in exorbitant rents. Then, again, the right hon. Gentleman had put into the mouth of Her Majesty these words—"The Irish Land Act of 1870 has been productive of great benefits." Now, he (Mr. O'Connor Power) was slow last year to describe that Act as a failure; but the additional experience he had had during the last 12 months, and the events that had happened during that period, left no doubt in his mind on the subject. Historically and literally it was a mis-statement to say that the Land Act of 1870 had conferred great benefits on the people of Ireland. The Royal Speech went on to say—

> "In some respects, however, and more particularly under the strain of recent and calamitous years, the protection which it supplied has not been found sufficient, either in Ulster or the other Provinces."

Now, he protested against making the Land Act of 1870 the Alpha and Omega of all the legislation on the subject of land. The sooner they emancipated themselves from the opinion which the right hon. Gentleman had, to a great extent, produced in reference to that measure, the more free they would be to examine the Irish Land Question from its very foundation, and to take a true measure of what would be required to reform the land legislation of Ireland. He joined with his hon. Friends who had already addressed the House in the dissatisfaction they expressed at the prospect of being face to face with a very strong and stringent Coercion Bill, side by side with a very inadequate measure of Land Reform. It was plain, from the description given last night by the Prime Minister of the Land Bill which the Government were about to introduce, that there was no intention of dealing thoroughly with the question. Therefore, they were face to face with this situation. Though it had been proved over and over again that the poverty of the masses of the Irish people was due to a vicious land system, and though the country had for nearly two years been agitated by a movement almost unparalleled in the history of Irish national struggles, they were face to face with the fact that the Liberal Government proposed to find a remedy simply in an amendment of the Land Act of 1870. Such a proposal was nothing more nor less than a mockery of the wrongs and sufferings of the Irish people; it was an imposture on justice; and it would be the duty of Irish Representatives who, perhaps, like himself, had not attended a single land meeting to expose that imposture to the intelligence of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition asked the Government why Parliament was not summoned in November for the purpose of dealing with the condition of Ireland. He (Mr. O'Connor Power) agreed with the right hon. Baronet that it was the duty of the Government to call Parliament together in November, but for a very different purpose from that which the right hon. Gentleman sketched out. The Government ought to have foreseen the extent to which the land agitation would spread. If they were dealing with disaffection in England, or a great national movement in England, similar to that which was now going on in every part of Ireland, they would not wait until the agitation had forced itself beyond Constitutional bounds before divining the cause and applying a remedy. If Her Majesty's Government had realized the situation and assembled Parliament in November, without touching the vexed question of Land Law Reform at all, they might have done more to destroy the occupation of his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) than by all the Coercion Bills which, with the co-operation of their political opponents, they might be able to inscribe on the Statute Book if the House sat on until the 31st of December next. In view of the fact that the Government had appointed a Commission to inquire into the question, it would not have been fair to have expected from them a measure dealing with the tenure of land; but they might have acted on the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), made two months ago at Birmingham, in reference to the improvement of the resources and the reclamation of the waste lands of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman asked what was £10,000,000 for such a purpose? He, for one, had been misled by that speech, for he read that suggestion in the light of a foreshadowing of one of the measures which Her Majesty's Government intended to introduce side by side with any proposals they might deem it their duty to submit upon the question of the tenure of land. If they had assembled Parliament on the 2nd of November, and said to his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City that they were inquiring into the subject which his agitation had been endeavouring to advance, and, pending that, tendered remedies to meet the poverty and distress in those parts of Ireland which were suffering from a crowded population, the result to-day would be very different. Certainly, they would not have been obliged to ask Parliament now to permit them to use the rude remedy of coercion. They might pile Commission upon Commission, and their ablest Commissioners might pile Report upon Report; but they would have to come round to this stern fact in the end—one of the most prominent facts in the agricultural condition of Ireland—that there was in certain districts in the South and West of Ireland, owing to a process of eviction from better lands carried on for the last 50 years, a surplus population for those lands. The easy-going English politician said at once that the remedy for that state of things was to be found in emigration. He (Mr. O'Connor Power) totally denied that emigration was a real remedy, especially as those in Ireland who had hitherto emigrated were the wealth-producers and not the wealth-consumers. It must be further remembered that in saying that a surplus population existed in certain parts of Ireland, he did not mean that the country as a whole was too thickly peopled. The fact was that the population was unequally distributed through the operation of the proceeding he had mentioned, and that circumstance alone had led to the circumstance that they were now brought face to face with this talk about an over-peopled land, and the necessity for emigration. If the Government had been duly sensible of their responsibilities, instead of having to come to the Land League for instruction, they would have paid attention to the proposals made year after year by the Irish Members. If, in November, a Royal Commission had been appointed and £8,000,000 or £10,000,000 had been raised by loan for the reclamation of waste lands, at least half of those 200,000 tenants who, in every crisis, suffered most from distress might have been accommodated on those lands, and those 100,000 tenant farmers would have represented 500,000 of the population. The testimony of scientific men proved the practicability of the idea, and the result would be that more room would be found for those who remained in the hitherto crowded lands. Had the Government acted in that way, there would have been no necessity for calling Parliament together in January for the purpose of suspending the Constitution, and a great advance would have been made towards the solution of the Land Question, and they would have struck at the root of Irish poverty and misery. The Prime Minister, probably without intending it, had lent some force to the complaint that was very common in England as to the amount of Parliamentary time and attention occupied by Irish affairs, and had reminded his hearers that England and Scotland, not less than Ireland, formed part of the United Kingdom. That might conceivably have been a delicate way of bidding for the gratitude of Irish Members after again taking Irish affairs into consideration. To his mind there was a feeling in England that the English Parliament had been making concessions to Ireland, and that for a series of years they had been presenting that country with great boons. Representing for the time being, at all events, one of the Irish counties, he would say, in the name of that county, that he wanted no concessions to Ireland. He wanted concessions to justice; and if they conceded justice no Irish Member would ask for concessions to Ireland. He utterly repudiated the idea that they had been making concessions to Ireland. They had only been paying back gradually, and with stinted and reluctant hand, the debt that for centuries had been due to the people they had robbed, and whom they had attacked in all the elements of their civilization. They had already heard that force was no remedy for Irish discontent; and yet the Premier came down to the House with a Coercion Bill in his pocket. Was ever a Minister in a more painful, he might say in a more ridiculous, position; and would anyone be surprised to hear a man so situated confess that he laboured under a deep sense of shame and humiliation? It was simply reversing all the teachings of the Liberal Party, and borrowing the policy and the principles of their opponents. The policy in times past in Ireland, as even Conservatives would admit, had been a policy of brute force and tyrannical and unconstitutional violence; and they now found the Liberal Party of England making a shameful retrograde movement, and going back upon the policy which had been proved, over and over again, to be a failure. The right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition represented that policy; but there was no sham, no humbug, no misconception about his acts. The Prime Minister, he (Mr. O'Connor Power) supposed, represented the policy of the present—that was the policy of expediency, which sacrificed public liberty in order to prevent, as he said himself, "a serious division of Parties in this House." He believed they also wished to prevent, primarily, a serious division of Parties in the Cabinet itself. He (Mr. O'Connor Power) claimed for the Irish Party that they represented the policy of the future, and that they were, therefore, entitled to some degree of sympathy. Thirty years hence, and he hoped and believed long before, all the proposals contained in the programme of the hon. Member for Cork City would be written in the Statute Book; but he appealed to the Prime Minister to consider what Ireland would suffer in the interval, what national antipathies would be fanned into flame, what mutual denunciations would be heard among Saxons and Celts, and all because the right hon. Gentleman, to prevent "a serious division of Parties," had swallowed his own public professions and Constitutional principles enunciated in public upon the hustings for the sake of keeping a divided Cabinet in power. A celebrated American statesman, Henry Clay, had said that he would rather be right than be President of the United States; but the Prime Minister preferred to remain at the head of an ostensibly united, but really divided, Cabinet than to do justice to Ireland. ["Oh, oh!"] He had some grounds for his suspicions; but if the relations between the Members of the Cabinet were really happier than he had been led to believe, time would show whether that unnatural harmony could last. As he had said last year in the debate on the Address, it remained to be seen whether the Liberal Party, in fighting the battle at the General Election, had struggled for principle, or for power. He had no idea that in so short a time the question would be decided in such a manner. Where were their principles? One short year ago the name of the right hon. Gentleman stood as powerful for the cause of liberty to the oppressed as an army in battle array. What was the right hon. Gentleman's position to-day? He was the victim of political necessity. Twelve months ago he was the Leader, not only of English Liberalism, but when he spoke there was not a slave shivering in his chains in any part of down-trodden Europe who did not feel his soul exulting in the prospect of a glorious emancipation. When, however, the slave read the message which the champion of Bulgarian rights was now sending to the people of Ireland, he would say that times were changed, and that men had changed with them. He would say that if English Liberalism was truly represented by legislation of this character, English Liberalism was remarkable for its arrant hypocrisy. These appeals to the principles of Liberalism would, he feared, fall very flat on Her Majesty's Ministers to-day. Twelve months ago they would have had considerable force. ["No, no!"] Well, they had had considerable force. The contest in Mid Lothian, as far as the Prime Minister was concerned, was made up of appeals to the principles of universal liberty. Even the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who could not be accused of posing usually as a champion of oppressed nationalities, went through the country saying that the doctrine of nationality lay at the basis of international peace. That doctrine had now evaporated. It was no longer mentioned in the declarations and speeches of Her Majesty's Ministers. But the General Election had now gone by, and they might be some distance from another Election—he did not know, and he must say he did not care very much. For he could not conceive that any General Election which might take place would result in a policy more opposed to the true interests of Ireland than the policy contained within the four corners of the Queen's Speech, written by the hands of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister had acted in direct opposition to the great principles of Liberalism associated with his name, and had disappointed the greater portion of the Liberal Party. He would conclude by an appeal to Her Majesty's Government, which might have some force. They had succeeded in destroying the last chance of the existence of a Liberal Party in Ireland. He did not hesitate to say that if the hon. Members for Ulster cared, they could inform the Prime Minister that he had made it impossible to construct the Liberal Party in Ireland. He asked the hon. and learned Member for Tyrone (Mr. Litton) where was the policy of the "three F's," which the hon. and learned Member submitted for the acceptance of the House? That policy was not embodied in Her Majesty's Speech; and he thought he might likewise assert that Her Majesty's Government had done something to damage the Liberal Party in England and Scotland. He was perfectly sure that if the hon. Members whom he saw opposite to him were to echo the sentiments which were deep down in the hearts of the masses of the English people in Lancashire, Yorkshire, Northumberland, and Durham, they would tell the Prime Minister that they were thoroughly disappointed with his programme. [*Cheers from the Ministerial side below the Gangway.*] Those cheers were an ample proof of the correctness of his statement. Therefore, upon what principle did Her Majesty's Government come before the House with any feeling of confidence? They had anticipated opposition from their old and legitimate foes, and they could not hope to win any measure of support from the Representatives of the nation which they were about to coerce. They were repudiated, at the present moment, by the masses of the English working people. ["No, no!"] They, therefore, came forward with a programme upon the adoption of which no Party was bold enough to stake its reputation; and the only chance of passing it was to be found in the appeal which the Prime Minister had made to the divided elements of the temporarily united Party which had placed him in power.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) has spoken with his usual ability, but with less than his usual fairness, and I might almost leave his remarks to answer themselves. I believe that in Ireland, excited as it is now, to say nothing of England and Scotland, there is hardly a man in the hon. Member's own country who would charge on my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone) that his policy affecting the interests of Ireland has been merely devised in order that he may remain one more year in Office. Why, the hon. Member does not think so himself. In one remark he made I quite agree with him. He repeated a remark of my right hon. Friend, and I repeat it again, that we do not believe any more than he does that coercion is a remedy for the evils of Ireland. We do not believe that by a coercive or repressive policy we can heal the wrongs of Ireland. But this we are most reluctantly forced to believe, that protection to person and property is wanted in Ireland, and must be given; that it is necessary; and that of all the wrongs which could be done to the Irish people there could be no greater wrong than for the Government not to fulfil its first duty, which is the protection of life and property. If, when we bring our measure before the House, we cannot prove that it is necessary; that without it life is not safe, that personal liberty is not safe, and that industry cannot be carried on—if we cannot prove those things, then, I suppose, the House would properly consider that we had failed to make out a case for it. I presume that, personally, I have more direct responsibility with regard to Ireland than any of my Colleagues; and the House would therefore expect me to make some remarks before this debate comes to a close. In doing so I am in this position. I shall have to defend myself and the Government from attacks on both sides. First, let me say a word or two in regard to the speech of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), who moved the Amendment. The hon. Member spoke with great moderation. My work would have been somewhat easier for the last two or three months if all his speeches had been marked by the same moderation. But, taking his speech as it was delivered to-night, he stated what the object of the Land League was. He spoke of meetings for agitation. Those meetings, instead of having had the effect the hon. Member says they have had, or were meant to have, of preventing outrages, have, I have been forced to find, been followed by outrages. Outrages have followed the meetings in almost exact proportion. The hon. Gentleman says that the other object of the Land League was the recommendation to persons to refuse to take farms from which others had been evicted. This is the most extraordinary moderate way in which the hon. Member described that object of the Land League. I do not know if I should have alluded to the special circumstances of any of his speeches if he had not forced me to do so by that remark. Let him look back to his speech at Ennis, made very soon after Parliament was prorogued, and I think he will find that his recommendation was made in a way that he would not like to have anything recommended to himself. This recommendation to persons to refuse to take farms from which others had been evicted included a recommendation to ruin them if they did so. It was a recommendation to take care that no one bought of them or sold to them. It was a recommendation to taboo them, socially, in the market-place, in domestic life, in the church, and to treat them as lepers. All I can say is that the language which he has brought before the House to-night, as to the objects of the Land League, is somewhat different, and a great deal more moderate, than that which he addressed to the people of Ireland. Nevertheless, the hon. Member, in what he proceeded to say, really, to my mind, stated very much the case of the Government. He showed the painful necessity under which we are of bringing forward some measure, and asking for further powers, for the protection of person and property. What do I understand him to say? That the force of public opinion was to be brought to bear in the case of persons offending against the unwritten law. The hon. Member assents to that; and he went on to say that while, generally speaking, it is a great crime to excite public opinion against the law of the land, yet in this case it was no crime. In fact, he declared in moderate but in very plain language, which will be well enough understood in Ireland, that the object in which he intended to persist was to replace the law of the land by the unwritten law—that is, by the law of the Land League. Now, I ask every Member of this House, I would ask even the Irish Members, whether it can be expected that a Government should thus allow the duties and authority, which are their prerogative, to be taken from them? I ask the Members for Ireland whether, if ever they succeeded in obtaining a separate Irish Government, by the Repeal of the Union, or by the establishment of Home Rule, they would for a moment expect that such a Government could continue if it were to allow its law to be replaced by an unwritten law?

MR. PARNELL: The right hon. Gentleman, I am sure, does not wish to misrepresent me; but what I should say was that our desire was, by acting upon public opinion, to replace the bad portion of the law of the land.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: It will be in the recollection of the House that the hon. Member distinctly said that what he wanted to carry out was the unwritten law—to replace what he calls the present Land Law by an unwritten law. In other words, by the action of public opinion, as he calls it, the law of the land was to be disregarded and another law put in its place. He went on to state the effects which had followed his speeches. He said how patriotic it was for people to be willing to go to gaol, and to suffer hard labour, for keeping his law, and for breaking and setting at defiance the law of the land which had the power of punishing them. But the position in which we find ourselves is, that there is no great danger of those persons who follow his teaching having to suffer for what he calls their patriotism. The state in which we find Ireland at this moment is this—that all law must, more or less, have a force behind it in order to make it obeyed, and which must be able to make those who break it fear punishment. What I have to prove to the House—and unless I prove it the Bill it will be my painful duty to bring in I hope will be rejected—what I shall have to prove, I am sorry to say, is this—that those who break the law of the land have no fear of punishment under the present condition of things, because very few persons, hardly anyone in fact, dares to give evidence against them, and very few juries dare to convict. It was upon that account that the remark was inserted in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech as to the reign of terror which has followed from the existing state of things. But, although those who break the law of the land have no fear of punishment, those who break the hon. Member's unwritten law have very great fear of punishment indeed. I do not charge the hon. Member with having himself incited the people of Ireland to commit outrages; but he knows very well that the result of his speeches and of his action would be that to a certainty these outrages would come. [*Cries of* "No!"] And he knows that these outrages have followed upon the observance of his unwritten law. [*Cries of* "Withdraw!" *and* "It is false!"] In the Gracious Speech from the Throne, Her Majesty says that there is already terror, and that it is reasonable terror; there is fear on the part of any man who ventures to disobey the mandates of the Land League, and to obey those of the law of the land.

MR. O'DONNELL: I rise to Order. I want to know, Sir, if I understood the right hon. Gentleman correctly when I understood him to say that the hon. Member for Cork knew the result of his teaching would be the commission of outrages? If I understood the right hon. Gentleman rightly, then all I can say is that it is as base and abominable a calumny to be uttered against a Member of this House——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Dungarvan has spoken to a point of Order, and he has himself been guilty of disorder in imputing calumny to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. O'DONNELL: I desire to ask, Sir, whether the right hon. Gentleman was in Order in speaking as he did?

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman, as I understood him, spoke of the results of the speeches of the hon. Member for Cork. In so doing he did not appear to me to transgress the Rules of the House.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I rise to a point of Order. The right hon. Gentleman not only spoke of the effects—what he termed the results of the speeches of my hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork—he not only spoke of those speeches as having led to the commission of outrage and of crime, but he also said that my hon. Friend was aware that those speeches would lead to outrages and crime. I ask you, Sir, to rule if it is within the competence of the right hon. Gentleman, and the Order and decencies of this House, that such a charge should be put forward.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the right hon. Gentleman in his speech had attributed motives of that kind to the hon. Member for Cork he would have been out of Order; but I did not understand that that was the effect of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I have no objection to put it in this way—[*Cries of* "No!" *and* "Withdraw!"]

Mr. O'DONNELL: Apologize.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I have no objection to put it in this way——

Mr. O'DONNELL: Withdraw.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I shall withdraw nothing at the peremptory demand of any hon. Member of the House, unless, Sir, I am requested by you to do so.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Do I not understand, Sir, that you ruled the right hon. Gentleman to be out of Order? If so, I ask him at once to withdraw the objectionable words.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said that, as far as I understood the right hon. Gentleman, no observations fell from him that, in my opinion, were out of Order.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I desire that there should be as little heat in the matter as possible. I will, therefore, put it in this way—that the hon. Member for Cork, with his knowledge of the Irish character, and with his ability, ought to have known, and it is a wonderful thing to me if he did not know, what the natural effect of his speeches would be.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I again rise to Order. Is it in Order for the right hon. Gentleman to say that the hon. Member for Cork, knowing what the Irish people are, ought to have understood that they would commit outrages as the result of his speeches? That is what I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say, and; I would ask, is that a decent explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: I call upon Mr. Forster.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: At any rate, the outrages undoubtedly followed upon the meetings of the Land League. I repeat what I stated before, that there has been great fear of punishment on the part of those who have followed the unwritten law, and there has been very little reasonable fear of punishment by those who broke the law of the land, and the reason is because there have been these outrages, and because of the terror which has resulted from them. I wish to say a word or two now in regard to the hon. Member's statistics. I observed that he took the outrages which have occurred for many years past, and he showed that altogether crime in Ireland has not increased. I believe he is right in that statement. But agrarian crime has very largely increased. It has very largely increased during the last year; very largely increased within the last two or three months, and remarkably so within the last month. And the agrarian crime which has most increased has been the crime of intimidation—violent and lawless intimidation, and intimidation likely to strike terror into the minds of the people—that very intimidation which has made those who keep the law afraid of keeping it, and those who break the law able to break it with impunity. The hon. Member compares the evictions with outrages, and he gives the impression that the evictions have increased, and that with the evictions the outrages have also increased. Against that statement I have to inform him—or rather remind him, for I think he has all the figures before him, and will, therefore, I suppose, be aware of it—that although, as he states, there have been far fewer evictions within the last six months—I believe there have been hardly any during the last month or two—yet the outrages have very greatly increased. Indeed, the outrages within the last month or two have immensely increased; and the endeavour to fasten them upon the evictions is, I think, disproved by the facts. There is another matter which I have also to state, and that is that there are outrages now prevailing in parts of Ireland in which there have been but few evictions. Take, for instance, the county of Limerick. In those parts of the county in which there have hitherto been but few evictions there is now very great insecurity. A system of terrorism exists, and there is great prevalence of crime and outrage. I am afraid it will be my painful duty, in bringing in the Bill with which the Government have intrusted me, to give to the House very many more reasons for it than I can give now; but still, I cannot quite allow the hon. Member's statement to go over to Ireland without giving one or two cases just to show that intimidation does exist, and what the character of the intimidation is. I will take a case which occurred within the last day or two in the county of Limerick. I give it, not as a very violent outrage—not as an attempt to kill, but as just that kind of outrage which carries out the unwritten law, and which most successfully makes those who break it fear punishment. The report says—

> "On the 27th ult., at 5.30, a shot was fired into the shop of a lady. The bullet pierced the shop window and a partition."

It seems there was a bullet. It is evident that I was mistaken as to the character of the outrage, and that it was an attempt to kill.

> "She was in the shop and stooped. Had she been standing she would have been shot dead. At 5 o'clock on the morning of the 28th, a shot was fired in the road in front of her house."

The only motive that could be assigned for this outrage was that she had refused to join the Land League, or to subscribe to its funds. I will read another case, and, for obvious reasons, I do not give the names. The report says—

> "I beg to state that in county Clare, on Tuesday evening at half-past 7, a very small farmer residing in my district was shot at in his own house and wounded. Two men entered his house, asked him why he sent his children to a school kept by a man who was a Government spy, and told him to beg his life. This he refused to do, and they fired upon him. The teacher had made himself obnoxious by tearing down a threatening notice posted near the school-house. The farmer is a very poor man having only 2 cows and 11 children."

[*Cries of* "Oh!" *and laughter from the Home Rule Members.*] I am surprised that such a statement should be received with laughter by any hon. Member. I can imagine the indignation with which laughter would have been received if any one of these hon. Members had quoted this case as one of distress. It is stated that these outrages have been much exaggerated. Well, there have been exaggerations in the Press, and I was very sorry last night to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) make a statement which made me think that he has not really very much studied the question. The right hon. Gentleman stated that only one-tenth of the outrages came before the police. The hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham) said 50 per cent; but how the right hon. Gentleman could fall into such an error very much astonishes me. The statement is about as correct as that of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), that one-tenth of the outrages reported by the police are not outrages at all. In point of fact, the truth is rather on the side of the right hon. Member for North Devon than of the hon. Member for Galway. There has been a good deal of denial of outrages, and the case I am about to mention is one in which I think the denial ought to be disproved. A lady was shot at recently near Limerick. Yet one of the most influential papers in Ireland, or probably in the United Kingdom, *The Freeman's Journal*, stated as a positive fact that that outrage was an entire exaggeration. Some Roman Catholic clergyman wrote to say he was quite sure that no shot was ever fired at Miss Ellard, but that there was some hooting, and, fearing that she was in danger, she fired at those who were hooting her. Now, the facts are these. The lady was in her own waggonette, and when 300 yards from the railway station a shot was fired from a gateway on the side of the road. The shot struck the splash-board with such violence that she thought one of the springs of the carriage had broken, and she called on her servant to pull up. Immediately a second shot was fired which struck one of the iron supports of the cushion against which she was leaning. Why was this lady fired at? Because she had been written to by the Land League on the subject of rents, and had not answered the letter. Hitherto she had been very popular with her father's tenantry and labourers with whom she came in contact. Her father is very old, and, I am sorry to say, is in a very bad state of health. I will not give any more cases of outrage now. I might keep the House until to-morrow morning, and it is not my duty to anticipate the remarks which I shall have to make when I shall have to bring in the Bill which I must bring before the House. I will, however, make one remark in regard to a statement made by the hon. Member for the City of Cork at the beginning of his speech. The hon. Member expressed a hope or expectation that I would give the exact details of the Bill to-night. That would be a perfectly unprecedented course to take. We are now debating the Address; and if I were to give the outlines of the Bill before bringing in the Bill, this debate would really be a debate upon the Bill itself, and would neither be in accordance with precedent or custom, or convenient to the House. I will now turn to another branch of the subject, and to a speech of a very different tone—that of the hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim. If the hon. Member for Cork heard that speech it must have given him some comfort, because it is quite clear the hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim does not think that the hon. Member for Cork has anything whatever to do with the present state of things. The hon. Member puts it all on the shoulders of Her Majesty's Government. He charged Her Majesty's Government with the most distinct violation of pledges, and accused us of reducing Ireland to a Pandemonium, saying that we had converted our Elysium into a howling wilderness of crime and despair. He evidently thinks that not only have the speeches of the hon. Member for Cork not caused the outrages, but I suppose he imagines that we committed them ourselves. At any rate, his remarks would seem to imply that. But these were general remarks, and I am willing to make very great allowance for them. He has not had—very few Irishmen have had—a pleasant time of it during the last quarter of a year, and I can say also that the Irish Secretary has not had a pleasant time. The hon. and gallant Member said we were—

> "Silently and indifferently looking on at the wreck and misery which is caused, careless of the cries of vengeance that were raised up against us."

I do not think I ought to allow this debate to pass without showing to the House to what extent we have not been indifferent to the state of affairs in Ireland. Let us come to the definite charges of the hon. and gallant Member. He asked—"Why did you not renew the Peace Preservation Act?" and added—"Had not the Peace Preservation Act expired, the country would have been spared the degradation which it has endured." I am very much surprised at that expression on the part of the hon. and gallant Member, looking at the experience which he possesses. He must be aware that if the Peace Preservation Act had been continued into this year, there is no reason to suppose that it would have checked the outrages which have occurred. He must know very well that outrages increased last year, not so much as they have recently, certainly, but increased on the whole, and to that extent that they clearly show that the Peace Preservation Act was powerless to prevent them. Last January, when I, at any rate, was not an Irish Secretary, silently indifferent to what was going on, offences against the person, which are the most serious of agrarian outrages, were more than in any part of last year except December—more than they had been in any month since March, 1850. Therefore, I absolutely demur to the statement of the hon. and gallant Member that had the Peace Preservation Act not expired we should have been saved from the present state of things. But he says we might have renewed this Act, and that we found a Bill ready prepared in the office pigeon-holes. A noble Lord also, in "another place," said that a Bill was courteously presented to me by my Predecessor. But what was the use of courteously presenting me with a Bill when the House met on the 20th of May, and the Bill had to be passed by the 1st of June? Then the hon. Member said—"You might have done as you did in 1870." We are going to carry the measure we shall propose with all the strength in our power; but I do not suppose that the hon. Member thinks ten days are sufficient for the purpose. What he ought to have recollected, and what the late Government ought to have recollected, was the state of public opinion with regard to this measure, the probable opposition they were likely to have in the House of Commons, and, particularly, they ought to have remembered their own experience in 1875, when they thought it their duty to renew a portion of the Peace Preservation Act, which it took them six weeks to carry out. That measure, too, was brought in on the 1st of March, and not on the 20th of May. With the view they say they held, and with the information possessed by the Members of the late Government, on which they say we ought to have acted, and upon which they themselves might have acted, it was their duty to have brought in that Bill, and made it safe in the early part of last year. The facts were these. I have stated that the agrarian outrages in January last year were larger than they were in any month until September, and that offences against the person were larger than they were in any month until December. The information received from the magistrates was in their hands in January, and yet they silently and indifferently looked on, and took no steps to pass this Bill, which hon. Members opposite, perhaps, suppose would have prevented the present state of things.

MR. TOTTENHAM: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the succeeding months?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Yes. In the month of March the number of outrages fell to 83; but, according to the case of the hon. and gallant Member, the Government ought to have brought in the Bill before they knew what were the returns for the month of March; and when it is stated that they were perfectly sure that if they had succeeded in the late General Election they would have had time to bring in this Bill I am not at all sure that they would. Judging from the experience of 1875, that would not have been the case. The hon. and gallant Member quoted a speech of the late Prime Minister, in which he stated that, if necessary, he would renew the Act. That was before the Elections. After the Elections he stated that he would have brought it forward. I can only state that the impression which I found existing in Ireland was that it would not be brought forward, and that the Coercion Act would be allowed quietly to expire. *The Dublin Evening Mail* of May 15, when it was thought the present Government were going to bring forward the measure, said—

> "The course which the late Government undoubtedly would have adopted was to allow the Coercion Act quietly to drop."

All I can say is that the noble Lord and his supporters had not taken the care which they ought to have taken to make it clear in Ireland that they meant to bring it forward. Again, there were the remarks of influential organs of Conservative opinion in England—*The Standard* and *Globe*—to the same effect. The non-fulfilment of duty on the part of the late Government would not have excused us; but we had before us these facts. First, that the Peace Preservation Act, as it then existed, had done little or nothing to check outrages. Secondly, we found them diminishing. Thirdly, that it was impossible for us to have passed that Bill, so courteously presented to me, although it was only a renewal Bill. It was absolutely unavoidable that five or six weeks should elapse before any such Bill could be passed. There was, therefore, no time to bring before the country a perfectly new Act, which it would have to be; and we not unnaturally thought that as we should be six weeks about it, as it had not been effectual, as matters were getting better, as distress was not increasing, but diminishing, and as there might be a good harvest, we might try whether Ireland could not be governed in exactly the same manner as England. [*Laughter.*] The noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) laughs at that proposition. I certainly plead guilty to the fact that we had some hope that a good harvest would do something towards quieting Ireland. I am now going to say something which I daresay will meet with ironical cheers from hon. Gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. Members below the Gangway. We had the hope, and I have not given up the hope, that the Irish people would have some confidence in a Government which, at any rate, means well towards them; and, notwithstanding the efforts of the hon. Member for Cork and the hon. Member for Cavan, who sits near him, I believe that they and I shall live to see that expectation fulfilled. But what happened during the Session? Outrages did not very materially increase; in fact, it may be said that they did not increase at all, for though they increased to some extent in number they diminished in seriousness. In the month of July there were 84 agrarian outrages, and only three outrages against the person. There was, indeed, a matter that occupied a good deal of attention during last Session, to which, however, I should not have alluded had it not been for a remark of the hon. Member for Cork. It will be within the recollection of the House, and I think it is worthy the recollection and attention of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, of the hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim, and the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin, that the hon. Member for Cork, who lost no opportunity of sneering at the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, made a statement to-night similar to that he made soon after the Session in the country, to the effect that if the Bill had passed it would have undoubtedly crushed, or very much injured, the agitation in Ireland. I have been led, by the remarks of the hon. Member for Leitrim, to reply to the charges made by the Members of the late Government, perhaps more than I should otherwise have done. I am perfectly aware that this question is far too serious, and that the interests involved are of far too painful an intensity for either the House or the country to be patient with much bandying to and fro of responsibility with respect to it. I am, however, obliged to reply, to some extent, to the attacks which have been made. I acknowledge this—that whatever have been the difficulties which we inherited, or which have been forced upon us, it was our business to try to meet and overcome them; and I think that the House will, perhaps, give me a short time, while I state very briefly what our attempts to overcome them have been. But before I describe what we have done, I must explain what we have not done, which, I believe, is more in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite than what we have done. It has been stated in "another place," and frequently in the country of late, that we ought to have summoned Parliament together long ago, and that we ought to have asked for much stronger and greater powers. Well, hon. Members who say that are under one mistake to begin with; they seem to suppose that the Government has only to ask for powers, and that they will be immediately granted. Especially they seem to think that my noble Friend the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and I had only to say we wanted some extraordinary powers and that we should get them. But we have, after all, to deal with a Representative Assembly, and with the House of Commons, which requires a very strong case to be made out before it will grant any extraordinary powers to the Executive. I am perfectly aware that in the present case that demand will be made; and I say it will be a sorrowful thing for the country when a demand is not made, and rigorously made, that the strongest case for such further powers should be made out. The hon. Member opposite has complained that when a number of gentlemen connected with Ireland came to see me some months ago I asked them for suggestions. I do not think it would have been courteous to such a deputation as that which came before me had I not done so. They made suggestions, and very strong suggestions they were; but I told them the liberty of the subject ought to be considered. They came with experience, with much anxiety, and many of them with much suffering; but they seemed to suppose that when crime first appeared, even to a slight extent, and on the first appearance of the inability of the tribunals or the usual modes of justice to stop that crime, such events ought to be immediately followed by the suspension of liberty. I stated to them that we had to exhaust all the Constitutional powers reposed in us before we asked for more, and that the House of Commons was very jealous of the liberty of the subject. There is another reason why, especially as regards Ireland, I look with very great reluctance upon any such demand as we are now about to make, and that is that, time after time, it has been found necessary, I will not say without ground, but in some cases with insufficient ground, in others with sufficient ground, to ask Parliament for larger powers in the government of Ireland; and, therefore, there is at this moment a very sorrowful reliance in Ireland, not so much upon Irish determination to support the law, as upon English help to see that the law is enforced. Of that there can be no question. I felt—and probably that was one reason, and a very strong reason, why I did not come so quickly as the hon. and gallant Member opposite to the conclusion to which I have now been forced—

that every officer of the law, every officer of Government in Ireland, from the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary down to the junior resident magistrate, the local magistrate, and even the youngest policeman, had been taught too much to rely upon British power. All these were reasons why we were reluctant to come to the conclusion at which we have arrived. Will the House pardon me if I enforce these views by an authority much more powerful than mine, whose words have been, I believe, read in "another place," and which were spoken some 50 years ago by Sir Robert Peel, in a speech addressed to the House of Commons, and when he was in the position now occupied by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon. The circumstances were that the Liberal Government of that day found themselves forced to bring in a Bill for very much stronger powers than we shall now ask for the government of Ireland. The state of Ireland was worse then than it is now. Murders were then more common, and apparently, owing to the increase of civilization, we now think more of murders and outrages than our ancestors did, and we think more of hanging for them, while the Government is now more blamed for not preserving law and order than it was then. But how did Sir Robert Peel meet the Government of that time? Did he do what, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite did last evening, all he could to damage the power and prestige of the Government in Ireland by saying it is true that he would support it in what they were doing now, but that they had been neglecting their duty, and were a Government scarcely worth supporting? No. He said—

> "He had never taunted His Majesty's Ministers for not proposing at an earlier period the measures of coercion which they now demanded. When others said that they ought to have applied for coercive measures, he had been no party to the complaint. His language had always been—'Try the ordinary laws; there is great evil in coercive measures. You cannot rely on them for any permanent good, but there is great risk that they will relax the energy of the ordinary law.' "—[3 *Hansard*, xv. 371.]

I say that though we are forced to bring these measures forward, from the very bottom of our hearts we feel the truth of that saying. Sir Robert Peel goes on to state that he thinks that—

> "The time has come when, if necessity were made out, he would go in for the suspension of the ordinary law now ineffectual for its purpose."

I give these words in order that hon. Members from Ireland may not think that Sir Robert Peel is an authority they can quote. Well, we came to the conclusion that we ought to exhaust the ordinary powers of law before we applied for more. Now comes the question—Have we done so or not? I maintain that we have done so, and I challenge any Member of this House to prove the contrary. Before the meeting of Parliament many charges were made against the Irish Government of not using the powers we possessed, and I have postponed addressing the House longer than I should otherwise have done, because I thought the charges would have been repeated here this evening. But they have not been repeated; and I will say again that I challenge any right hon. or hon. Member to make out a fair case in which we have neglected to use our powers, and show, with regard to the Irish Executive, that any officer, from the highest official in the Castle to the policeman in the country, has not done his utmost for the preservation of law and order. I wait for any such accusation, and am ready to meet it. Although such accusation is not made, I must make one or two remarks. What were our resources, according to our Constitutional powers? We had the police to detect and prevent crime, the military to assist them in preserving order, and the Law Officers—the Attorney and Solicitor General and the Crown Solicitors—for instituting such prosecutions as appeared to be necessary to vindicate the law. Now, as to the police; what have we done? The hon. Member for Cork has complained against the employment of the police. We sent the police, as it was our duty to do, into the disturbed districts; and the House will, perhaps, be surprised to hear that in the county of Galway there has been and is at least one policeman to less than 50, and one soldier to less than 100 adult men. And yet there has been a great prevalence of outrages, although there have been many fewer than there would have been had the number of police been less. With regard to the proclaimed counties, 591 police have been sent into them, and the number of troops has been increased from 19,000 to nearly 26,000. I am sometimes not surprised that, smarting as they were under the sufferings they have had to endure, gentlemen of all classes in Ireland have complained against the Government; nor am I surprised that many gentlemen in England, labouring under the sense of humiliation occasioned by these difficulties, should suppose it was owing to some fault on the part of the Government that these difficulties have not been overcome. We have been blamed, indeed, for our precautions; but I suppose that had we not taken them we should have been very much blamed. I cannot adequately describe the help I received in the discharge of my functions from the calmness, patience, and judgment of Earl Cowper; and here I must say one word with regard to the Permanent Under Secretary in Ireland. I understand that one or two attempts have been made to cast blame upon him; but, if so, never was blame less deserved. After some experience of official life, I can in justice say that I never met so hard-working a man, with such courage, judgment, and impartiality, as Mr. Burke. I have seen statements to the effect that the police are a failure as detective officers. I have not found this to be the case, and I do not believe that charge is true. I will not now detain the House on this subject; but I think I could convince the House that if the police have not detected crime it has not been from any want of vigilance, still less from any want of courage, but from the essential difficulties of their task. You must remember with what a country they have had to deal. These farm-houses where outrages are generally committed are isolated; not easy to get at by day, almost impossible at night. But the chief fact is, no man dares to give the police any information. Lord Grey wrote a letter some few days ago giving his opinion upon Irish questions, and his view as to how outrages could have been prevented. I was really surprised, considering the experience of the noble Lord, that he should suppose this could have been done in the way he imagines. I merely quote what he said as a sort of warning, if I may say so, to hon. Gentlemen, whatever may be their ability, in coming to crude opinions as to the state of affairs in Ireland. He said—

> "If the police were not sufficiently numerous to act as a patrol, they could easily do so if mounted and employed singly, each being supported by a small body of cavalry."

Why, that was one of the first things that occurred to me; but I almost immediately found that it was through ignorance of the circumstances, for long before one policeman and the party of soldiers reached the house the tramp of the horses would be heard, and the marauders would then be warned and enabled to keep out of the way until the force had gone by, and immediately afterwards to spring out and commit the outrage. The Duke of Marlborough, in "another place," made allusion to a Circular sent to the Constabulary. He seems to suppose that it was sent out as a reflection upon the Constabulary. I cannot allow that remark to remain without giving it an answer to-night. In the first place, that Circular was not meant for publication, and how the noble Duke obtained possession of it I do not know. In the second place, charges had been made against the police of laxity of duty, and it was my business to afford them an opportunity for vindication. The answers I have received from the County Inspectors are a complete vindication. Let me read an extract from one—

> "When an outrage is to be committed, a party of 15 or 20 men could be assembled almost at once, from an adjoining townland, at any particular place where the members of this institution intend to carry out their design. With these 15 or 20 men two or three strangers appear to act; they go into the houses, the party from the locality, who would be known, remaining outside on the watch, and to assist if required. There is no movement made by the police that is not closely watched. They receive no information from anyone. Well-disposed persons are afraid to be seen speaking to them, so complete is the state of terrorism."

I could quote many instances of the great courage the police have shown and of their great forbearance. There are many matters we must look upon with sorrow in Ireland; but it is a hopeful thing for the country that such a body of men can be found without difficulty to show such unvarying fidelity, such courage, such loyalty, such sympathy with the population amongst whom they have to act, and such forbearance under the most difficult and trying circumstances. One other charge made against us is that we have not enforced the law or given power to enforce the law. We have done what I stated we should do. I said it was our duty to carry out the law, and we have done so. Whenever an application has been made to us for assistance in enforcing the legal rights of landlords or of others we have given the necessary force; and I have thought that humanity, as well as the duty of the Government to see that the law was carried out, made it incumbent on us to send such force which would make resistance to the law as difficult as possible. When we are charged with not doing that duty, it must be considered that we have had 217 applications for assistance in enforcing rights, and that we gave that assistance in 214 cases, there being a satisfactory explanation with regard to the other three cases. In some cases we have sent large bodies of men—as many as 100—and, instead of being lax in this respect, we have suggested to the sheriffs that it was their duty, when necessary, to ask for assistance. The hon. and gallant Member said that in the debates of last year I said I would not be responsible for the peace of the country. I believe I never said anything of the sort. I said I knew I was responsible for the peace of the country, and that, as far as I could do it, I was determined that the peace of the country should be preserved. But I also stated that I believed it would be far better if the law had been improved in the way we thought it ought to have been improved. And, again, I said that it was the duty of the Government to enforce the law as it stood; otherwise there would be no law or order in the country, and no power for any man to enjoy his rights. The hon. and gallant Member alluded to a Circular that we sent out to the magistrates. It has been referred to in "another place," and has been alluded to pretty frequently in the course of this debate; so much so, that the hon. and gallant Member called it my famous Circular. Nothing shows more the excited, and not unnaturally excited, state of men's minds than that so much should be thought and said about that Circular. It was a very natural thing to send it out. Surely it was my duty, and that of the Executive Government, to do everything we possibly could to make use of our powers without coming to Parliament for fresh ones. It was no slur upon the magistrates to send round information of one or two Acts which they might possibly have lost sight of, and of one or two provisions in regard to witnesses which some of them might not remember. We knew that, generally speaking, the magistrates, both local and resident, were aware of these Acts; but we thought no harm would be done by sending the information round. The most remarkable interpretations have been put upon that step; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon, last night, seemed to suppose that we thought all the difficulties might be met by it. We never thought so, nor said so; and if you look at the Circular, you will find that it gives no impression of the kind. I will tell the House the immediate reason why we issued that Circular. In looking back into the records of past times, some gentleman in the Irish Office discovered that a similar Circular had been issued in the year 1866. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) will kindly give me his attention, because I dare say that he was in the Government at the time a similar Circular was issued in 1866, and signed by Lord Naas. He thought it necessary to send it out. We were informed of it, and we thought it well to do so also. It is precisely the same Circular with two alterations. The one was that we found there was a legal mistake in the former Circular, which we corrected. The other was that there had been an improvement in public feeling since that time. In the former Circular the magistrates were reminded that whipping was a possible punishment; but we did not think it advisable to repeat or enforce that. I do not intend to detain the House much longer; but I have a word or two to say in regard to meetings. Something was said about meetings in the beginning of the evening. I dare say more will be said about them. All I wish to do is to make a remark on the right hon. Gentleman's speech of last night. He said, to my surprise, that we had taken the advice of our Law Officers, and that they had advised us that the meetings of the Land League were illegal. We had no such advice. The right hon. Gentleman also said—

"Why did you not take steps to put down those meetings? The Government have interfered now and stopped these meetings—why did they not do it earlier? The Government have been guilty of one or other of two things—either of an unstatesmanlike want of foresight, or of what I may almost call criminal negligence."

There were loud cheers at that statement. It was a most remarkable statement for the right hon. Gentleman to make. These meetings were nothing new; they had been going on since April 1879. Two hundred and three of them had been held under the right hon. Gentleman's Government. If there be criminal negligence in not stopping these meetings, there was also criminal negligence on the part of the late Government. I would ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gibson), who was a Law Adviser to the late Government on this matter, and who will probably speak in this debate, did he advise, or did the late Solicitor General for Ireland advise, that these meetings should be stopped? I wonder that he did not give the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon a little information on this matter, and tell him how the thing really stood, before he allowed him to make a charge against us of criminal negligence for doing precisely what he had done under the same circumstances. Well, we have thought it our duty to try and exhaust the Constitutional powers we possessed, and we have exhausted them; and we are driven to the distressing conclusion that further powers must be asked for. We believe that it is our first duty to protect liberty, and person, and property. We believe that the Irish people would have a right, and a well-founded right, to resist and to defy the English Government, or rather the Imperial Government—hon. Members constantly called it the English Government—to defy the Imperial Government if they neglected this duty. We cannot quietly sit by and allow the law of the land to be replaced by another law. We cannot allow men to be interfered with in the daily walks of life by a system of terrorism. But we do not for a moment suppose that the fulfilment of this painful duty—by far the most painful duty with which I ever had to do—is fulfilling our whole duty to Ireland. We still intend, and we still believe, that we shall be able to look into the grievances of Ireland, and especially into the grievances connected with her chief industry—old grievances which we fully acknowledge are at the foundation of the state of things which now exists, and which have enabled Gentlemen like the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and his associates, to bring about the state of things which they have brought about. We believe that it is our duty to probe these evils to the bottom and to remove them. The hon. Member for Mayo, judging of how we are going to deal with the land measure, before he knows anything, or scarcely anything about it, has chosen to come to a conclusion and to say that he exposes an imposture. He is generally moderate, and I think it would be better that he should wait until he hears our explanation and until he obtains information. I would appeal to all persons in the Three Kingdoms to wait for two or three weeks and see what we shall do in the matter. There is another matter mentioned in the Queen's Gracious Speech in which great alteration is required in Ireland, and upon which also we have determined to deal. I will not detain the House longer. I am much obliged to it for the kindness with which it has listened to me. I hope I have not been heated in the remarks I have made; if so, I regret it. I have had attacks to repel; but I am most anxious that we should, if possible, all of us on both sides of the House, treat this matter as seriously as we ought to treat it, bearing this in mind—that we who have these measures to propose feel that they are of the most painful necessity; that they ought not to be passed unless they commend themselves to the general feeling of the country and of Parliament; and that they do not for a moment relieve us from the duty of giving good government to Ireland—rather, if possible, they make that duty more imminently incumbent upon us than it ever has been before.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Speaker, I desire, with the permission of the House, to make a few remarks, as concisely as I can, upon the Gracious Speech from the Throne, and upon the speech just delivered to the House by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant; and I can assure the

House, and I can assure the right hon. Gentleman, with entire sincerity, that, although it may be my duty to offer some criticisms conceived in a frank spirit, I shall endeavour to present those criticisms entirely free from bitterness, and, as far as I can, divested of Party spirit. The Gracious Speech from the Throne contains a statement of the past and of the present, and it contains promises as to the future. It deals with topics possibly graver, more important, and more full of deep interest and anxiety than any that have been presented to the House for a great number of years. Unquestionably, in reference to my own country of Ireland, it deals with a state of facts which, in the long and chequered history of that country, is absolutely unprecedented. I think that anyone, criticizing at all the Irish Executive, is bound to approach the consideration of the question with great caution and with great forbearance. Anyone acquainted with the history of Ireland, and anyone acquainted with the responsibilities of its administration, knows that it is a subject beset with anxiety and surrounded with grave difficulties; and, therefore, I think it is right to concede in the fullest and in the frankest way to those who at any time may be charged with the responsibility of its administration, at all events, that before they are criticized they should be given the fairest possible construction for their actions, and that they should be given full and ample time to ascertain the position of affairs. I shall endeavour, in the few remarks I shall address to the House, not to depart from what I have stated in reference to this matter; but it must be borne in mind if it is the duty of the Opposition, if it is the duty of this House, if it is the duty of the whole Empire to bear the topics which I have referred to in mind, that there are special circumstances which surround the present Government of the Queen which show that they are peculiarly acquainted with all the circumstances of Ireland, and, therefore, though entitled to an ample measure of forbearance and consideration, almost less than most Cabinets can they lay claim to it; because they contain within the ranks of the Cabinet two able and experienced ex-Lords Lieutenant; because there is also sitting on the opposite Bench a Nobleman who performed with great ability and success the important Office of Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant; and because the Cabinet itself is presided over by a Prime Minister who has devoted a great part of his time to a consideration of what is rightly called "the Irish problem." Now, there is another circumstance which, I think, in addition to that special knowledge, should make the Government recognize the special responsibility which presses upon them individually; and that is the topic which, I think, was present to the mind of the right hon. Gentleman who last spoke, because he tried to anticipate the criticisms I might make upon it, and in regard to which many observations have already been made, and that is in reference to the Peace Preservation Act having been allowed to expire last June. As I understand, the way in which that topic has been presented to the House by the right hon. Gentleman is this. He has endeavoured to suggest that that Bill was a small Bill, and that it was not a very important Bill; and then he adds that, whether it was important or not, the late Government hardly left themselves time to pass it, and left the present Government still less time to pass it. That is about the way in which he has presented the matter to the House. Well, I admit that that Act was a mitigated Peace Preservation Act. Many of the clauses in it which made it most unpopular in this House and in the country were removed by my right hon. Friend near me (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) in 1875; but it contained in it provisions which the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington), in 1875, said he recognized as of first importance in Irish legislation of this kind—first, the restrictions on the possession and sale of arms, and, next, what in that debate the noble Lord said was second only in importance in this class legislation, and that was the power of fining a locality for an extra police force. They were not very stringent provisions, but they were provisions of importance. They would not of themselves be able to cope with the crisis; but they were provisions which, at an earlier stage of the crisis, would have been an important complement and supplement to the power of a capable, vigorous, and energetic Executive. It is suggested, in regard to this Act which expired in June, that we had hardly allowed ourselves time to pass it into law. I do not think that the dates show that. It is obvious that if the late Government had been returned to power, and been able at once to resume their position on the Treasury Bench, and without delay to apply themselves to the measure, the dates justify the belief that they had amply sufficient time to pass this measure into law before the 1st of June. It is urged by the right hon. Gentleman, as it was urged by the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister yesterday, that the time left to Her Majesty's Government was still less, because the Members of the Cabinet had to seek re-election. Now, in the Gracious Speech from the Throne to the new Parliament, which I will not trouble the House by reading in detail, they stated that they did not renew that Act, not on the ground that they had not sufficient time, or that the short interval before the 1st of June prevented them, not for any such reason at all, but because they regarded the matter as a question of high policy—as a question of well-considered statesmanship calculated to show the contrast between the new Administration and the old. They said they were anxious to show a desire to avoid the evils of exceptional legislation in abridgement of liberty; and for that reason, and not on account of any want of time, they declared to Parliament and the country that they allowed the Act to lapse. Well, Sir, I make no charge, or suggestion of any charge whatever, against the Government on that ground. I impute no unworthy motives to Her Majesty's Government. I think it reasonable to concede that Ministers were actuated by a generous spirit of hopefulness that their trust and confidence would not be misplaced. But, Sir, that responsibility they incurred. The decision they arrived at certainly threw the weight of responsibility on themselves, because they acted against experience, its warnings, and its teaching; against the advice respectfully given to them by their Predecessors, and against the advice tendered to them by those in Ireland in whom they might have placed some confidence. For some time nothing occurred to show that this confidence on the part of the Government was misplaced. The condition of the country last July was fairly satisfactory and hopeful. There was a noble harvest—the best in Ireland for 40 years; and the Judges in the last Summer Circuit were able substantially to say that the position of the country, although there were some features to cause anxiety, showed that there were not any grave elements of crime to call for special or particular notice. But what is now the state of the country? The hon. Member for the City of Cork, in about one of the most adroit, intelligent, and sagacious speeches I ever heard delivered in this House, showing a thorough knowledge of the men he sought to convince, entirely and absolutely ignoring the tone, the language, and the manner he has adopted elsewhere, wishes to make the House forget what the true position of the country is. Now, Her Majesty's Gracious Speech presents in strong language the position of the country; and, in my opinion, it underrates, if anything, the real position of Ireland, although it presents it, as I have said, in strong and clear language. At present there is a great army in Ireland, with flying columns arranged to go all through the country, with 6,000 more troops necessarily there than in last year, while the Constabulary are recruited to their full strength; at least one-third part of the country is declared, by Privy Council Orders, to be in a state of disturbance, and Munster and Connaught are in an absolute state of pure and unmitigated anarchy. ["No, no!"] I have heard hon. Members below the Gangway with consideration and respect; and as there are not many hon. Members who express my views on Ireland, I ask them to give me the courtesy of listening to me. I think the remark I have just made as to my own position and independence in the matter is worthy of some note in this House, because there are not many Members in this House—and I do not wish to make the slightest reflection upon them—who occupy the same position. There is a natural desire on the part of a county Member, particularly if he represents a locality where this agitation and its operations prevail, not to say anything which might lead even to a transient feeling of misunderstanding in reference to the question. I have said that Munster and Connaught are in a state of absolute and unmitigated anarchy. Leinster and Ulster are in a condition which is rapidly in some cases, if not in all, growing into a state of anarchy. They are not as yet as bad as the other two Provinces; but the movement is growing and spreading in them rapidly. ["Hear, hear!" *from below the Gangway.*] Yes; the movement that is spreading over them is one of organized lawlessness, of ostentatious terrorism that seeks unscrupulous ends by unscrupulous means. To many in Ireland it has appeared, as I believe it has to many in this country too, that during the last two or three months the Irish Executive—I do not wish to use any disagreeable words—have hardly been as firm and as resolute as they might have been, and that, at all events, they have been no match for the organization of this terrorism, whose executive is resolute, whose code is clear, and whose action is remorseless and certain. In the Provinces to which I have referred there is absolutely no assertion of legal rights. Hundreds and thousands of Irish tenants are anxious and desirous of being honest; but they are terrified out of honesty. The landowners are anxious to do their duty, and adhere as long as courage, manly and firm, will permit them, to the discharge of their duty. They cannot receive the rents they are offered in the name of this agitation—rents which would divest them of one-half of their property. And then the law—I do not complain of this, because it is the statute law of the country, enacted by the intervention of Parliament—the law demands and compels that the landlords in holdings of £4 and under have to pay all the poor rates; and thus, in Connaught, where the poor tenants paying upon a holding of £2 or £3 may be counted by thousands, the landlords, who do not receive a single shilling in the shape of rents, must pay all the poor rates. The Government also claim and demand that those landlords who have to pay succession duty should be assessed, not upon Griffith's valuation, but upon Griffith's valuation with 33 per cent added; so that everything is taken from the landlords, while the Land League would give them nothing. Again, look at the position of the Civil Courts of the country, and take Limerick and Tipperary, two of the greatest counties in Ireland, where the Courts usually have the largest measure of business at this time of the year — the Queen's Courts for the poor man in Ireland usually thronged with suitors—and it is a fact that they have almost nothing to do. Why is this? Because terrorism has put down all appeals to the Courts of the Queen; while the Land League Courts in some places sit weekly, examine witnesses, and issue their ukases, that the people should not go to the Petty Sessional Courts but to them. The Land League Courts—I will speak of what has appeared in the newspapers — these Land League Courts, presuming to administer jurisdiction in the Queen's Dominions, I hear it asserted on all sides, award fines and punishments and "Boycotting" as sentences; and such is the fine adjustment of their equity, that a man who had the audacity to pay his rent was sentenced to employ four labourers who had left a "Boycotted" employer for a period of a month. The hon. Member for Cork, in his able speech, said there had not been many outrages, and took to himself a great deal of credit on that account. Why, anyone listening to him would think that Ireland was now a kind of Arcadia, and that he ruled it with a shepherd's crook, leading his interesting lambs behind him. The hon. Member said there were not many great outrages now, and that in those places where the Land League organization was most perfect they were fewest in number. Surely this is about one of the most terrible signs of disorganization if rightly understood; for as the operations of the Land League become more fully developed and better known, its minor penalties become more efficacious, its capital sentences less necessary, and as the law recedes the terror becomes more crushing and remorseless. It is also necessary to bear in mind that in those counties where the Land League organization is most perfect—in Mayo, for instance, the real Arcadia of Ireland—the people whose lives may be in danger and might be worth very little if unprotected have to go about with two policemen when they go to fair, market, or church. The hon. Member for Cork, with a noble courage worthy of a better cause, commenced his speech—I do not like to use the word audacious, and, therefore, I will not use it—by saying there was a gigantic and incomprehensible conspiracy on the part of the English Press, the object of which I do not see, to malign

Ireland on the subject of outrages, and that we are dreaming, in fact, in thinking there is any disturbance or outrage in that country. Why, Sir, the figures stated by the right hon. Gentleman, startling and painful figures as they were to listen to, are well under the mark. It is stated at every one of the Land League meetings that there is exaggeration of the outrages, and that they were manufactured. My conviction is that there is gradually developing a manufactory for the denial of outrages in Ireland. I need not repeat the figures; I shall only refer to them. The Judges, in their Charges to the Grand Juries, gave an account of the number and character of the outrages which were in themselves appalling. The figures given now by the right hon. Gentleman are also so startling that they cannot be explained away by any suggestions of exaggeration. One circumstance with reference to these outrages I shall state in a single sentence—namely, that relating to the pressure which has been brought to bear in many cases on the Catholic clergy who disapprove of this agitation and refuse to join it. Now, this is very remarkable; because, unquestionably, upon platforms it has been indicated that if the Catholic clergy hold aloof from this movement it will be remembered against them at Easter and Christmas, the times at which they collect their dues; and notices have been placed on chapel walls directed against the clergy who refused to join the movement. One case, of which I heard lately, will illustrate what I believe happens in a good many places. A parish priest of great respectability refused to join the movement; and the word went out, as they say in Ireland, that he was not to get dues exceeding 1*s*. An old parishioner in good circumstances, who was in the habit of giving £1, resolutely gave it again, and his ricks were burnt down that night. This agitation is not Constitutional; it is not designed for the reform of the Land Laws. You have had hundreds of meetings of this Land League, and at not one single meeting was there a Petition drafted to be sent to the Imperial Parliament. The wants of Ireland are resident landlords and capital, and the Land League have adopted a machinery to make every Irish landlord an absentee, and to drive capital out of the country. The agitation is not Constitutional. It is against the best interests of the Empire, and it is known to be so. The hon. Member for Cork, in that inimitable speech of "bated breath and whispering humbleness" which he delivered a few hours ago, seems to have forgotten the words which he used on another occasion, when he said—

> "He would never have taken off his coat for the movement if he did not think it would lead to something else."

Are we to forget what was said by the last apostle of the movement, when returned for Wexford the other day, that his mandate from his constituents was—

> "To give expression on every occasion, in every way, to the undying spirit of hostility which animates us all to the domination of England in Ireland."

[*Cheers.*] Some hon. Members cheer that sentiment, and yet they ask the House to believe that their agitation was for the reform of the Land Laws in a Constitutional way. My right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, in a masterly description during the pending trials of the whole agitation, pointed out that the Irish farmer in this movement was a mere cat's-paw. The agencies that are used to win him to the side of the League are those which the honesty of no human being can easily stand against—greed and terror. Greed: a real ready money business down. Terror: that there is no resisting, for the sanctions to its resistance are remorseless. Landlords are, as a rule, not disliked in Ireland. I know this as well as any Gentleman who contradicts me—they are not, as a rule, disliked. Until the movement came on, the relations between landlords and tenants in Ireland were, as a rule, harmonious and kindly. And yet this movement is against the landlords. Why? Not only because they have land, but because they are loyal and true to the cause of the Queen and the country. Every stage, every step, every tendency of this movement was known to Her Majesty's Government from the earliest times. They were known to the Prime Minister when he spoke at the Guildhall on the 9th November last; and he, as might be expected, in worthy and fitting language described the position of affairs. At that time the Prime Minister had in his possession a great amount of information. He must have known the facts which were unfolded by my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, two or three days ago in Dublin, in describing the state of affairs to the 2nd of November, a week before the dinner at the Guildhall. Lord Mountmorres had then been murdered, and so had Mr. Boyd, and the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin had then issued a Pastoral describing the painful position of affairs, and pointing out that the soil of Ireland had drunk deeply of the blood of her sons. Again, the words which the right hon. Gentleman used yesterday, show that he was conscious of the seriousness of this position. He pointed out at the Guildhall that the rights of free citizenship, of landlords and tenants, were almost then a nullity; and he said the Government would be prepared to act when they had a truer and sounder demonstration of the facts. What more demonstration, I ask, exists at the time of my speaking of the necessity for vigorous action than existed at the time of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman at the Guildhall on the 9th November? What new fact has since developed? We have the statement of the Attorney General for Ireland, made three or four days ago, that every step and stage of this movement has been watched in its undeviating criminality; its steadily progressing mischief unchecked and uninterrupted by a single lull. Is it not legitimate and fair to ask what new fact has come to light between the 9th November and the present time? What new fact was wanting then which prevented the Prime Minister acting on the 9.h November, that now compels him to come to the House and say that the present state of the country puts us in a position before Europe of shame and humiliation? If Parliament had been then summoned, two precious months might have been gained from this agitation, and the people of Ireland might have been spared from allowing themselves to live in the illusion of hopes now dashed to the ground. We are told by the Prime Minister that on the 30th November the Government asked for or obtained the opinions of the Irish Law Officers; and I have no doubt that the present Law Officers gave to the Government wise and well-considered counsel, nor have I the shadow of a doubt that in any advice that the Law Officers gave to the Government it would have been pointed out what would be the chances of convictions for agrarian outrages by juries as at present constituted, what crimes could be dealt with under the existing law, and what were the chances of reaching those crimes by punishment. It is said that the prosecutions instituted by the late Government were dropped by them; but that, in my opinion, is not an accurate description of what occurred. The prosecutions were instituted at the close of 1879, not by information; but the steps taken then by the traversers were not at all so rapid, and did not show any such desire for a speedy trial, as the hon. Member for Cork and his Colleagues have shown recently. They applied for and obtained further time for the different rules, and when we left Office we left all the machinery ready for the application requisite for a change of venue. Everything was in perfect order for the legitimate continuance of the prosecutions, and it was the present Government who elected upon their own judgment not to proceed with the prosecutions we had instituted. The excuse alleged for the tardy action of the Government is, that this is a new and unprecedented movement. I will not dwell upon that, nor upon the proceedings at the Winter Assizes, for they have been sufficiently commented upon. But we have had one statement from the Prime Minister which I do not clearly comprehend. The Prime Minister stated, when my right hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) referred to Judge Fitzgerald's Charge, that that was delivered after the Cabinet had determined to summon Parliament. I do not think I understand what is the point of that statement, because, though there was something new to the public in Judge Fitzgerald's Charge, there was nothing in it that was new to the Government. They knew what was in Judge Fitzgerald's Charge long before it was delivered. Judge Barry—about, I suppose, one of the most popular Judges in Ireland, and certainly a very able man—delivered an extremely moderate Charge at the Waterford Assizes recently, and, dealing with the exaggeration theory, he said that, making all possible allowance for exaggeration, if one-tenth of what was alleged and reported to him was true, the country was in the gravest and most serious condition that could well be imagined. The effect of the Winter Assizes was an acquittal in nearly every agrarian case; and at the end of the Assizes, Judge Fitzgerald had to point out that practically the jury system had in many cases broken down. It has been suggested in the course of this discussion that there is some analogy between what is going on in Ireland and the innocent simplicity of a strike. It is a kind of blasphemy on trades-unionism to compare it with this. There is no analogy, unless trades-unions insist not only upon not working, but on having their wages at the same time. Then it has been said that there is some analogy between these cases in Ireland and the Tithe war; but the tithe case was one of a hardship, not owing to the payment of money—for thousands of Irish farmers only paid one farthing, and some only a fraction of a farthing — it was the feeling of the Catholic farmers against having to pay even the smallest contribution to maintain the clergy of a Church to which they did not belong. There is not the faintest analogy. But I wish there was this amount of analogy—then, Parliament stepped in and gave £1,000,000 to help the poor clergy; but I am not aware that it has now been proposed to give any such sum to the landlords in Ireland. Now, I am very sorry that the right hon. Gentleman thought it necessary to disinter the poor old Disturbance Bill, which, I think, has now pretty well mouldered away in its unregretted grave. But, as he has referred to it, I must say this. He quotes the hon. Member for the City of Cork as he was speaking here to-day; but he forgets how the hon. Member spoke in Ireland of that great legislative achievement — the first heir of the invention of the right hon. Gentleman. He forgets how the hon. Member said, at Waterford, that it was such a contemptible, miserable, little Bill, that if he had not known that the House of Lords would reject it—and do his dirty work for him—he would have kicked it out himself. If that Bill had passed it would not have obviated a single hardship, it would not have prevented a single outrage. In fact, it would not have been in operation, for there has been the best harvest that Ireland has had for a generation. I do not like to remind the right hon. Gentlemen of unpleasant things; but I think the teachings of that Bill were the only things of any great importance about it, and they were mischievous. I am afraid that when the right hon. Gentleman indicated that the enforcement of some rights, just according to law, might, in his opinion, be unjust, that conveyed to the agitators what, by a slight extension, would say that it was not unjust to resist rights whose enforcement would be unjust. Now, what did the Irish Executive do? I have been challenged about the Memorandum of the 1st of December. I do not appeal to that Memorandum; everybody knows it was a thing to be forgotten, and I do not say anything about it. [Mr. W. E. FORSTER: What Memorandum?] That of the 1st of December, 1880 — that Whiteboy Memorandum. Somebody or other told the right hon. Gentleman and his advisers, prior to the 1st of December, that certain Acts of Parliament were in existence, and then he told the magistrates—what they had known all their lives—what they contained. And the excuse is that the Chief Secretary in 1866 had issued a similar Memorandum. The only other matters that remain are the prosecutions of the 2nd of November. I do not criticize them, because they are matters pending; but I really think the Prime Minister was not called upon to give that suave apology to the hon. Member for the City of Cork for the inconvenience to which he had been put in having to come over to attend Parliament, for I am bound to say I never saw any Member of this House look less put out, less inconvenienced, than the hon. Member by his present painful and melancholy position. And I see from the public journals that he has contracted an interesting engagement for New York on the 17th of March. I cannot, of course, speculate on the result of these trials; but my opinion is that there is no reason why they should be over this time 12 months, or by any definite time whatever. Now, these prosecutions must have been founded upon the Law Officers' opinion that the Land League operations were illegal. The right hon. Gentleman challenged me to state—he was rather cautious, and I thought he was going to say he wanted to know in what particular the existing law had not been adequately applied; but he challenged me to state—that the

Government had not done their best. Well, I do not know what the right hon. Gentleman's best is; but I am bound to say that if the Irish Executive had the courage of the Law Officers' opinion, upon which the prosecutions were founded, they were bound by that opinion to prevent a single meeting of the Land League being held after the institution of the prosecutions. Experience had demonstrated the danger and the poison of these meetings. Four or five meetings were put down on the eve of the meeting of Parliament; but on what rule or plan? Is there any system? The Prime Minister stated yesterday that the Law Officers advised that the Land League meetings, under certain conditions and certain circumstances, were illegal. I assert that the sound definition of an unlawful assembly is this: Any meeting assembled under such circumstances as, according to the opinion of rational and fair men, is likely to produce danger to the tranquillity and peace of the neighbourhood, is an unlawful assembly. And I will tell you what, in the opinion of the highest Judges in the land, is also an unlawful assembly. If the persons assembled say, "We will have what we want, whether it be according to law or not"—a meeting for such a purpose, however it may be masked, is unlawful. Now, an unlawful assembly is not confined to a case of threats against persons. It is not confined to meetings which purport to interfere with the course of justice. The application of the definition which I have given requires caution, tact and discretion; but it also requires that the Executive which will have the administration of that definition shall possess some nerve, some courage, and some resolution. They must not act too soon, and they must not be too late. The only explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman with regard to these unlawful assemblies is a poor, petty, puny, sophistical *tu quoque*. He said, "Now I come to the unlawful assemblies;" but he said nothing on the subject, except that "When you were in Office you did not put them down." That is no answer. We were dealing with an earlier, less dangerous, and less developed phase of the crisis which had been going on during a time of exceptional difficulty and distress in Ireland. You are dealing with it at a time when it has attained dangerous, serious, and most important proportions, when there is no excuse of distress, and when the people have enjoyed the most abundant harvest they have had for years. Now, I say the Government might have interfered before the 2nd of November. They are prosecuting now in respect of 90 meetings which took place before that date, and each of these must have been unlawful. They had had abundant experience of the character of the agitation; at each of these meetings there was the invariable denunciation of landlords, the same invariable advice not to pay rent except in certain proportions, and they were invariably followed by intimidation. I ask what excuse or justification there was for not interfering, at all events, after the 2nd of November? I suspect they were hampered by an arrangement made between the Irish Government and the hon. Member for Cork City. It was a very remarkable arrangement, and I venture to say there was never anything like it before. It was stated in open Court, in the pending trials, that an arrangement was made between the Irish Government and the hon. Member for the City of Cork, that if the hon. Member would protect — [The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND dissented.] — I am perfectly familiar with the matter; I have a note of it from the *Freeman's Journal*. If I mis-state anything I shall be glad to be corrected; but it was unquestionably proved in open Court, and the evidence given was not, as far as I am aware, contradicted either by the Attorney General for Ireland or the Solicitor General for Ireland, that the Irish Executive had made an arrangement with the hon. Member for the City of Cork that, if he would protect the Government reporters, they would no longer send police to the Land League meetings.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): As the person who examined the witness, I distinctly stated that there was no such arrangement.

MR. GIBSON: I accept my hon. and learned Friend's statement; but it is to be regretted that, although public attention has been called to the fact, and it has been mentioned on public platforms by the hon. Member for the City of Cork, it has not, so far as I am aware, been denied in the *Freeman's Journal* or by the Chief Secretary. Now, there is one other matter. I think the Land League Courts might have been put a stop to sooner. They have been going on for weeks, and yet it was not until the 5th of January, the day before the meeting of Parliament, that an attempt has been made to put down one of them. I do not want to suggest any scape-goat theory, nor, that if there is any blame, it falls only upon the right hon. Gentleman. He has Colleagues, whom he must have informed of every step he took, and they, of course, must share the responsibility. But I cannot understand the crisis of the Cabinet Councils in November. I cannot understand the shortness of the Prorogation from November the 26th to December the 2nd. The very fact of the shortness of time shows the urgency of the crisis; but if there was a crisis then, why was not Parliament summoned? What new fact has arisen since then? Another crisis occurred shortly after that. A Cabinet Council was summoned for December the 16th; but it was hurried on and held three days earlier, on December the 13th. This showed that there was an urgent and acute crisis, at all events, in the right hon. Gentleman's mind. I suppose that was an endeavour to do his best. The dates that I have given condemn the action of Her Majesty's Government. For my part, I do not see that any explanation can be given. None has been seriously attempted. At the last moment the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary appears to have asked for special measures, and the Cabinet took upon itself the immense responsibility of refusing them. I have already detained the House for a long time, and there is only one word more that I wish to add. The Bills that are to be brought in are open, I think, to the possibility of misconstruction. I think it is unfortunate that what are called remedial and protective measures should be mixed up together. In such a case there is a double danger. First, there is the danger that the remedial measures may be taken as a concession to the tenants made through terror; while, by the landowners, they may be taken as being rather like a reversal of the conditions of Magna Charta, and that as justice has been delayed and denied to the former so long, it may now look like an endeavour to sell it. It is alleged, with reference to the Protection Bill, that it is likely to be useless, and that Coercion Bills have often been tried and have always failed. That statement has been repeated so often that people have come to believe in it. But I deny the truth of the statement altogether. What occurred in a previous case? I will not go back to the questions of 1814 or 1831; but I will take the precedent of 1870, a precedent which all here present can remember. The Peace Preservation Act of that year was introduced in April. In the four months preceding its introduction there were 1,161 agarian outrages, and in the four months after only 91. Do not let it go forth, therefore, that when there is a state of lawlessness, anarchy, and terror, a Protection Bill affords no protection. I entirely object to, and protest against, the use of the word "coercion." The proper word is "protection," for the object of the Bill is the protection of the honest and loyal subjects of the Crown. Such legislation has also been stigmatized by the use of the word "exceptional." I equally denounce the use of that term; the proper word is "effectual." Is it better that lawless men should go in dread of a strong law, or that honest men should go in dread of the impotence of existing law? Everything will depend upon the administration of this new law, which requires caution, forbearance, firmness, and vigour. I deplore—everyone deplores—the necessity of introducing this Bill. No one likes measures which interfere in the slightest degree with liberty. But such measures have now become a necessity. In my opinion, every citizen who values the best interests of Ireland, and law and order, is bound to give his support to this measure, which should be administered so as to be attended with the best possible effects. The land proposals of the Government I will not discuss. I do not suppose that anyone thinks I ought now to discuss them. When they are submitted to us and we have had an opportunity of considering and studying them, to those proposals which may be reasonable and fair I shall myself give a reasonable and fair consideration to. But that is not the question now. The paramount question before the House, as has been rightly presented in Her

Majesty's Gracious Speech and by the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken, is that of preserving law and order. I am sure that everyone hopes that the Government measure will have the effect of restoring law and order, of ending terrorism, and of removing a state of things which is an outrage upon civilization.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Shaw,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday.*

MOTIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in moving for leave to introduce a Bill dealing with Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections, said: I will, as shortly as possible, endeavour to place before this House the necessity of some legislation upon this subject. I assume that there is a general concurrence of opinion that it is the duty of the Government to introduce some measure, and to endeavour to mitigate, if not to stop, the corrupt practices which have been proved to have taken place in certain constituencies of this country. Before stating the nature of the provisions of the Bill, it would be well to consider the evils with which we have to deal, and, therefore, the object towards which legislation is to be directed. It seems to me that one of the greatest evils that exists, and which has sprung up of late years, is that of the extravagant and lavish expenditure which seems to pervade the great majority of elections throughout the country. The mere fact that a candidate is called upon to provide an extravagantly large sum for his election is in itself a great evil. It prevents men of great mental capacity from entering the field. Such men have to yield their places to others who possess the one virtue of wealth, and that alone. But it is in the course of the expenditure that the greatest evil is produced. In the increase of that expenditure the greatest and most serious danger that arises is, that it brings into the arena of electoral contests a state of things which tends to destroy the morals of the electors in the constituencies of this country, and to give opportunity to a class of men whose sole object is to make money out of elections. I think that the real object of consideration for the House is whether we could not base the political contests, not upon results produced by organization, or by agents, but rather upon the honest expression of political opinion, and upon the voluntary efforts of men actuated by a desire that their political views should prevail. There is one further objection to the employment of an electioneering staff for money. The men so called into existence have, as I have said, but one object—the making of money. They are the people who always encourage, frequently practise, the more serious corrupt practices with which we have to deal. The man who receives £1 a-day as a messenger for doing nothing, rightly enough can see no difference between the receipt of that sum and an additional payment for his vote. I have regarded, therefore, this excessive expenditure as the root from which corrupt practices are apt to grow; and many of the provisions of the Bill I am asking permission to introduce are framed with the object of greatly reducing the class of expenses to which I have referred. Before stating what those provisions are, I hope hon. Members will forgive me for saying that I am about to draw largely upon one quality which, I believe, is possessed by all — namely, earnestness with which to approach the consideration of the question. If we merely attempt to alter the present system by bits, it would be better to leave legislation alone. We have had a great deal of legislation on the subject, and any further enactment would be of little use unless we are disposed to make alterations in the present system of elections; otherwise it would tend to encourage, rather than prevent, the existence of corrupt practices. If that earnestness on the part of hon. Members exists, as I believe it does, they will have ample opportunity of showing it by giving consideration to the Bill which the Government propose to bring in. The first question which presents itself is, how shall we deal with the payments, many of them entirely colourable, made to persons employed in elections? I have received many suggestions how to mitigate the evil, and I have to make acknowledgment to many to whom I could not personally reply. For myself, I am inclined to recommend the House to go further than a mere mitigation of the present system of paid employment. By one sub-section of the Government Bill it is proposed, substantially, entirely to abolish it. It proposes, with exceptions I will mention, to prohibit the employment for payment of any agent, canvasser, clerk, messenger, watcher, or any person in any other capacity. The exceptions are one election agent, whom we bring into existence for an important purpose, one personation agent in every polling-station, and one clerk and one messenger—who are not to be electors—for every polling district in counties, and for every 500 electors in boroughs. The Bill will also prohibit, within like areas, the use of more committee-rooms than one, which is not to be in a licensed house. It also prohibits any payments for the conveyance of voters to the poll, both in counties and boroughs. In order to mitigate the inconvenience resulting in the case of county elections, an equivalent will be given by making polling-places more numerous. Other expenses, such as payments for exhibiting bills or the use of boards, are prohibited. But I feel we have to deal with an ingenious class of people, and I much fear that means will be found to evade these prohibitions against personal employment by making contracts with different persons, who, in order to fulfil their contracts, such as to print and deliver bills and addresses among a constituency, will employ voters, and so perpetuate in another form the evil we are seeking to check. It is therefore, proposed that the limit of expenditure for all purposes shall be fixed in a Schedule, such expenditure graduating according to the size of the constituency. Care will be taken that the expenditure shall be sufficient, without leaving any opportunity for expenses for illegal purposes. No expenses will be allowed at the house at which the candidate may put up, except such as are legitimate; for instance, the hire of a room for a meeting, where the candidate might have the opportunity of placing his views before his constituents. One other safeguard, I think a very material one, remains. It is proposed that no contract or payment shall be made except by the election agent. Every account must be sent to the election agent within 30 days of the Return; within 40 days payment must be made; and within 50 days a detailed account must be sent to the Returning Officer of the district of every claim made upon the agent and of every payment made. It must also state the amount received by the agent, and from whom it has been received. The Bill makes it an illegal practice for anyone to pay or provide any money for the election except to the election agent. The statement of expenses and receipts so made must be accompanied by a declaration made before a Justice, and on which perjury can be assigned, by the candidate or his agent, stating that no payments have been made or monies received beyond those shown in the Return, and that no further payments will be made. Any breach of these provisions amounts to an illegal practice, and the seat is vacated thereby. I may, however, add that clauses are inserted to protect persons who are prevented, from unavoidable causes, from complying with these provisions. I have mentioned only the main portions of the Bill dealing with this expenditure; but, leaving these, I have to deal with other evils which exist in connection with elections—namely, the more acute forms of corrupt practices, as distinguished from the illegal practices which are created by the Bill. It would be absurd for us to deal only with illegal expenditure if we did not also, at the same time, deal with corrupt practices, as the two things are brought very much together. The first matter I would mention is this—we propose to make the law more stringent in relation to withdrawal of Election Petitions. Among other things, it is made a misdemeanour to enter into any agreement whereby for money, or for the vacating of a seat, or for other consideration, a Petition is to be withdrawn. It is proposed to render the punishment for corrupt practices more severe. It is important that the commission of bribery should be regarded as involving degrading consequences—we think that probably the best means of putting an end to bribery is to make it degrading for anyone to be convicted of practising it. It is proposed, therefore, to add hard labour to the punishment of imprisonment in the case of a person convicted on indictment of bribery. In relation to treating, it is proposed to make the licensed victualler who personally permits corrupt practices to take place within his licensed house, or who keeps open house for the purpose of influencing an election, giving persons permission to consume liquor without paying for it, liable to imprisonment with hard labour, and in addition to have his licence suspended for two years if the offence is a grave one. Moreover, there are some further penalties in the way of incapacitating the guilty individuals from voting, and so forth, in order to strengthen and increase the punishment. It is then proposed to accept the suggestion contained in the recommendation of the Committee of 1875, that upon all trials of Election Petitions the representative of the Public Prosecutor shall be present. He will have to see that the Petition is thoroughly and properly tried, and that all the evidence which could be material is brought forth. If he finds there is sufficient evidence of corrupt practices on the part of any person who has not received a certificate of indemnity, it will be his duty to summon that person before the Judge, who shall forthwith, in the presence of the constituency, proceed to try the matter—and in this respect the Judge will have no greater power than that already vested in a Justice of the Peace—and, on conviction, shall have power to sentence the guilty person to six months' imprisonment with or without hard labour. Following the practice before Justices when dealing with indictable offences, the accused may elect to be tried by a jury, in which case the trial will take place at the Central Criminal Court. The Judge, if he thinks the circumstances of the case warrant it, may send the man for trial; but it must not be in the district where the alleged offence has occurred. It is thought desirable to avoid the partizanship of the locality. It is also proposed to add somewhat to the punishment of a person convicted of a corrupt practice. It is important that the commission of bribery should be regarded as involving degrading consequences. Hard labour, therefore, is added to imprisonment in cases of corrupt treating or of keeping open house and supplying liquor without payment, whether to voters or non-voters, and the licensed victualler is liable to have his licence suspended for two years. Another alteration in the law is suggested. Hon. Members are aware that at present the law so stands that if a person has committed corrupt practices, however flagrantly, if he is reported and scheduled by the Judge as having been guilty, or in the same way reported by the Commissioners, he still remains a voter on the Register; and it is not until an Act of Parliament declares that he is disfranchised, that there are any means of removing him from the Register. The result of the present state of the law is that persons who have committed corrupt practices vote in subsequent elections, and set the example to other people that they can break the law without fear of consequences. By the Bill it is provided that if a person is reported or scheduled by the Judge or Commissioners, after being heard—for all must be heard and have an opportunity of being heard before being reported—the fact of his being so reported shall incapacitate him from voting for 10 years. There is another matter I might mention. We propose that when a candidate has been guilty of corrupt practices personally, he shall never sit again for the constituency amongst which those corrupt practices have occurred. I trust the House will understand that while these are the main provisions of the Bill, there are many which I hope will be beneficial to which I have not referred. For instance, it has been thought desirable to cause solicitors, many of whom have taken and do take conspicuous parts at elections, to bear the full responsibility of officers of the Court to which they belong. The certificate of indemnity will no longer relieve a solicitor from an application to the Supreme Court of which he is an officer to punish him for misconduct. In the case of a Justice of the Peace who has been guilty of corrupt practices, the Public Prosecutor shall call the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the circumstances, and the guilty person shall be removed from the Commission of the Peace. I feel, Sir, that at this late hour of the night, I ought not to detain the House any further. I think I have in the main stated the provisions of the Bill, which I now submit for approval. I would merely say that to the principles of these provisions the Government will adhere. Of course, the details will be for the consideration of the House, and to every hon. Member I would respectfully recommend their consideration when they come before him. I do hope we shall all feel the time has come when some action must be taken in regard to the practices dealt with in the Bill. We have sat long enough on the bank; but the stream of corruption flows on, and it seems useless to hope that it will cease to flow unless something is done to stop it. We have cause to know how deep and how strong the current is, and how unchecked—though I hope not uncheckable—it still runs on. It is a disgrace to us all. Foreigners and foreign journals can point with derision to its existence in the midst of a Constitution for which we ever claim superiority, and to such criticisms now reply must be absent—

> "Pudet hœc opprobria nobis
> Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli."

Let us, however, hope that, by the passing of this Bill, we may not only be able to reply that we, as a Legislature, have strenuously striven to show how sincerely we desire to remove corruption from amongst us; but, also, that before long we shall point to its effect as giving greater strength to the Representation of the people, grounding it upon a pure and not a corrupt basis. I beg to move for leave to bring in this Bill.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: I do not rise for the purpose of offering any observation at the present moment upon the principles of this Bill. I wish simply to ask a Question of the hon. and learned Member, if he will allow me to do so. I presume the measure will at once be laid on the Table, and that we shall have it before us before long? When we have it before us, I am sure we shall give it every possible consideration, for the purpose of achieving a most desirable end, and one which for many years—I can only say for myself—I have sincerely desired. I would venture to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman who is sitting next to the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt), as to when the Reports of the Election Commissions are likely to be submitted? There is considerable anxiety in the country to know when they may be expected. The proceedings before the Commissioners have been very long, though I have no doubt all those officials have been striving to do their duty in a very disagreeable matter.

Mr. CALLAN: And I should also like to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he proposes that the Bill shall extend to Ireland, or whether he intends to introduce a separate measure dealing with that country?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James): I hope the Bill will be in print in the course of next week. As regards the Reports of the Commissions, I believe one is already prepared, and will be at once delivered, and the others, I trust, or some of them, will be ready in a fortnight. As to the character of the Bill, it will be a general measure, and will extend to Ireland and Scotland.

Mr. BROADHURST did not wish to discuss the measure, but merely to say that if it came up to the statement of the hon. and learned Member, it would improve the electoral system of the country, and give the constituencies greater freedom of choice in candidates. The measure was not before them, therefore, he could not say much with regard to it. Nevertheless, he thanked the Government most heartily for introducing it.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill for the better prevention of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. Solicitor General.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 1.]

BALLOT ACT CONTINUANCE AND AMENDMENT BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: At this hour of the night it is not my intention to detain the House by any lengthy statement as to the details of the Bill I am about to ask leave to introduce; and much less should I do so, because, on the whole, I think it will be the opinion of every Member of this House that, considering the many great difficulties that attended the first introduction of secret voting into this country, the law, as it is at present administered, is one which has met with considerable success.

The first desire which, I think, should be felt by all of us, should be to thank the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) for the manner in which the Ballot Act has worked. In asking leave to introduce a Bill to render perpetual the present mode of election by ballot, I would ask the House to wait until they see the measure in Committee before they discuss it, for the reason that the Amendments we propose to make are chiefly Amendments of extreme detail which could not be properly considered before the Bill is in Committee. I would merely ask leave to introduce the Bill.

Mr. GRAY expressed a hope that the hon. Baronet would see the propriety of extending secret voting to elections of Poor Law Guardians, as well as elections of Parliamentary and Municipal Representatives. He never, himself, could comprehend why Poor Law Guardians had not been included in legislation of this kind. The Ballot Act was about to be amended and rendered perpetual, and it appeared to him that now was the time when all public bodies should be reformed in accordance with the principle of that measure.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that while the Members of the Government were favourable to the view of his hon. Friend (Mr. Gray), yet they were of opinion that Parliamentary and Municipal Elections should be dealt with by the present measure, and Guardians' Elections by another Bill. There would not be time to introduce such a Bill during the present Session.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to amend and make perpetual "The Ballot Act," *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Charles Dilke, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Attorney General.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 2.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

Mr. STEVENSON moved for leave to bring in a Bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday.

Mr. CALLAN said, he intended to oppose the Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the Motion must be postponed until another day.

Mr. STEVENSON remarked, that no Notice of opposition had been placed upon the Paper.

Dr. CAMERON believed that it was necessary for an hon. Member to give Notice that he intended to oppose.

Mr. CALLAN said, the Notice of the intention to move for the introduction of the Bill appeared on the Paper for the first time that day, and he apprehended that, under the half-past 12 o'clock Rule, it could not be proceeded with now that it was opposed.

Mr. STEVENSON was of opinion that it was necessary to give Notice of opposition, and that the Notice should appear upon the Paper.

Mr. CALLAN said, the half-past 12 o'clock Rule stated that if a Bill was before the House, then Notice of opposition must be placed on the Paper; but in this case, as the Bill did not appear upon the Paper until that morning, he was within his right in opposing its introduction without Notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member for South Shields (Mr. Stevenson) will refer to the Standing Order, he will find that it is in these words—

> "Except for a Money Bill no Order of the Day or Notice of Motion be taken after half-past 12 of the clock at night with respect to which Order or Notice of Motion a Notice of opposition or Amendment shall have been printed on the Notice Paper, or if such Notice of Motion shall only have been given the next previous day of sitting and objection shall be taken when such Notice is called."

Objection being taken to the Motion of the hon. Member for South Shields, it must be postponed.

Motion *postponed* accordingly.

PUBLIC HOUSES (CLOSING ON SUNDAY) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

Mr. PEASE moved for leave to bring in a Bill for closing public-houses on Sundays in England and Wales, making provision for the sale of beer for consumption off the premises during certain limited hours, and for the exceptional requirements of large towns.

Mr. CALLAN begged to oppose the Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the hon. Member opposes it, it cannot be taken to-day.

Motion *postponed* accordingly.

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE.

Lord KENSINGTON moved—

"That a Standing Committee be appointed to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms in the Department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House."

Mr. CALLAN said, he felt compelled to oppose the appointment of the Committee. He was bound to confess that the Kitchen arrangements had hitherto been most unsatisfactory. Suggestions for improvement had frequently been made; indeed, material alterations were required, and although promises of amendment were made last year, they had not yet been carried out. He would suggest that there should be a material addition made to the Committee as now proposed, and he would further propose the name of the hon. Member for Clare (Captain O'Shea).

Mr. SPEAKER: As the Motion is opposed it must be postponed.

Motion *postponed* accordingly.

STANDING ORDERS.

Select Committee on Standing Orders *nominated:* — Sir John Mowbray, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Monk, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Denis O'Conor, Mr. Rodwell, Lord Arthur Russell, Sir David Wedderburn, and Mr. Whitbread.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

SELECTION.

Committee of Selection *nominated:* — Mr. Cubitt, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. Whitbread, and the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (WALES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Roberts, Bill to prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday in Wales, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Roberts, Mr. Richard, Mr. Samuel Holland, Mr. Hussey Vivian, and Mr. Rathbone.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 3.]

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AND REFORMATORIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Callan, Bill to amend the Industrial Schools Act, and the Laws relating to Reformatories (Ireland), and to enlarge and extend the powers of the Poor Law authorities in respect thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Callan, Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Martin.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 4.]

NEWSPAPERS (LAW OF LIBEL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hutchinson, Bill to amend the Law of Newspaper Libel, and to provide for the registration of newspaper proprietors, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Edward Leatham, and Mr. Samuel Morley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 5.]

FREE EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to enable School Boards in Scotland to provide by means of rates only, instead of by rates and fees, for the Education in Board Schools of children resident in their district so far as that education is compulsory, *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Mr. Ernest Noel, Mr. Peddie, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Henderson, and Mr. Mackintosh.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 6.]

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS REPEAL BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stansfeld, Bill to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. William Fowler, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, and Mr. Joseph Cowen.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 7.]

REMOVAL TERMS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James Stewart, Bill to provide for uniform terms of entry to and removal from Lands and Heritages in Scotland, and to provide, in certain cases, fixed terms for payment of Rents of such Lands and Heritages, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. James Stewart, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Patrick, and Mr. Mackintosh.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 8.]

METROPOLITAN OPEN SPACES ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Walter James, Bill to amend "The Metropolitan Open Spaces Act, 1877," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Walter James and Mr. Bryce.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 9.]

AGRICULTURAL TENANTS' COMPENSATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chaplin, Bill to amend "The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875," and to secure to Tenants compensation for their improvements in all cases, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chaplin, Mr. James Cowan, Mr. J. C. Lawrance, and Mr. Birkbeck.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 10.]

CLERICAL DISABILITIES ACT REPEAL BILL.

On Motion of Sir Gabriel Goldney, Bill to repeal the Act of the forty-third year of the reign of King George the Third, chapter sixty-three, relative to the eligibility of persons in Holy Orders to sit in the House of Commons, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Gabriel Goldney and Mr. Thorold Rogers.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 11.]

VOLUNTEER CORPS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. P. J. SMYTH, Bill to authorise the enrolment of Volunteer Corps in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. P. J. SMYTH and Mr. PATRICK MARTIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 12.]

LONDON CITY (PAROCHIAL CHARITIES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. BRYCE, Bill to provide for he better application and management of the Parochial Charities of the City of London, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. BRYCE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WALTER JAMES, and Mr. DAVEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 13.]

CHURCH BOARDS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ALBERT GREY, Bill to provide for the establishment of Church Boards in parishes in England and Wales, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ALBERT GREY, Mr. EDWARD HOWARD, Mr. STUART-WORTLEY, Mr. MARRIOTT, and Mr. PULLEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 14.]

PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ANDERSON, Bill for the Amendment of the Law as to Patents for Inventions, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALEXANDER BROWN, Mr. HINDE PALMER, and Mr. BROADHURST.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 15.]

BILLS OF SALE ACT (1878) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. MONK, Bill to amend "The Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment Act," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MONK, Mr. Serjeant SIMON, Mr. FRY, and Mr. BARRAN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 16.]

CORN RETURNS BILL.

On Motion of Colonel BARNE, Bill to amend the Law relating to Corn Returns, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel BARNE and General BURNABY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 17.]

REFORMATORY INSTITUTIONS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Bill further to facilitate the building, enlargement, and maintenance of Reformatory Institutions in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Mr. GABBETT, and Mr. GRAY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 18.]

LIMITATION OF COSTS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ERRINGTON, Bill to limit the costs which may be incurred and facilitate the redemption of lands by tenants in Ireland in certain cases of ejectment, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ERRINGTON and Mr. BLENNERHASSETT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 19.]

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. RICHARD POWER, Bill relating to the Municipal Franchise in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RICHARD POWER, Mr. LEAMY, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DAWSON, and Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 20.]

BURIAL FEES BILL.

On Motion of Sir ALEXANDER GORDON, Bill for the regulation of Burial Fees, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir ALEXANDER GORDON and Mr. BRINTON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 21.]

MEDICAL ACT (1858) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HARDCASTLE, Bill to amend "The Medical Act, 1858," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HARDCASTLE, Sir TREVOR LAWRENCE, and Dr. FARQUHARSON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 22.]

MARRIAGE LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. BLENNERHASSETT, Bill to extend the legal hours of Marriage, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. BLENNERHASSETT, Mr. MONK, and Mr. OTWAY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 23.]

THAMES STEAM NAVIGATION REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CHARLES M'LAREN, Bill for the better regulation of Steam Navigation on certain portions of the River Thames, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CHARLES M'LAREN, Mr. OTWAY, Mr. WALTER JAMES, Mr. BRODRICK, Mr. HARCOURT, and Mr. HANBURY-TRACY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 24.]

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION ACT (1859) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. WILLIAM FOWLER, Bill to further amend "The Municipal Corporation Act, 1859," with respect to the division of Boroughs into Wards, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. WILLIAM FOWLER, Mr. RYLANDS, Mr. WALTER JAMES, and Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 25.]

MARKETS REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. WARTON, Bill for the Regulation of Markets, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. WARTON and Captain AYLMER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 26.]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. PEASE, Bill for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. PEASE, Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, and Dr. CAMERON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 27.]

IRISH RAILWAYS PURCHASE BILL.

On Motion of Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, Bill for the Purchase of Irish Railways, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Rowland Blennerhassett and Colonel Colthurst.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 28.]

TITHE (EXTRAORDINARY CHARGE) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Inderwick, Bill to amend the Tithe Commutation Acts as to the Extraordinary Tithe Rent-Charge on hop grounds, orchards, fruit plantations, and market gardens, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Inderwick, Mr. Howard, Sir Edmund Filmer, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Arthur Vivian, and Mr. Thorold Rogers.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 29.]

CHURCH PATRONAGE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stanhope, Bill to amend the Laws relating to patronage, simony, and exchange of Benefices in the Church of England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Stanley Leighton, and Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 30.]

AGRICULTURAL TENANTS COMPENSATION (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Thomas Acland, Bill to secure Compensation to Agricultural Tenants in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Thomas Acland, Mr. Evans, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Lord Moreton, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Rodwell, Sir John Kennaway, and Mr. Story-Maskelyne.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 31.]

POOR LAW GUARDIANS ELECTION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Edmond Gray, Bill to provide for the Election of Poor Law Guardians in Ireland by ballot, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Edmond Gray, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Errington, and Mr. O'Connor Power.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 32.]

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Litton, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Summary Jurisdiction of Magistrates in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Litton, Mr. Errington, and Mr. Broadhurst.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 33.]

COUNTY COURTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Norwood, Bill to extend the jurisdiction of the County Courts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Norwood, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Benjamin T. Williams, and Sir Eardley Wilmot.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 34.]

RIVER FLOODS PREVENTION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Magniac, Bill to make provision for the better Prevention of Floods, and for the Conservancy of Rivers, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Magniac, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Biddulph, and Sir Charles Reed.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 35.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (EXPENSES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Ashton Dilke, Bill to amend the Law relating to Parliamentary Elections, by providing for the payment of necessary expenses out of the rates, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Ashton Dilke, Mr. Barran, and Mr. Burt.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 36.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Bill to amend the Laws relating to Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Rathbone, and Mr. Cohen.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 37.]

HIGHWAYS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Estcourt, Bill to amend the Law relating to the providing of funds for the maintenance of Highways in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Estcourt, Mr. Yorke, and Mr. Master.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 38.]

BOILER EXPLOSIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hugh Mason, Bill to make better provision for inquiries with regard to Boiler Explosions, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. Burt, Mr. Henry Lee, and Mr. Broadhurst.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 39.]

INFECTIOUS DISEASES NOTIFICATION (IREDAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Edmond Gray, Bill to provide for the better notification of Infectious Diseases in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Edmond Gray, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Dawson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 40.]

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Litton, Bill to amend the Law with respect to the payment of Clerks of Petty Sessions in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Litton and Mr. James Richardson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 41.]

TEACHERS' REGISTRATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill to provide for the registration and organisation of Teachers, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Playfair, and Mr. Balfour.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 42.]

FREE LIBRARIES BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Free Libraries, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Lord George Hamilton, and Sir Charles Reed.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 43.]

BILLS OF SALE ACT (1878) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Serjeant SIMON, Bill to amend the Bills of Sale Act 1878, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Serjeant SIMON, Mr. MONK, Mr. LEWIS FRY, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. BARRAN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 44.]

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ANDERSON, Bill for the amendment of the Law regarding Property of Married Women in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DUNCAN M'LAREN, and Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 45.]

BANKING LAWS AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill for the amendment of the Laws relating to Banking.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. RAMSAY, and Mr. CHARLES M'LAREN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 46.]

CHURCHWARDENS ADMISSION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. MONK, Bill to facilitate the admission of Churchwardens to office, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MONK and Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 47.]

JUDGMENTS (INFERIOR COURTS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. NORWOOD, Bill to render judgments obtained in certain Inferior Courts in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, effectual in any other part of the United Kingdom, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LITTON, Mr. MONK, Mr. REID, and Mr. Serjeant SIMON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 48.]

SALMON AND FRESH WATER FISHERIES BILL.

On Motion of Sir JOSEPH BAILEY. Bill to consolidate and amend the Salmon and Fresh Water Fishery Laws of England and Wales, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir JOSEPH BAILEY, Mr. DILLWYN, Mr. DODDS, and Mr. HOWARD.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 49.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 10*th January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Limitation of Actions* (5); Settled Land* (6); Conveyancing and Law of Property* (7); Solicitors' Remuneration* (8); Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment* (9).
Second Reading—Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal)* (2); Judicial Committee* (3).

ROLL OF THE LORDS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: The same was ordered to be *printed.* (No. 4.)

ARMY—INSERTION OF ARMY ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE PRESS.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF BRADFORD asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Why, as stated in the General Regulations in the Army Circulars of last month, the "Shrewsbury Chronicle" has been withdrawn from the list of newspapers in which Army advertisements may be inserted?

THE EARL OF MORLEY, in reply, said, that all details in respect to the insertion of Army advertisements in the newspapers were committed by the Government to the Treasury, and he had no knowledge of the motives which had led to the exercise of their discretion in the manner indicated by the Question of the noble Earl.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE CAPE COLONY—THE INSTRUCTIONS TO SIR HERCULES ROBINSON.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL CADOGAN said, he had to put a Question to the noble Earl the Secretary for the Colonies, of which he had given him private Notice, relating to the affairs in South Africa. The Prime Minister was reported to have stated in "another place" last week that it was his intention to present to Parliament the private instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson on his departure for South Africa. Now, it was a universally acknowledged rule that instructions of that kind should not be conveyed to Parliament until the arrival at his destination of the person to whom they had been addressed. Sir Hercules Robinson left England on the 30th of December, and it would be some days yet before he could reach South Africa. He (Earl Cadogan) could not help thinking that Sir Hercules Robinson, with his experience, ought to have had some latitude given him, and that he should be permitted to be guided by the circumstances at the Cape on his arrival. It was obvious that the publication there of the instructions in question before his arrival, or of a telegraphic summary of them, would weaken the authority of Sir Hercules Robinson, and establish a dangerous precedent. He wished to ask the noble Earl, Whether it was really intended to present those instructions to Parliament before the arrival of Sir Hercules Robinson at the Cape? He would also take the opportunity of asking for any information as to the production of Papers in reference to the Transvaal.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY, in reply, said, there had been already laid on the Table Papers coming down to a comparatively recent date on South African affairs generally; among them would be found Papers regarding the Transvaal; and further Papers would be published hereafter. With regard to the instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson, they were certainly not of a private or confidential, but were essentially of a public character. They were laid by him on the Table of that House on Friday, and they were also laid on the Table of the House of Commons. It was quite correct to say it was not customary to submit to Parliament the instructions given to a Governor before he had arrived in the Colony; but in this instance the matter was one in which great interest was felt, both here and in South Africa, and there was nothing whatsoever that it was not right the public should know before Sir Hercules Robinson arrived in the Colony. There was nothing the Government wished, either for the sake of the Governor or their own, to keep from the public, and they thought it advantageous in the public interest that the Papers should be printed at once rather than that they should be kept back until Sir Hercules Robinson arrived in the Colony.

AFGHANISTAN (OCCUPATION OF CANDAHAR).—OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of LYTTON, in rising, pursuant to Notice, to call the attention of the House to affairs in Afghanistan, and to make a personal statement with reference to his own action as Viceroy of India, in regard to the late Afghan War, said: My Lords, in addressing your Lordships for the first time, I deeply feel how great is my need of your indulgence; for not only do I lack the Parliamentary experience and ability so eminently possessed by those to whom this House is accustomed to listen upon questions of importance, but my consciousness of this deficiency is increased by a solemn sense of the national magnitude and gravity of the matter about which I have given Notice of my desire to call your attention this evening. I am anxious that the terms of that Notice should not be misunderstood. The object of it is to lay before the House as promptly and plainly as I can certain considerations which appear to me deserving of the early attention of your Lordships, in consequence of the announcement made to us in the Speech from the Throne, that Her Majesty has been advised to abandon the possession of Candahar—a city twice conquered by Her Majesty's troops. But it is not my intention to enter at large into the long history of the war which led to the occupation of Candahar. I shall only refer very briefly to certain matters, connected, no doubt, with the story of that war, but which have an essential bearing upon the whole policy of the measure we have been informed of. These matters, and the importance of them, were strongly impressed on my mind when I was Viceroy of India, and I do not think they have yet received from this House or from this country the emphatic notice of which they seem to me deserving. To that extent, therefore, my remarks will partake of the character of a personal explanation; and, also, in so far as it is not my intention to conclude them with a Motion. For this course I have a strong reason—at least, it is a reason strongly felt by myself. My Lords, I do not think it would be fair either to the present Viceroy or to the present Government if I endeavoured to-night to elicit from your Lordships a definite, and possibly a premature, opinion upon a measure for which Her Majesty's Ministers and Her Majesty's Viceroy are jointly responsible, and of which neither the motives nor the objects have yet been communicated to us. I have always strongly felt that India ought not to be governed from England—at least, not in the sense of being directly ruled upon the dictatorship, either of Parliamentary Parties, however numerous and enlightened, or even of retired Viceroys, however earnest and experienced, who cannot possibly have that personal familiarity with the constantly fluctuating aspect of Indian affairs which is necessarily possessed by the Governor General in Council. Holding this opinion, I should, indeed, be sorry if my first act upon my taking my seat in this House were to come impetuously forward with a Motion which might, in my own opinion, at least, have even an appearance of such a tendency, and, very probably, such a practical effect. My present object, therefore, is only to lay before this House the views I was induced to form, as Viceroy of India, upon the important question of Candahar; in order to obtain for them, before that question is discussed, with a view to a decision on the Papers we are still awaiting from Her Majesty's Government, not a recorded opinion, but such fair consideration as your Lordships may reasonably be asked to vouchsafe them in recognition of the great national importance of the subject to which they refer. In the discussion which took place last Thursday on the Address, it was observed by my noble Friend the late Prime Minister that the policy of the present Government appeared to be based on the principle of inverting and reversing, as far as they practically can, the action of their Predecessors. Now, I think this observation was especially true and just as regards the Afghan policy of the two Governments. The Afghan policy of the late Government was affirmed and supported by very large majorities in this and the other House of Parliament, upon the most prolonged and vivacious discussion of every conceivable topic in any wise relevant to the incidents or objects of the Afghan War. That discussion was practically closed by the verdict of Parliament, and it is not my desire to re-open it. I shall accept the recorded result of it as the starting-point of the observations I wish to offer in deprecation of the abandonment of Candahar. But if the abandonment of Candahar be right, then the Afghan War was wrong—at least, this appears to be what Her Majesty's Ministers intended us to feel. For, in the Speech from the Throne, they have distinctly indicated their settled disposition either to reject as worthless, or to repudiate as unjustifiable, the most important practical result of that war, and to revert as closely as they can to the condition of things which preceded the war, which occasioned the war, and of which the war was intended to prevent the recurrence. This is obvious, because, if we are to retire from Candahar, only with the intention of going back to Candahar as often as it may hereafter become necessary, either to control the action of the Cabul Power, or to punish its misbehaviour, or to exclude foreign influence from Afghanistan, or to correct the results of such influence, why, then, of course, it would be more reasonable and more effectual for this purpose to remain at Candahar, which is already in our possession, on the principle that prevention is better than cure. Therefore, I presume that the control of the Cabul Power, and the exclusion of foreign influence from Afghanistan, are not among the motives of this decision. My Lords, I do not know what the motives of it may have been; but I do know very well what the effect of it will be. In India the effect of it will be this—in every Native bazaar, at every Indian Court, along every Indian frontier, it will display to Her Majesty's subjects, feudatories, and neighbours, in that part of the world, the unaccustomed and bewildering spectacle of the most violent and most inexplicable oscillation in the policy of their Rulers; and, if I know anything of Oriental character, such a spectacle will certainly not be conducive to their respect for the sobriety of your will, or their confidence in the serenity of your wisdom, and the value of your word. That is what will be the effect of it in India. And now, what will be the effect of it in England? It will be to cast upon the late Government—no, I will not say this, for I believe that to be impossible—but it will, at least, advertise to the whole country the deliberate desire and intention of the present Government to cast upon their Predecessors in Office the odium—the unmerited odium—of having involved India in a great and costly war, leading to no appreciable result of adequate benefit to the permanent security of the Empire on behalf of which that war was waged. Now, I must say I do not think the late Government has deserved of its successors that they should endeavour to place it in such a position as this. For my own part, I do not hesitate to say that if a full and complete equivalent be not now obtained for all the blood and treasure cost us by the war—or rather the two wars undertaken in Afghanistan—wars which could neither have been averted or evaded by any Administration responsible for the security of India—the fault of this will not rest with the late Government of India; it will not rest with Her Majesty's late Ministers; but it will rest, and history will make it rest, with those who reject the results of that war and refuse even to retain the advantages secured by it. My Lords, I must also add that—considering that Parliament has, by large and repeated majorities, confirmed the principles and approved the objects of the Afghan War—the presumption is, to say the least, *primâ facie* against a measure which implies that those principles are wrong, and those results worthless. This, I confess, is the point of view from which I now approach the question whether we ought to abandon Candahar, or to retain it. I do not know, and the House does not know, what are the reasons which have induced the present Government to come to the decision that Candahar ought to be abandoned, and to advise Her Majesty to this effect; but I do say that such a decision ought not to be carried out without a fair, an impartial, and, if necessary, a repeated reference to the reasons which induced the late Government to come to the precisely opposite conclusion that Candahar ought to be retained, and to advise Her Majesty to that effect. My Lords, these reasons were numerous, they were serious, and they were carefully considered. But, for the present, they may all be summed up in the conviction, to which the late Government was led by them, upon a full review of the whole condition of those affairs with which you are now dealing in Afghanistan—that the permanent maintenance of the British Power at Cabul—I do not say necessarily by means of annexation, though neither do I shrink from saying by means of annexation should that become necessary; but, at any rate, in some form or other, direct or indirect, which, for all practical purposes, will be a substantial reality—is now the only effectual safeguard against a recurrence, and possibly a constant recurrence, of the dangers so conspicuously brought into light, and so forcibly pressed on our attention, by our experience of the late Afghan War, and our knowledge of the circumstances which gave rise to it. Whatever may have been the merits or demerits of that war, it has conclusively established, beyond all possibility of reasonable or honest question, one fact of supreme importance. That fact is the facility with which Russia—if she has established her influence in Afghanistan, or if she can establish her influence there—will always be able, whenever she desires, to cripple the action or embarrass the policy of England in Europe, by disturbing the security of England in India. And to do this, moreover, without even employing her own troops for the purpose, but simply by creating a diversion on the North-West Frontier of India, through an alliance with the Cabul Power. This, I say, is the one great fact you have now to deal with, and which, whatever be your policy, you must always bear in mind. It is established on evidence of the most formidable character. It cannot be disputed, and it ought not to be shirked. My Lords, the Russian Mission to Cabul, which was the immediate occasion of the Afghan War, is a proceeding of which the morality has been justified on the ground that it was virtually a war measure legitimized by the fact that our European relations with Russia were, at that time, strained to the very verge of imminent hostilities. But we are not concerned to discuss the morality of that proceeding. What does practically concern us is the danger of it. And, from this point of view, it matters nothing to us whether the Mission was the result of sudden impulse or long premeditation. If it was the result of sudden impulse, it clearly shows us how close is the peril to which we shall at all times be exposed from the establishment in Afghanistan of any foreign influence more powerful, or more energetically exerted, than our own. If, on the other hand, it was the result of careful preparation, it shows us, no less clearly, how great is the value attached by Russia to the acquisition of such an influence, and what is the purpose to which she will put it if she acquires it. In the one case, you must look upon Afghanistan as a loaded pistol lying on your doorstep, ready to be exploded in the full front of your power whenever Russia, upon a sudden impulse, stretches out a hasty hand to seize it. In the other case, you are fully warned of the mischief which such a weapon may inflict on you, if you ever relax your own firm grasp upon the butt end of it. In both cases the danger is the same; and in either case the magnitude of such a danger can scarcely be exaggerated. And in connection with this consideration there is another, which must always be taken into account. I do not suppose there exists in Europe a man whose mind is loaded with weightier or more constant cares, arising out of wider interests, than the Sovereign who personally administers the vast Empire of Russia. It is practically impossible for the Russian Government at St. Petersburg to be incessantly watching and controlling the detailed action of its local authorities in a region so remote as Central Asia. The Russian Governor General at Tashkend thus occupies, in his great Satrapy as the Representative of a distant and despotic Government, a position of great practical independence; and, if he be an able, energetic, and ambitious man, anxious to extend the influence, or the territory, of his Sovereign, he will naturally do a great many things which he has not been instructed to do—at the risk of being disapproved if he fails, but in the hope of winning honour and reward if he succeeds. This consideration leads me to the point of what I have to say about the object and origin of that Russian Mission. It was not an unpremeditated Mission. It was not an impromptu act of retaliation or precaution. But it was the carefully prepared result of three years preliminary correspondence, and three years direct negotiation—in all, six years of patient preparation. I affirm this briefly, but positively. It would take me all night to prove in detail what I affirm; but the proofs of it are to be found by those who care to search for them, obscurely buried and inconveniently dispersed through numerous Blue Books, all of which are accessible to your Lordships. And, in one word, this is what they prove. From the year 1872 to the year 1875, the Governor General of Russian Turkestan was in constant communication with the Ameer of Cabul; and his communications were regarded—I must say most reasonably regarded—by the Ameer and his advisers as having no other conceivable object than that of establishing Russian influence in Afghanistan. The Ameer was at first seriously alarmed, and afterwards dangerously attracted, by the increasing significance of these communications; and, in the year 1873, he made to the British Government a strong appeal on the subject of them. With the result of that appeal he was, as your Lordships well know, dissatisfied. Great, however, as is the importance I attach to this incident, as the turning point of our relations with Afghanistan, it is not my present intention to refer to it any further. For it was the subject of animated controversy in this House only two years ago; and I do not wish to revive that controversy, or to provoke on the part of any noble Lord in this House those feelings of personal acrimony which I am most anxious not to import into my own remarks. But the fact remains, and I state it as a matter of history, without wishing to use it as a matter of controversy, that, from the year 1875 to the year 1878, the Russian Governor General was, for all practical purposes, permanently represented at Cabul, in the most effectual manner, by means of incessant relays of special Envoys or agents; the one alway arriving before the other departed. The Government of India, moreover, had the strongest possible reasons to believe, and, indeed, to know, that the object of these incessant special Missions and secret communications was to negotiate and prepare that alliance which they enabled General Stoletieff afterwards to conclude so easily and rapidly at Cabul in the year 1878. My Lords, the terms of that alliance, which was an alliance defensive and offensive against India, are known to the Indian Government, and to Her Majesty's Ministers. But, as they have not yet been made known to the Parliament and the people of this country, and as I am not yet aware whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to lay them before the House, I will not now refer to them. All I wish to urge upon your Lordships' serious consideration is the broad fact which appears to me established by all the circumstances I have thus briefly indicated in regard to the position of the Cabul Power, between the now no longer distant bounds of the Russian and British Empires in Asia. Thus situated, no Ameer of Cabul can practically stand alone and aloof from the influence of one or other of the two great European Empires with which Afghanistan is contiguous. He must inevitably fall under the control either of the British or of the Russian Power; and, if he does not fall under British control, it is obvious that he will fall under Russian control. To deny this appears to me as extravagant a proposition as it would be to assert that a stick, balanced on its end and left to itself, will not fall in one direction or another. And now, let us suppose for a moment that Afghanistan falls under the control of Russia. Can any one of your Lordships doubt for a moment that the establishment of Russian influence in Afghanistan would be practically incompatible with the untroubled maintenance of the British Power in India? My Lords, it does not lie in the mouth of any responsible statesman to maintain such an opinion. And, certainly, no such opinion was entertained by the late Lord Lawrence, whose authority on this subject was so frequently invoked in your discussions of two years ago. Ten years previous to the event of which I am now speaking, the only danger beyond our North-West Frontier anticipated by Lord Lawrence, or by anyone else, was from the establishment of Russian influence in Afghanistan by forcible means. Lord Lawrence could not then discuss, for no one then foresaw, the danger which actually did arise 10 years later from the public presence of the Russian Power at Cabul—not as the foe, but as the avowed friend and ally of the Ameer of Cabul, at a time when that Prince had ceased to be the avowed friend and ally of the British Government. Yet even then, in a valuable Minute dated 1868, Lord Lawrence recorded his opinion that it is so necessary to exclude Russian influence from Afghanistan—ay, and to exclude it at any cost—that Russia, he said, ought to be plainly told that any further advance upon her part beyond a given point towards India—and, my Lords, her Asiatic Frontiers were then far less close to ours than they are now—would entail upon her war with England in all parts of the world. War in all parts of the world! Such was the importance attached by Lord Lawrence to the efficacious and permanent exclusion of Russian influence from Afghanistan; and I think the leading Members of the present Cabinet are all equally committed to this principle. For the Cabinet which held Office from 1868 to 1874 exacted from Russia, in 1869, a formal engagement, since then repeatedly renewed, to regard and treat Afghanistan as a State entirely excluded from the sphere of Russia's legitimate influence. If, then, all responsible British statesmen and all practical Indian Administrators are agreed as to the importance of maintaining British, and excluding Russian, influence in Afghanistan, it surely follows that the only practical question we have to consider is how is this to be done? Now, there are two ways in which you may endeavour to effect this object. You may seek the attainment of it by the exercise of a recognized control over the foreign relations of the Cabul Ruler by means of competent British Representatives or Agents in his dominions. This was the plan first tried by the late Government of India, and which led to the Treaty of Gandamak. So long as that plan was possible, we were anxious not to weaken but to strengthen the Cabul Power; and in its despatch of July, 1879, the late Government of India, reviewing the terms and objects of that Treaty, recorded its opinion that, so long as the Treaty was loyally observed by the Ameer of Cabul, the annexation of Candahar would not only be unnecessary, but also undesirable. The case, however, was essentially altered by the atrocious massacre of our Mission at Cabul, which defeated the main object of the Treaty of Gandamak. And, my Lords, I do not deny for a moment that this is an event which I recall, and shall always recall, with the keenest affliction. I do not think that even his nearest relations can mourn with a deeper grief than mine the dastardly murder of my dear and truly gallant friend, Sir Louis Cavagnari. I will not obtrude upon this House my great private sorrow for that irreparable loss. Apart, however, from that great sorrow, my opinion as to the propriety of the course we pursued by acquiescing in the Ameer's strongly expressed, and apparently sincere, request for the support of a British Mission at his Court, is an opinion entirely unchanged by the abominable crime with which it was so ill requited. But, although I think it was right, and even necessary, in the interests of all concerned, to make that humane experiment, undeterred by the risks it involved, and of which we were not unconscious, I admit, my Lords, that the experiment has failed. That being the case, the failure of it leaves open only one course practically conducive to the attainment of those objects which all responsible statesmen have hitherto approved, desired, and insisted on; and this is the course adopted by the late Government in reference to Candahar. For if you cannot have moral guarantees for the adequate control of the Cabul Power, then you must have material guarantees. The failure of the Gandamak Treaty has proved the impossibility of moral guarantees; and what will be your material guarantees if you abandon Candahar and the Kurram headlands? As long as you retain possession of these, the position we have to assert, and the interest we have to safeguard, upon our Afghan Frontier will be practically independent of the good or ill-will of any Cabul Ruler. My Lords, the possession of Candahar and the surrounding country, when brought into railway connection with the Valley of the Indus, will give us in Afghanistan the only kind of influence which it is now possible for us to exercise over the people of that country. It will enable us to compel them, when necessary, to keep the peace; and it will render comparatively unimportant to us the condition of their relations with Russia. The possession of Candahar would lay open the whole of Afghanistan to our armies in case of need. It would most effectually secure the Empire's only vulnerable Frontier against both attack and intrigue; and it would open the means of bringing by rail all the trade of Central Asia to Kurrachee on the one hand and Calcutta on the other. I beseech Her Majesty's Ministers—most earnestly I beseech them—not to neglect the warning given them by General Roberts, or the example set them by Russia, in reference to the importance of cultivating their trade routes between India and Central Asia. It is not to war, but to commerce that you must look for the extension of your legitimate influence in Asia. And, my Lords, pray remember that the loss of legitimate influence really means the loss of peace, the loss of security, the loss of freedom, the loss of all that renders possible the existence of the Indian Empire. And then there is another point which must not be lost sight of. The question of Candahar does not stand alone. Beyond Candahar there is Herat, beyond Herat there is Merv. My Lords, Herat is a position which England has twice fought to preserve from foreign domination. It has been called the key of India; and Liberal statesmen have at all times attached great importance to it. My own opinion is that the importance of Herat is entirely relative; and that if the British power were firmly established at Candahar, you could afford to regard with indifference what happens at Herat. For you would then be in a position both to prevent any arrangements about Herat of which you did not approve, and also to enforce the observance of arrangements of which you did approve. But do not flatter yourselves that this is now your position. You are at present utterly powerless to exercise the smallest influence over the destinies of Herat, and so you will continue to be till you are firmly established at Candahar. And now let us see what are the objections to this policy. The most practical of them all lies in the assumption that the annexation of Candahar will be expensive. My Lords, this is a very debatable proposition. I do not think it can be denied or affirmed with any degree of certainty; for the rude phenomena of Afghan rule furnish no data from which to estimate correctly the probable financial results of British administration. I do not think that any Indian Administrator could have possibly predicted before the annexation of the Punjaub, whether that great addition to Empire would most increase the expenses or the revenues of the Indian Government. Much must necessarily depend upon the manner in which the Province is administered; much also on the selection of the man to whom the administration of it is first intrusted. The opinion I was led to form, as Viceroy of India, upon the best information which could then be obtained, is that Candahar, if judiciously administered, will, when connected by rail with the Valley of the Indus, at once pay its expenses; and that, in a short while, it will pay them twice over, and much more than twice over. I should think less highly than I do of the administrative capacity of our Indian Services if it turned out otherwise; but I admit that this is only a personal anticipation—a guess, if you will. Let us assume it to be over sanguine—what then? My Lords, national security, and that permanent immunity from external danger which is the essential condition of national security; these are blessings not to be enjoyed without paying the full price for them. The possession of Empire must always be an expensive privilege. But the loss of Empire may be a ruinous disgrace; and the safety of India is worth more thana few pieces of silver. We cannot haggle with destiny. I feel not a shadow of a doubt that any re-settlement of the North-West Frontier of India which leaves that Frontier exposed to a recurrence of the dangers that gave rise to the Afghan War will inflict, and at no distant date, upon the Government of India far heavier financial burdens than any which can be incurred on account of the administration of Candahar. The importance of this general consideration cannot, I think, be more forcibly pointed out than it was, some years ago, by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In 1859 he explained that what Her Majesty's Government had then to guard against, even at the cost of war for the purpose, was not then, any more than it is now, the bugbear of an imminent armed invasion of India by Russia, but the constantly disturbing and unsettling effect, all along our Frontier, of the subtle extension of Russian influence and intrigue even from a point so comparatively distant as Herat. The noble Earl then said, and said most truly, that by this means Russia, without moving a soldier, could paralyze the finances of India. And I must ask your Lordships to observe how infinitely greater would be the danger, then pointed out by the noble Earl, if Russian influence and intrigue were extended, not merely from Herat, but from Cabul on the one side, and Candahar on the other; whilst British influence had no extension beyond Peshawur? Putting aside, therefore, this debatable question of expense on which we have no adequate data for practical argument, I come to what may be called the moral objections. We are told that annexation is very immoral; and that we have no right to annex Candahar unless the Candaharis specially request us to be so good as to do so, or unless, on the other hand, they commit some abominable crime, for which their conquest is the only fitting punishment. This objection was mentioned by the noble Marquess who is now Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington), in reply to a deputation urging him not to relinquish Candahar. But the noble Marquess is a statesman whose mind is not swayed by impulsive sentiment; and I earnestly hope that the noble Marquess will not allow his calm and manly judgment to be confused by a mere word. What is conquest? It has many different meanings. It may mean such an operation as the conquests of Attila—massacre, confiscation, the sack of cities, the sale of their inhabitants into slavery; and this is probably the greatest of all evils. It may mean such an operation as the conquests of some Mahommedan Princes; the imposition of a grinding tribute, the degradation of the national religion, the violation of national traditions, and the outrage of national sentiment. This also is a great calamity for the conquered. But when it means only that good government is to be substituted for anarchy, that security for life and property is to supersede robbery and murder, and that a few English officials, with a limited number of English troops, who all pay liberally for everything they get, are to replace lawless Sirdars, who, owning a doubtful allegiance to a distant and alien despot, are in the habit of taking whatever they want without paying for it at all—then, my Lords, I really cannot see that conquest is a terrible thing, although you may please to give it a terrible name. The British power, if established in Candahar, would interfere with no man's religion. It would bring much money into the country, and, so far from augmenting, it would greatly diminish the burden of taxation by increasing the wealth of the population. Under British rule the Candaharis would quickly learn, as others have learnt before them, that law and order mean wealth; and there are no people in the world so greedy of wealth as the Afghans. As to national sentiments and traditions, British rule would not disturb them, for the simple reason that they do not exist. To suppose that the Candaharis have any sort of loyalty to Cabul, or any liking for the rule of a Cabul Ameer, is to evince complete ignorance of their history and way of life. If ever there was a merely geographical entity, it is Afghanistan. It is as idle to talk of the national sentiments of the Afghans as it would be to talk of the corporate feeling of the parish of Marylebone, or to suppose that because Westminster and Athens are both of them cities, therefore the City of Westminster is regarded by its inhabitants with feelings like those with which Athens inspired the Athenians. My Lords, if any man was competent to judge of the normal natural condition of Afghanistan, that man was surely Lord Lawrence. Well, this is what Lord Lawrence wrote of it in 1868—

> "It appears to me that it will always be found exceedingly difficult, for any extended period, to maintain a united and strong government in Afghanistan. The genius of the Chiefs and people, as evinced in the independent Pathan communities of the Border, is evidence to this effect. A Chief may now and then arise who may for a time unite the different Provinces under one rule; but when he has passed away, the tendency again will be to separation. With the single exception of the pressure of a common enemy, and even this circumstance will not avail, there appears to be no ties to bind the Afghans together."

My Lords, I do not believe that the people of Candahar would regard themselves as humiliated in the smallest degree by annexation to British India. I am confident that such annexation would be of immense and permanent benefit to them; and I am disposed to doubt rather whether they deserve such a favour than whether they have merited such a punishment. Of any policy, however, which involves annexation, it may justly be asked, What is to be the practical limit of it? How far will you go with such a policy? How far can you go? "Are we," it may be said, "to go on conquering and annexing one barbarous wilderness after another, till we reach, at last, the Dardanelles, in one direction and the boundaries of Russian Turkestan in another?" If not, where will you stop? Where will you draw the line? My Lords, I think it is very right to ask, and very necessary to answer, these questions. I do not underrate, and to a great extent I share, the sentiment with which, by so many of our countrymen, war and conquest are regarded in the light of public crimes. I will yield to no man in the condemnation of wars undertaken for no better object than the gratification of personal ambition, the indulgence of national vanity, or the provision of active service for an army. But I must observe that no one can denounce war and conquest in the absolute unmeasured terms so frequently employed for that purpose without denouncing, at the same time, one of the most potent agents of civilization. The greater part of Europe consists of the fragments of the Roman Empire, an Empire created by wars which rendered possible the diffusion of Christianity and the development of law. The whole of America, North and South, has been conquered from its original owners, who were savages, chiefly by Englishmen and Spaniards. The enormous Russian Empire has been formed by a series of obscure wars waged against barbarians impenetrable to any other civilizing process; and the whole fabric of the British Empire in India is an additional illustration of the same thing. Upon those, therefore, who have condemned my Afghan policy, solely on the ground that, in one form or another, it involves conquest, I am entitled, I think, to retort their own questions. Where, I ask, do they draw the line? Can they justify our present possession of the Peshawur Valley? Have we any right to Lahore? What is our title to Delhi, to Allahabad, to Benares, to Calcutta? My Lords, I believe that the most consistent and candid of my critics would answer all these questions plainly and directly enough. They would say, and, indeed, some of them have said, we have no business in India at all. It was by crime that we acquired our power in India. The only justification for its maintenance is that its downfall would be injurious to the Natives; and the only attitude that befits us in that country is one of penitence for the sins of our forefathers, with an anxious desire to expiate, if possible, their fault. But, surely, the first remark suggested by this view of the case is, that those who hold it are, for that very reason, disqualified to form a trustworthy opinion on the policy best calculated to maintain and uphold the Empire of British India. No one should try to administer an institution of which he entirely disapproves. The man who does not value life and health ought not to practice as a physician; and a man who condemns the Indian Empire in principle is disqualified to judge of the measures necessary for its defence and security. I shall not attempt to refute these views; but I cannot pass them by without a few words of energetic contradiction. Whatever may be said by those who maintain them, I cannot believe, and I do not think the English nation will believe, that an Empire can have been founded on robbery and fraud; when we are also told in the same breath by those who make this assertion that the Empire thus founded must, nevertheless, be maintained, because its fall would involve 200,000,000 people in anarchy and bloodshed, and relegate them to the barbarism from which they are slowly emerging. Grapes do not grow on thorns, nor figs on thistles; and it is surely not under the protection of thieves and robbers that men sit beneath their own vines and fig-trees in undisturbed enjoyment of the peaceful fruits of honest labour.

My Lords, if I seem to have been asserting truisms I am sorry for it; but it seems to me that the alleged moral obligation to retire from Candahar cannot be stated in any terms which do not imply the proposition that we ought to retire from India altogether. And, therefore, to the question, "How far would you go, and where would you draw the line?" I reply, without hesitation, that, for the present, I would go as far as Candahar; and there I would draw the line. Because I am convinced that, if the line be promptly drawn there, and, when drawn, firmly maintained, then you may look upon the permanent security of the North-West Frontier of India as a question practically closed—I will not say for ever, because no such question can be closed for ever; but closed, at least, for a period of time so long that the present generation need no longer be practically concerned about it. And now, my Lords, I am at the end of what I had to say upon this great question. The sum and substance of it all is this. No Afghan Government ever has been, or ever can be, or ever will be stable, unless it submits to the direct influence either of England or of Russia. Shere Ali recognized this essential condition of his own power; and when, unfortunately, the British Government, in 1873, failed to respond to his recognition of it in our own favour, he, naturally, turned to Russia, and leant on her for advice and support. Russia then, no less naturally, utilized to her own interests the opportunities thus placed under her hand. And, when her European relations with us became strained, she incited the Ameer to a course of conduct which ultimately placed him in a position towards us not to be tolerated by the British Power without discredit to its own character, and danger to its own interests in India. Hence the Afghan War. That war has now placed it in your power to prevent, for a generation at least, any recurrence of the dangers that gave rise to it. But, if you reject the successful results of that war, if you restore Candahar and the Kurram headlands to the Cabul Power, or otherwise abandon the positions you now hold there—in short, if you look upon the Afghan War as a mere blunder, which has bequeathed to you no permanent benefits, nor any other duty than that of precipitate retreat, and penitential reversion to the previous state of things, then, my Lords, I predict—and I predict it with a feeling akin to despair—that, before long, you will be obliged to go back to Candahar under conditions of greatly aggravated difficulty and danger; or else, that you will have to make your final choice between holding India as tenants-at-will to Russia, and fortifying her Frontier behind the mountains, at a vast expense, upon a scale fitted for its protection, not merely against mountain Tribes, but against the organized military power of a great European rival, supported by their co-operation, and encouraged by the shaken confidence of your own subjects in your ability and determination to resist its advances. Having said this, I have now no more to say. The subject is a great one. It demands a great decision. But I leave it with confidence in the hands of your Lordships, feeling, as I do, that in all its bearings and in all its aspects, it most vitally concerns the safety, honour, and welfare of our Sovereign and her Dominions.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My Lords, the ability, the eloquence, and the very considerable skill with which the noble Earl has addressed your Lordships, shows how very little need he had to apologize for his first effort in this House. That eloquence and that ability, nevertheless, and I may say all the more, compel me to undertake a duty which is, I confess, extremely irksome to myself, and may be, I fear, even more irksome to the House. It is one of the happy circumstances of our political life that when a great public official is removed from the high Office he has held he and his opponents are accustomed to "bury the hatchet," and no longer to maintain controversies respecting a policy which is dead. I confess I was surprised to hear the noble Earl go back to a portion of a speech delivered some days ago by the noble Earl who was at the head of the late Government, deprecating violent changes in the government of this country. I agree with the noble Earl in deprecating these violent changes; and I say that, much as they are to be deprecated, even as respects the home policy of this country, they are still more to be deprecated as regards the policy of this country in its Eastern Empire. But who was it that overset the policy of this country? Who was it that went out to India expressing himself in condemnation and almost in contempt of the conduct of all previous Viceroys, from Lord Auckland to Lord Northbrook? It was the noble Earl himself, who now tells us that a change of policy is, above all things, to be deprecated. My Lords, I took some part during recent years in indicating in this House the policy of former Viceroys, and in showing, as far as I could, how derogatory to the dignity and to the interests of England was the new policy which had been adopted by the noble Earl. I was usually met by noble Lords opposite at that time saying—"Do not speak of these things; they have been decided by Parliament. This matter is a *res judicata*." That was repeated to me over and over again; but I never would submit to that view of what was a *res judicata*. It was, indeed, a *res judicata* as far as the late Parliament ever had an opportunity of expressing its opinion; but it was one of the devices, or at least one of the misfortunes, of the late Government that it could never bring its policy before Parliament until long after it was possible to discuss it. But, my Lords, it was not a *res judicata* in the country; and we have now a right to say that the condemnation of the country has been passed on the policy of the noble Earl and of his Colleagues. In the recent political history of this country there has been no such overthrow as that of the late Government. I often look back upon it with amazement and astonishment. The late Government, like the host of Sennacherib, were found in the morning to be all dead corpses. They were completely swept off the political chess-board. There were a great many causes leading to that overthrow; but my firm conviction is that among the items of their policy which discredited them most with the people of this country and which led to their condemnation was their policy in Afghanistan. And now, my Lords, I am very glad to say that I entirely concur in one part of the speech of the noble Earl who has just sat down. He did not join in the language often used in condemnation of the policy of Lord Lawrence. Indeed, he confessed that Lord Lawrence had always held that Russian political influence ought not to be allowed to be established in Afghanistan. That was the policy not of Lord Lawrence only, but of all the Viceroys who preceded the noble Earl opposite. In his speech to-night the noble Earl passed over everything that was personal to himself, although the Notice he has placed on the Papers led us to expect that he would vindicate the charges for which he was responsible. I maintain that the only danger which arose to the Indian Empire from Russian influence in Afghanistan was that brought on by the violent and unjust conduct of the late Government towards the late Ameer. You talk of the Russian Mission. By your own avowal you left the late Ameer to the influence of Russia 14 months before the Russian Mission was sent to Cabul. The noble Earl opposite withdrew his Agent from Cabul in the month of April, 1877, and the Russian Mission did not arrive at Cabul till the end of June, 1878, when a wholly different stato of affairs had arisen. In his well-known despatch dated the 10th of May, 1877, the noble Earl said that after the Conference at Peshawur the Ameer would be left entirely to the influence of Russia. Well, that is exactly what happened. The noble Earl seems at that time to have anticipated the action in the Sister Island of the disciples of Mr. Parnell. He first plied the unfortunate Ameer with threatening letters, and then he "Boycotted" him. And having thus been plied with threatening letters and "Boycotted" by the English Government, Shere Ali, naturally, as soon as danger arose, threw himself into the arms of Russia. The noble Earl has referred to the Correspondence of the late Ameer with General Kauffman in a manner which implied that the Ameer was coquetting with Russia; and we know that the late Government, or at least its friends, when they were anxious to defend what had been done, gave out that secret Papers had been discovered at Cabul proving the culpability of the Ameer in that respect. I asked the Government at the time to produce those Papers, and they declined to do so. I have since had access to them, and I say most positively that there is not the slightest indication in them of any tendency on the part of the Ameer to coquet with Russia until after he had been threatened, and violently threatened, by the noble Earl. During that long correspondence of seven years there are only one or two letters that have not already been produced to the public. The particular letter upon which the noble Earl has founded his accusation of bad faith is one which has long been on the Table of your Lordships' House, and I defy any man to detect in it anything but fear of Russia. Well, my Lords, the whole of this disquisition on Afghanistan has been hung to-night by the noble Earl on a very small question indeed—namely, the question of the retention or non-retention of Candahar. I mean a small question compared with that which the noble Earl opened to-night, but did not pursue, but which he opened so far as to compel me to say what I am now saying. I must confess I do not understand the prodigious importance which the noble Earl attaches to the retention of Candahar. He did not himself intend to occupy Candahar till a very late period of his Viceroyalty, and I am not quite sure that the late Government ever made up their mind to retain it. He spoke as if the late Government had so decided. They may have done so; he has better opportunities of knowing that than I. But in the published Papers, as I read them, there is no proof that the late Government had finally made up their minds on that matter. In the very interesting and able despatch which the noble Earl drew up shortly after the Treaty of Gandamak he said distinctly that it was not his intention to retain Candahar. Well, I confess I do not understand the prodigious change which came over the noble Earl's policy after the murder of that unfortunate gentleman, Sir Louis Cavagnari, at Cabul. The noble Earl speaks of that murder to-night with very strong feelings—feelings of the sincerity of which no man can for a moment doubt. But what light did that murder cast upon our general policy in respect to the Afghan people? The noble Earl had been warned, over and over again, by those who were denounced as being of the Lawrence school that the objection of the late Ameer to receiving British officers in his dominions, and especially at his capital, on the ground that he could not protect them, was a real and *boná fide* objection. And any man who knew the history of the Afghans and of our relations with them must have been aware that there was excessive danger to an English Envoy from the fanaticism and hatred of the people. That view formed a part of the policy of previous Viceroys, with which the noble Earl thought proper to maintain no continuity. He ridiculed the notion of danger. He even disparaged the consideration of good faith which had actuated former Viceroys in not sending officers to Cabul; and no sooner had he patched up the miserable Treaty of Gandamak, which lasted some three months, than he intimated that it was time to establish an Envoy at Shere Ali's Court. Then, at a time when the British troops had just ceased from slaughtering the Afghan people, burning their villages and ravaging their country, he sent that unfortunate officer, Cavagnari, with an escort of 70 men to Cabul, which was then seething with thousands of fanatical Mahomedans, excited against the Feringhis who had brought such misfortunes upon them. I am not surprised that that horrible and disastrous massacre should have produced a profound impression upon the noble Earl; but that impression ought to have been of a different kind. He ought to have been convinced that he had been wrong from the beginning—that the policy of forcing British officers down the throats of the Afghan people, of putting them in a city where they could not be protected, and where they could not obtain a word of information of any value, was a mistaken policy. Instead of that, what happens? He resolves and tries to persuade the Government at home—with what success I do not know—to violate the distinct promise he himself gave that no part of Afghanistan should be annexed by the English Government. For your Lordships may remember that when the British troops entered Afghanistan the noble Earl issued a Proclamation to the effect that he made war with the Ruler of the country only, and not with the people—a Proclamation of the same value as those of Napoleon in a similar sense when he ravaged Europe and upset Thrones. The noble Earl says there is no national sentiment in Afghanistan. Does he mean to say that there is no sense of independence? There is no people on the face of the earth, not even excepting the English people, who value more than the Afghans do the independence of their native land; and unless the noble Earl has conclusive proofs that the step is absolutely essential to the safety of the British Empire we have no right to retain Candahar. The noble Earl has delivered a lecture on the abstract questions of peace and war. Whom he was addressing I do not know. It cannot have been any Member of this House; he must have been thinking of those persons known as the Manchester school, who are not largely represented in this House. However that may be, I agree with him that war is one of the greatest instruments of civilization, as is also annexation. But it is entirely a question of circumstance and of degree. The noble Earl asked us if we did approve of the annexation of the Punjaub. If England had nothing upon her conscience but the Sikh War she might be happy with regard to the past of India. The Sikh Army invaded the British Empire; and after two campaigns, the most severe England ever engaged in with a half-civilized foe, the English arms were victorious and the territory of the Sikhs was annexed. But the noble Earl has shown no right on our part to annex Candahar. What change did the murder of Cavagnari by a few fanatical Mahomedans produce upon the question, either as regards its morality or the safety of the British Empire? My Lords, every one of the general arguments which the noble Earl has used to-night applied equally at the time when the Treaty of Gandamak was drawn up. The murder of Cavagnari threw no light on the situation. My Lords, I contemplate with amazement the courage of the noble Earl in speaking of his Afghan War as advantageous, as having been honourable in the manner in which it was conducted, and happy as regards the influence it exercised on our Indian Empire. Just look at the results. First, it was undertaken to deliver us from the danger of Russia. But whom did the noble Earl invite to fill the vacant Throne of Cabul? A man who had been for 10 years a pensioner of Russia—Abdurrahman.

THE EARL OF LYTTON: He was not invited.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: The noble Earl says he was never invited. I am very glad to hear the noble Earl say that, because it turns on a nice distinction between that word and some other word which I do not know. But this I do know, that the man whom the noble Earl—I will say invited—to open the communications, I will not say the negotiations, with him—perhaps the noble Earl might object to that word—was this Abdurrahman, as being the man most likely to take over the government of the country when it got too hot to hold us. The House will recollect that there was another illustration of this wonderful policy of having British officers and a British Army in Afghanistan, when General Roberts, some 12 months ago, found himself surrounded by a people in arms, who, according to the noble Earl, had no national feeling and no sentiment of independence, but had somehow risen in thousands, and shut up General Roberts in the cantonment of Sherpur. I believe that if all the Papers were produced it would be found that when he found our position so very dangerous there the noble Earl was very glad to get out of Cabul. Well, I say, then, that the noble Earl opened communications with Abdurrahman and invited him to undertake the government of Cabul, out of which he was so ready to "scuttle," to use the word of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Beaconsfield), when Sir Frederick Roberts was in that position. I believe, when that event happened, the noble Earl—our position had become so dangerous—came to the absolute determination to get out of Cabul as soon as he could, and Abdurrahman, at the suggestion of the noble Earl, succeeded in establishing himself there. That is one result of the noble Earl's policy with regard to Russia. The next is that Candahar was to be placed in the hands of what the noble Earl was graciously pleased to call an independent Ruler—namely, the Wali Shere Ali, who said he would undertake the government of Candahar if the Viceroy would support him. The noble Earl replied he could not leave an army in Candahar. The Wali said, "Well, but you will not go very far off;" and he obtained a sort of promise that a British force would be kept in the neighbourhood of Candahar —a pretty expensive and exhaustive pledge for the Revenues of India, involving, as it did, the defence of 400 miles of lines of communication. Well, the Wali found that his position was rather a doubtful one, and he suggested that he should be allowed to retire to India upon a pension, thinking that much better than to have the command of Candahar. Such was the independent Ruler selected for Candahar. Now, my Lords, to give a third instance of the noble Earl's policy. The Government, he said, thought their policy of immense importance to India, for behind Candahar was Herat, and behind Herat was Merv. The irony of events was great in the appointment of Abdurrahman; but it is not complete until we hear what the Viceroy intended to do with Herat. It was said to be a key, which reminds me of words once used by a naval officer in the Pacific, that he did not believe in keys. What was intended to be done with Herat? It was intended to hand it over to Persia — a country which was preeminently under the feet of Russia. Every statesman for years, and no one more than Lord Palmerston, has held that Persia should not be allowed to possess Herat, for the decadence of Persia, and her geographical position, placed her under the predominant influence and power of Russia. Well, the only alternative the noble Earl had was actually to hand over Herat to Persia. Under these circumstances, I confess it must have required some courage on the part of the noble Earl to come down and tell us that his Afghanistan policy and his Afghanistan War were calculated to save India from peril from Russia. My Lords, I believe that the policy of noble Lords opposite, and of the noble Earl especially, involved the greatest danger to which our Indian Empire has been exposed for the last century. In the first place, it has burdened the finances of India. It has laid the burden of from £13,000,000 to £15,000,000 on the shoulders of the already over-taxed and over-burdened people of India. It has shown the people of India that we squander their resources for our own selfish purposes, and because of our own timidity, our absurd timidity, in respect of Russia. Then there was another danger, known only to those who had access to the official Papers—it has involved a most serious danger to the discipline of the Army of India. It is perfectly true that, of all who were engaged in the Afghan War, that Army alone came out of it with glory and honour; but the strain which was put upon the Native Army of India was most serious. The Native soldiers detested the length of time they were kept from their families; and the recruiting system of India was placed under an undue strain. But above all—and I confess that this danger was by far the greatest—the policy adopted by the noble Earl led the Afghan people and all the Tribes upon our borders to doubt the honour and the good faith of the Indian Government. They watch the processes by which you quarrel with your neighbours; they watch the lightness with which you treat the written and verbal promises of former Viceroys; they watched you in that miserable Conference of Peshawur, in which—I repeat what I have already said in this House—the Afghan and the Mahomedan towered high above the Englishman and the Christian; they watch your proceedings, and have come to doubt the truth of your Proclamations and the sincerity with which you keep to your engagements. And for what was all this done? We were told by the late Government that the danger they wished to guard against was the danger of a new military basis to be formed by Russia on the Caspian. I hold that that was one of the wildest dreams ever entertained.

THE EARL OF LYTTON here indicated dissent.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: The noble Earl, over and over again, stated in his despatches that Russia had advanced her military basis, and in one he stated that she had advanced it from 1,000 miles distance to 400 miles distance. Well, that referred to Khiva and the Caspian base. But Russia has been endeavouring for years, and in vain, to conquer the wretched inhabitants of these deserts. Two years ago she sustained a reverse, and only last week we heard of another check, and in all this time she has not advanced more than 200 or 300 miles to the Caspian shores. I believe in India you are perfectly safe against future Russian aggression if you will do these things—Keep faith with your neighbours, save your own money, and avoid entangling yourselves by needless interference with a savage and barbarous, but a brave and independent people.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: The noble Duke has told us that he attributes the overthrow of the late Government to the enormous change in the public feeling of this country, which was mainly due to their conduct with respect to the Afghan War, and compared one defeat to the destruction of the Army of Sennacherib. He might have cited the lines—

> "The Angel of Death spread his wings on the blast,
> And breathed on the face of the foe as he passed;"

for the noble Duke evidently regarded himself as "the Angel of Death" who destroyed the late Government. We have been told, again and again, that all were agreed that Russian influence was not to be allowed in Afghanistan. I have before me a passage from a letter by the noble Duke, in which he said—"I do not think we can or ought to allow Afghanistan to become in any way subordinate to Russia." What do the noble Duke and his friends tell us as to the conduct they would have pursued in order to get rid of Russian influence? The Russian Mission was at Cabul; it was making a Treaty; it was dealing with that country in a manner which showed that it meant to exercise influence adversely to us. The relations between Russia and England were strained. Russia must have intended by sending the Embassy to check English influence. The late Government did not put forward as one cause of their suspicion of Russia the possible immediate movement of a great Army on India from the Caspian—a proposal which I have this evening heard for the first time. What they feared was the secret intrigue, the covert influence, the power in the councils of the country which would have made the people of Afghanistan the mere instruments of Russia. Russia being at Cabul, and carrying on her own designs there inimically to England, in what way would the present Government have got rid of her? She was there, and your only justification of her being there is the possible hostility between England and Russia. Suppose the Embassy remained, what would you have done to prevent that subordination of Afghanistan to Russia which you say must not exist? If the Ameer persisted in admitting Russian influence, I have yet to learn how otherwise than by force you could prevent Russian influence becoming dominant in Afghanistan. My noble Friend once said there is plenty of room for Russia and England in Central Asia; but we all agree that there is not room for them in Afghanistan. There was no breaking of faith with the Ameer, no putting of violent pressure upon him; but that has been argued before. He was asked to take English officers, not into Cabul, but into other cities of Afghanistan. He said he could not protect an English Embassy, and yet he was able to protect a Russian one from the fanaticism of the people. Why was that? Because in the one case he was friendly, and was engaged in making Treaties and looking forward to assistance. The Native Agent was withdrawn from Cabul because he was useless and had ceased to give us any trustworthy information. At certain periods we could rely upon his information; but we could not do so any longer, and, therefore, the Native Agent was withdrawn. To come to the present condition of affairs, we on this side have reason to complain that we have not before us a single document of a recent date, and we are obliged to take what little information we can get from speeches and replies to deputations. The noble Duke said he had read certain Russian Correspondence which we did not produce. We have no objection, if it is considered requisite to the elucidation of truth and the public good, to its being laid upon the Table; but, as it was not published, I have never alluded to its contents. If you are going to allude to it, let it be produced, and let the country judge what its value is. The noble Duke has laid great stress on all occasions on the allegation that some promise had been given that British officers should never act as Envoys in Afghanistan. I can vouch for the fact, and assert, on the contrary, that no such guarantees were ever given. If they were, how came the noble Earl (the Earl of Northbrook) to make propositions in a contrary sense, and, in arguing against the proposal of the Secretary of State for India, never to have alluded to such guarantees, but to have treated the question as one of opportuneness. The noble Duke then went on to the main question to which my noble Friend (the Earl of Lytton) has addressed himself with great ability, and that is as to the retention of Candahar, and he said—"You were ready to give up Candahar at a particular period; how is it you have changed your opinion?" My noble Friend has well explained that, when he stated that at the time they were ready to retire from Candahar their relations with the Ameer were apparently of the most friendly kind. It was not then necessary to retain it. The noble Duke never appears to get beyond the period when he was previously in Office—he never seems to look at the circumstances which have distinguished the policy since then. He appears to think that the policy always remains the same, and is stationary and on the same footing, whatever may have been the circumstances that have intervened. When the noble Duke speaks of the policy they have maintained from the first, and says they would never have made a beginning of the war, I ask him what he would have done? As I understand, the Government is as much opposed to Russian influence as we were. The noble Duke says that, in entering into communication with Abdurrahman, a pensioner of Russia, and assisting him to the Throne on which he sits, they had nothing else to do. They seem to have been in the same position as my noble Friend near me when he did what he thought was the best thing to do under the circumstances. He was not invited to become the Ameer of all Cabul; Candahar and the South of Afghanistan were excluded; but the Government now do not intend to continue the occupation of Candahar, and they do not tell us what they intend to do. I am at a great loss to make out how they are going to guard themselves. It may be that they are going to give up the city and yet maintain a cantonment. But the main purpose which we had in view from the beginning was not the possession of the city, but the control of the country, so that we should not only be in a state of better defence, but in a position to control the policy of Southern Afghanistan. That we have not been in a position to control that policy was shown by the conduct of the late Ameer. If we had had Candahar we felt that we should have been in a different position. If the population resisted without a just cause the invasion which followed on the murder of Major Cavagnari, we had a strong moral right to take possession of Candahar if we thought fit. The noble Duke says we had a right to take it to protect us from the dangers of war; and my noble Friend has proved, over and over again, that there were such dangers, not from direct invasion, which may be distant, but from disturbing influences against which we had equally the right to protect ourselves. It has been proved by what has taken place in Afghanistan recently that the fears which have been expressed as to the easy possibility of the march of troops from Herat into the country has not been so groundless as was supposed. It has been shown that a considerable force, with an ill-provided commissariat, can be brought from Herat to Candahar, and that again shows that there is a necessity for watchfulness and keeping a constant look-out for what may take place on that Frontier, and that Candahar ought not to be abandoned. We, my Lords, are much in want of Papers on this subject; and they ought, on a matter of opinion, to contain the opinions of the best authorities. I want to know fully and fairly what are the opinions of the eminent men in India upon this subject. It is most important that we should know what are the opinions of the officers General Green speaks of in his letter to *The Times*, the opinions which have been expressed on this subject by Sir Henry Rawlinson, Lord Napier of Magdala, Sir William Palliser, Mr. Maclean, Sir Edmund Hamley, Lord Strathnairn, Sir Richard Temple, Sir Michael Biddulph, and Sir George Lawrence. I think the country ought to have these opinions before it. The Government have introduced the subject into the Queen's Speech; but we are left without a single document or paper which can inform us what the policy of the Government is with regard to Afghanistan generally. I do not believe that any of those who held Office under the late Government were less sensible of the claims of honour and morality than the noble Duke. The noble Duke takes a line on that subject peculiar to himself. He exalts himself on high. He sets himself up against the vote of this and the other House of Parliament, and against the general feeling of the country where these things were going on, a censor of so infallible a character that if the world were against him—it did not matter—he was right and would stand alone. I deny that the country has come to the decision pointed out by the noble Duke. There were many subjects before the country when the late Government was defeated—how many might be understood by those who, having the time, have also had the pleasure of reading those voluminous speeches in which these subjects have been dealt with. The noble Duke arrogates too much to himself when he says that it was his enlightenment of the public mind and the instruction which he offered that brought about the change.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: I never said so.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: No; but the noble Duke puts himself forward as the consistent exponent of the feeling which is said now to exist in the public mind on that point. I would do him justice, and if it is the case that there has been this change in the public mind it must have been due to his philippics. No doubt there were difficulties in the Afghan War—difficulties connected with the recruiting of the Indian Army, consequent upon the long period they were detained from home, wife, and children; but, after all, no army could go into the field without undergoing these sufferings. But by keeping possession of Candahar it would not be necessary to expose your troops to any of these unpleasant circumstances. There would be frequent changes and reliefs, and good cantonments, instead of constantly changing to imperfect quarters. But the noble Duke tells us that we cannot get anyone to govern Candahar. If that be so—if we cannot resort to the same expedient in Candahar as in Cabul, and employ a Native Governor—we must govern it ourselves. It might, however, as I have already stated, only be necessary to keep cantonments in the neighbourhood of Candahar, and not in the city itself, as was meant by the late Government. It is perfectly true that some negotiations took place with Persia as to Herat; but the noble Duke has given a very incomplete account of what has passed, and I wait for the Papers to discuss it. I cannot say that the decadence of Persia exceeds that of Afghanistan, for, although the noble Duke tried to make the public think Afghanistan was always one united nation, the fact is that it was only in the last year of his reign that Dost Mahomed became possessed of Candahar. The people of Candahar had no sympathy with the Rulers of Cabul. The late Government, having looked into this question with thoroughness, came to the conclusion that it was no less important for the interests of India than of this country that Candahar itself or the immediate cantonments should be retained. With respect to the Afghan War, the verdict of this House has already been pronounced; it is not for us to appeal from that decision, although the noble Duke may, if he pleases. It is a piece of past history, and what we have to look to is the future. The security of the people of India depends on our looking to our Frontiers. It is our duty to show to the world our determination not to be shaken in the possession of our vast Indian Dominions; that we mean never to part with them; and that, believing danger as likely to approach us from the side of Afghanistan, we did not hesitate to recommend the retention of Candahar.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: The Papers which have been asked for will be produced as soon as possible. This question has been brought forward so early—within the first few days after the meeting of Parliament—that the Papers could hardly yet have been circulated. There is, however, great dearth of information showing the opinion of military officers as to what is called the "scientific Frontier." I have not myself seen any expression of opinion by the Commander-in-Chief in India, Sir Frederick Haines. I shall not enter into any detailed history of the late war. I think it has been proved to your Lordships, over and over again, that the Russian Mission to Cabul was the outcome of the policy of the late Government, and that the condition of things which led to the war would never have arisen if, to use the language of the noble Earl (the Earl of Beaconsfield), the late Government had not altogether "inverted" the great lines of policy upon which Viceroy after Viceroy since the late Lord Ellenborough had acted. The noble Viscount seems to think that there is some inconsistency in my noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) having expressed the opinion that if British officers would have been received by the Ameer cordially as residents in Afghanistan it would have been an advantage, and then having objected to the measures by which the late Viceroy urged the acceptance of British officers upon the late Ameer of Afghanistan. I see no inconsistency. It is one thing to wish to have a Mission at Cabul, another thing to force the Ameer to receive British officers, and to tell him that unless he received them all the promises of former Viceroys would be thrown away. Then the noble Viscount said that the Native Agent at Cabul was unreliable. What, then, was the reason why that Native Agent was rewarded by the late Viceroy, and employed in Afghanistan? The main question, however, brought forward by the noble Earl is whether it is right or wrong to annex the territory of Candahar; because I will not accept the noble Viscount's distinction between keeping a force in the neighbourhood of Candahar and annexing it. There can be no doubt that if a large British force is to be stationed in the neighbourhood of Candahar, with a British Resident in that country, if that would not be immediate annexation, it would be annexation in a very few years. Noble Lords would recollect that this retification of Frontier has been very much of a mystery. One year we were told by the late Viceroy that the scientific Frontier was the triangle of Jellalabad, Cabul, and Ghirisk, on the river Helmund, with a hold over the Passes of the Hindoo Koosh towards Balkh. Then the scientific Frontier was to consist of isolated positions in the Khyber Pass, the Kurram Valley, and in the neighbourhood of Quetta. Further events have happened, and the scientific Frontier has changed again; Candahar is to be annexed, and Herat handed over to Persia.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK denied that he had ever said anything of the kind.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: I am in a position distinctly to assert that it was the policy of the late Government to hand over Herat to Persia. The new scientific Frontier is, as I understand it, to be this—nothing is to be held in the Khyber; the Kurram Valley is to be under our control; Candahar is to be annexed; and Herat is to be handed over to Persia. I think that if experts were asked to consider the question of a military Frontier, with a view to decide what would be a real, solid, and valuable Frontier, they would at least come to some settlement upon the matter; but, so far as I can understand the policy of the late Government, there has been, year after year, some change in the scientific Frontier. One word as to the Kurram Valley. I was certainly surprised to hear the noble Earl opposite say a word about the Kurram Valley; because if one thing more than another seems to me to have been proved, it is that the Kurram Valley, as a military position, possesses no value whatever. When General Roberts was surrounded by an overwhelming force of Afghans at Cabul, General Watson, who occupied the Kurram, found it impossible to advance to his assistance, and, in fact, the Pass is blocked for four or five months of the year by snow. I can conceive nothing worse than the location of troops in such a place; and I have never seen any recommendation of the Kurram Valley as a part of a scientific Frontier by any officer who has any knowledge of the country, and who was writing under a sense of responsibility. With regard to Candahar, it is quite a new thing to hear that that is to be annexed, or occupied, if the noble Viscount likes the word better. I heard both from the noble Earl and from the noble Viscount what I never before heard so plainly asserted in any discussion, that we were not likely to be attacked by Russia, but that what we had to defend ourselves against was what is called "covert intrigue."

We have heard a great deal about the influence of rumours and impressions in the bazaars of India. But if we are to deal with these things, we should deal with them in some other manner than by exhausting our troops and wasting our money. The noble Earl said that the thing which more than any other had been proved by the late Afghan War was that it was very easy for Russia to agitate us by intriguing in Afghanistan. The noble Viscount took my noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll) to task for saying the Afghans were all of one mind with regard to their rulers. But my noble Friend never said any such thing. What he did say was that there was a strong national sentiment of independence among the Afghans, and that sentiment prevailed in no part of Afghanistan more than in the southern part of it. When the noble Earl spoke of the likelihood of the Afghans being influenced by Russia, I wonder that he did not recollect a despatch of his own in which these remarkable words occur—"All their national sentiments and prejudices were opposed to that fatal intimacy with Russia which was the final error" of the foreign policy of the late Ameer, Shere Ali Khan. It seems, that the noble Earl, like others who have been employed in India, has been satisfied that the Afghans would not be influenced by Russia. Why, then, are we to do things that increase the danger of our own position? What are we asked to do in occupying Candahar? Do your Lordships know that from Shikarpoor in Scinde to Quetta the distance is 225 miles, and from Quetta to Candahar 147 miles; and that the country is so difficult that it is precisely the kind of region that we should endeavour to place between us and our enemies. Noble Lords will recollect how difficult it was for us, with the whole resources of India, to maintain our communications with Candahar. The other day, after the disaster at Maiwand, General Primrose was at Candahar, and General Phayre was on the road from Quetta with troops ready to support him; but so great were the transport difficulties, even after the war had lasted for two years, that Sir Frederick Roberts, by his gallant march, relieved Candahar before General Phayre was able to move. So much for the difficulty of holding Candahar; and now for the expense. That would not be, I believe, less than £1,500,000 a-year; and, that being so, are we to station troops at such a distance, and at such an expense, not to face any real danger, but to meet that vague "covert intrigue" which the Russians may be supposed to be engaged in at Cabul? And then comes the other argument as to the effect that the withdrawal of our troops from Candahar would have on the Natives of India. But why should they feel the withdrawal from Candahar more than the withdrawal from Cabul? In my opinion, the feeling among the Native Princes of India when our troops retire from Afghanistan will be a feeling of confidence in the justice of the British Government, and an assurance that our words, when solemnly used, will be carried out by deeds, and that when the British Government has said it was not at war with a people it would justify the statement by not annexing their territory. I should have thought that when Her Majesty had been advised to declare solemnly in the face of all India that she desired no extension of her territorial Dominions, the noble Earl might have allowed that declaration to sway his mind to some extent. If I can interpret with any truth the feelings of the Natives of India, I should say that they will see with satisfaction that promises solemnly made are kept, and that after a successful war, we are content to go back to our own territories and husband our resources, confident in our own strength, and in the loyalty of the people. I have one other remark to make, and that is with respect to the observation of the noble Earl that since 1875 there had been Russian intrigues with the Ameer of Cabul, and that negotiations had gone on between him and the Russians. I can only speak for the time during which I had the honour of being Viceroy; and I feel it due to the Russian Government to say that up to the spring of the year 1876 I have no reason to suppose that the assurances given that Russia would not interfere with Afghanistan were departed from. There were rumours, but no evidence, of intrigues between Russia and Afghanistan. I believe, from what I have read, that the communications which passed later between Shere Ali and the Russian Government took place after the negotiations at Peshawur, and after the European complications which brought Russia and England to the verge of war. I would say, with respect to the Russian Government and the Indian Empire of the Queen, that I regret the expressions used by the noble Earl. I should have hoped that, now that the causes of the difference with Russia have passed away, we might endeavour to produce more cordial relations between the two countries. I should also have thought that anyone who regarded impartially the history of our own wars in Afghanistan and of Russian expeditions in Turkestan would have felt assured that neither Power had any reason for dreading the attack of the other, and would have desired to accept the position of rivalry only in the work of civilizing the Central Asiatic nations with whom we come in contact. As I have often said, I agree with the dictum of the late Prime Minister that there is ample room for both Empires in those regions. I cannot express too strongly the perfect confidence I feel in the propriety of the decision of the Government to withdraw the British Forces from Candahar as soon as the state of affairs admits; I believe it to be a wise decision, and a decision prompted by the truest regard for the interests of Her Majesty's Indian Empire.

Lord **WAVENEY** replied to some of the objections which had been made to the permanent occupation of Candahar. While admitting the difficulty of manning the garrison, he relied on authority as to the practicability of garrisoning Candahar with mountain Tribes, who, he observed, were attached to British rule, and might be formed into a sort of Native Militia. On a future occasion he should take the opportunity of submitting to their Lordships a Motion affirming the desirableness of constituting Candahar an independent city, such as the old cities in Asia Minor formerly were. He was convinced that the English people desired that Candahar, which was now an outlying post in India, should be added permanently to our possessions. The national interest was bound up with this question, which was one of security instead of doubt; and it was also bound up with the introduction into a turbulent district of the most civilizing of all qualities in government and administration, and even the successful prosecution of commerce.

Viscount **ENFIELD** regretted that the Papers in connection with this very important subject were not yet in their Lordships' hands; but he was able to say that they were now in the hands of the printers, and would be on the Table in the course of a few days. He would now recall to their Lordships' attention the state of the case with regard to Afghanistan since Her Majesty's present Advisers had held the seals of Office. At the close of last Session a statement was made that the evacuation of Northern Afghanistan had progressed in a most satisfactory manner, that some steps had been taken for the pacification of the country, and that the Indian Government had shown their good faith and their good will towards the people of Afghanistan by stating that they had no intention of effecting a permanent occupation. The present Viceroy, following in the steps of his Predecessor, proceeded with the negotiations which had been entered into with Abdurrahman Khan. It could not be stated with very great confidence whether his rule would be permanently acceptable; but it was to be hoped that his influence in Northern Afghanistan would be at once powerful and popular. He would not now discuss the unfortunate affair at Maiwand; but he might remark that events had marched very rapidly since that time. Her Majesty's Government could not pledge themselves to a permanent occupation of Candahar; but they thought it right to give to the people of Southern Afghanistan, as well as to their neighbours in the North, an opportunity of having a Ruler who would be acceptable to them. The policy of the late Government never contemplated the annexation of Candahar itself. He thought there was a very great mistake and misapprehension on the part of some of those who advocated the occupation of Candahar as to what it exactly meant. Some persons imagined that it meant simply a fortified place; whereas, in fact, it really implied the occupation of a territory of an extent which was one-fifth larger than England and Wales combined, and about the same size as the Punjab. According to the most reliable military authorities, a force of at least 20,000, if not 22,000 men, would be required for the protection of Candahar and the vicinity. Now, on what grounds could the annexation of Candahar be justified? We had no quarrel with the Sirdars or the people themselves; there was no necessity for a bulwark against Persia; and if we had to face Russia, it was surely better, as Sir Charles Napier held, to meet her on the banks of the Indus, where we were close to our supplies and reserves, than on the shores of the Caspian. Moreover, if the Afghans were friendly to us, they would themselves form a bulwark against Russia; and if they were unfriendly, it was surely better to have them in front of us than behind. What were the political reasons given for the permanent occupation of Candahar? It had been said that we should thereby influence Afghanistan in a friendly sense. It was perfectly idle to conceal that we were not liked, but cordially disliked, by the people of Afghanistan. It had been said that we would govern Candahar justly. No doubt we would; but still there would be endless intrigues against us. The whole history of the country taught us to expect such a result, and taught us, also, that the best way to gain the friendship of the Afghans was to leave them to themselves. We cleared out of Afghanistan in 1842; and from that time up to 1876, when we again interfered with it, our relations with that country were friendly. It was a poor argument to say that we must keep something to show for the blood and money we had expended. To make one bad bargain was no reason why we should make another. The best authorities held that, in a commercial sense, we should not be gainers by the retention of Candahar, though a few traders might benefit by it; and there were abundant arguments against such a step. We ought to take account, for instance, of the insignificance of the revenue which we should derive from the Province—not more, he believed, than 15 or 20 lakhs per annum—and the discontent which would be caused among our Native Indian troops by their prolonged absence from home. Above all, there was the flagrant injustice of the proposed annexation to be considered. He trusted that English policy in India would not seek for further territorial acquisitions, and that what he might call the "earth-hunger" was finally satisfied. If we persevered in a wise and pacific policy with regard to our neighbours, we should be able to meet any danger that came in a satisfactory, bold, and proper manner. If any danger threatened us, either from Russia or any other quarter, he believed that if our policy was true and just we might rely upon the co-operation of the Native Princes and the fidelity and courage of the Native Army.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS BILL [H.L.] (NO. 5.) A Bill for amending the Law relating to the Limitation of Actions:

SETTLED LAND BILL [H.L.] (NO. 6.) A Bill for facilitating sales, leases, and other dispositions of Settled Land, and for promoting the execution of improvements thereon:

CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY BILL [H.L.] (NO. 7.) A Bill for simplifying and improving the practice of Conveyancing; and for vesting in trustees, mortgagees, and others various powers commonly conferred by provisions inserted in settlements, mortgages, wills, and other instruments; and for amending in various particulars the law of property; and for other purposes: And

SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION BILL [H.L.] (NO. 8.) A Bill for making better provision respecting the Remuneration of Solicitors in conveyancing and other non-contentious business:

Were *presented* by The Earl CAIRNS; read 1ª.

AUGMENTATION OF BENEFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Augmentation of Benefices Act, 1863—Was *presented* by The LORD CHANCELLOR; read 1ª. (No. 9.)

House adjourned at half past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 10th January, 1881.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Wigan, *v.* James Ludovic Lindsay, commonly called Lord Lindsay, now Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, called up to the House of Peers as Baron Wigan.

NEW MEMBER SWORN—Timothy Michael Healy, esquire, *for* Wexford Borough.

SELECT COMMITTEE—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), *appointed* and *nominated.*

Public Bills—*Ordered—First Reading*—Married Women's Property * [50]; Agricultural Holdings (Warnings to Remove) (Scotland) * [51]; Naval Discipline Act Amendment * [52]; Local Inquiries (Ireland) * [53]; Barristers' Admission (Ireland) * [54]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday * [55]; Lunacy Law Amendment * [56].

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—REPORTED COLLISION AT CLAREMORRIS.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the reported collision between the people and the police at Claremorris, County Mayo, and if he can explain to the House the circumstances under which the police fired upon the people, with results which have, in one instance at least, proved fatal; and also, whether it is true that a verdict by a coroner's jury of manslaughter has been returned against two of the constabulary in consequence of their action on that occasion?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, that his attention had been directed to the case referred to by the hon. Member, and to the best of his belief the facts were as follows:—A force of constabulary, consisting of 112 men, under the command of a resident magistrate, assisted by an inspector, were engaged in protecting a process-server in the discharge of his duty, when they were violently opposed by a large party of some 300 or 400 men, armed with sticks, bludgeons, and stones, from behind a dyke filled with water, which had been dug across the road along which the police had to proceed. The police, who on approaching were received with volleys of stones, advanced through the water and dispersed the mob. In the circumstances of the case, the police appeared to him to have acted with extraordinary forbearance. The police resisted the attack made upon them, but did not fire any shot; therefore, the hon. Member's Question was not quite accurate in that particular. Anything done by the police was done in defence of their lives. Five of the police were injured. One of the rioters named Quinn, who appeared to be the leader of the mob, received injuries from which he had since died. There was no official information with regard to the coroner's jury; but he saw in the papers that there had been a verdict of manslaughter against the police.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATIONS FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF MEETINGS.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return containing the Proclamations issued for the purpose of suppressing public meetings in Ireland, and a statement of the grounds on which those Proclamations have been sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had no objection to laying the Return upon the Table of the House. Each Proclamation contained in itself a statement of the grounds on which the meeting was prohibited.

ARMY—MAJOR NOLAN.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to the announcement recently made in the public press, that the honourable and gallant Member for Galway had accepted the situation of Whip to a party in this House, the leaders of which are now being prosecuted by Her Majesty's Government; whether the honourable and gallant Member is the same Major Nolan of the Royal Artillery, who is at present in receipt of full pay and allowances; and, if so, whether the Right honourable Gentleman considers that his acceptance of the said situation is consistent with his duty as a soldier to Her Majesty, or conducive to military discipline in the Royal Artillery?

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked, Whether the right hon. Gentleman considered that any officer on full pay and allowances, or any Colonel of Militia, who held a seat in that House, could perform his duties satisfactorily at the same time to his Queen and his constituents?

Mr. CHILDERS: Sir, in reply to the noble Lord the Member for Liverpool, I can only state that if the House should see fit to censure a Member of Parliament for his conduct in the House, that conduct would become known to those under whom he might be serving Her

Majesty; but I am not aware that the gallant Member referred to by the noble Lord has subjected himself to the censure of the House, nor could I say, until I saw the terms of any censure, whether notice could be taken of it, by those responsible for the government of the Army, without violating Parliamentary privilege. In reply to my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), who has inserted, I have no doubt by accident, into his Question a few words not in the Notice which he gave me, on the subject of Militia Colonels—if he wants that answered, perhaps he will ask the Question again—I may say that the gallant Member for Galway is undoubtedly an officer of the Royal Artillery on full pay; and, from a purely military point of view, his presence in the House is doubtless inconvenient, as the battery which he is commanding is on its way to India. But I express no opinion whether the principle of *cedant arma togæ* ought to be applied in such cases. At the same time, I think the subject of the conflicting duties of a military officer on full pay, who is also in the House of Commons, well worthy of consideration by a Select Committee.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE PROHIBITED MEETING AT KANTURK.

MR. O'SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will inform the House the grounds on which the Government prohibited the farmers, labourers, and other inhabitants of Kanturk from exercising their constitutional right of holding a public meeting on the 2nd instant, to discuss the subject of the tenure of land in Ireland?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, the meeting was prohibited by proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant because information had been received that it had been called for the purpose of denouncing and intimidating certain of Her Majesty's subjects, and of preventing them from exercising their lawful rights.

SIR HENRY LAYARD, LATE H.M. AMBASSADOR AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any arrangements have been made with reference to the position of Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople other than those which subsisted at the close of last Session?

MR. RYLANDS asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Whether Sir Henry Layard still holds the appointment of Ambassador at the Porte, and is in receipt of the full salary attached to the Office?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the present position of Sir Henry Layard is one of some hardship. The period for which, according to the Regulations, he was entitled to remain on leave of absence and in enjoyment of full salary expired on the 11th of October last. Acting on the precedent of the case of Sir Henry Elliot in 1877, Lord Granville has sanctioned the issue of half-pay to Sir Henry Layard up to the 31st of December last, when his employment as Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople ceased, and he now remains *en disponibilité*.

STATE OF IRELAND—MEETINGS IN QUEEN'S COUNTY.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state whether the resident magistrate in the Queen's County was acting within his instructions in declaring at Borris, in Ossory, on the 31st December, that he was prepared to prevent the holding of any meeting whatsoever within the limits of the Queen's County on that day; and, if so, whether he will state the grounds upon which such instructions were issued?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member has asked me a Question under a misapprehension, no doubt, arising from a report which I also saw in the newspapers. I am informed by the resident magistrate, that he never stated he was prepared to prevent any meeting whatsoever within the limits of the Queen's County, and that no instructions to that effect were issued by him.

IRELAND—EVICTIONS—CASE OF ARTHUR KAVANAGH.

MR. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been directed to a case of eviction which terminated in the death of the evicted man, Arthur Kavanagh, at Coobroe, County Wicklow, on the 6th December last, a few hours after the eviction took place; and, whether the bailiff by whom the power of eviction was carried out was duly appointed by the sheriff to act as bailiff, and, if not, what steps the Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, in reply to the hon. Member, I beg to state that the official information I have with regard to the case is that this man died and there was an inquest held upon him, and the verdict of the jury was—

> "That deceased, Arthur Kavanagh, died on the 7th of December from the effects of fatty degeneration of the heart, and we are unable to say whether the excitement which he was under at the time accelerated death or not."

I am informed that he gave up possession of his farm and left his house for a few minutes, and then went back. At the moment of his death he was seated by the fire in his house eating bread and drinking coffee. I am also informed that there is reason to believe that the bailiff who acted in the matter had been legally appointed.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE PROHIBITED MEETING AT CLONDALKIN.

Mr. GILL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he would state for what reason the Irish Authorities prevented a meeting of the inhabitants of Clondalkin, in the county of Dublin, convened for Sunday last the 2nd instant, for the purpose of considering the question of land-tenure in Ireland?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The reason why the Government prohibited this meeting was because they had reason to believe that it was called for the purpose of interfering with the due administration of the law, and of preventing a fair and impartial trial in a certain case now pending for hearing in one of the divisions of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice in Ireland.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL REPUBLIC.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he intends this year to bring in a Motion condemning the Annexation of the Transvaal Republic?

Mr. COURTNEY: Sir, in answer to the Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that I have no present intention of submitting such a Motion to the House this year. I have done that so often that I think the House must be in full possession of my views, which I may now allow to be tested by the logic of events. I can only add that I observe that three or four Members have given Notices of Motion relating to the Transvaal, and I should be very sorry if any uncertainty or any diffidence on the part of the hon. Member has prevented him from doing the same.

ARMY (INDIA)—THE BENGAL STAFF-CORPS—CAPTAIN J. B. CHATTERTON.

Mr. GRANTHAM asked the Secretary of State for India, If he has in quired, in pursuance of his promise in August last, of the proper authorities in India, whether, by the Report Medical Board dated September 5, of a 1868, signed by Surgeon Major Peskett, Surgeons Lowdell and Condon, and Assistant Surgeon Walsh, at Nynee Tal, Captain Chatterton was not recommended to take twelve months' leave of absence for the purpose of returning to England to undergo an operation—viz. the division of the left tendon Achilles—on the ground that it was not safe to perform the operation in India; whether Surgeon Major Powell, acting as garrison surgeon in Fort William, Calcutta, did not afterwards, in April 1869, confirm the above recommendation on the same ground; whether the only report on which the despatch of January 5, 1869, ordering the compulsory retirement of Captain Chatterton, was founded, and which practically alleged that he was shamming, was not that made in November or December 1868, by Assistant Surgeon M'Dermott, who was shortly afterwards removed from the medical charge of that and other cases previously under his care; and how it was that Captain Chatterton was dismissed the army in April 1869, on the report of an assistant surgeon, when Captain Chatterton was acting on the reports of more eminent surgeons made both before and after the report of the assistant surgeon?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON, in reply, said, he had requested further information from India relating to this case.

AGRICULTURAL LECTURES AT SOUTH KENSINGTON.

MR. O'SHEA asked the Vice President of the Council, By what process the teachers who were invited to attend Professor Tanner's agricultural lectures at South Kensington in August last were selected; whether any Irish teachers were invited, and, if so, how many; and, if not, if he could explain why; and, whether the expenses of any of the teachers who attended were paid out of public moneys; if so, whether any Irish teacher received such assistance; and, if not, if he would state why?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, the teachers were invited by Circular, which was sent to all teachers, Irish included. Of 206 applicants, 44 were Irish. So many of the Irish teachers had received superior agricultural training at the Central Training Department at Glasnevin and elsewhere, that South Kensington had nothing to offer them better than that which they had already received; and as the class was reduced last year from 50 to 30, and as in the preceding year double the number of Irish students in proportion to population had been to South Kensington at the public expense, it was deemed desirable that the 30 students should be selected from England, Scotland, and Wales, none of which receive any grants whatever for agricultural teaching. I have, however, given instructions that in the future Ireland shall be represented by its full complement of teachers in Professor Tanner's class.

THE CENSUS (SCOTLAND)—THE GAELIC POPULATION.

MR. FRASER MACKINTOSH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, having had his attention called to the desirability of obtaining a census of the Gaelic speaking people of Scotland, he will issue instructions providing for such an enumeration?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, the question whether such a Census should be taken had been considered, and it was thought, on the whole, that the advantage of doing so would not be correspondent with the trouble and expense of it. There was no reason for altering that decision.

ARMY—ALLEGED SALE OF ARMS BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD asked the Secretary of State for War, If he can give the House any information as to the number of rifles sold by the late Government during their last year of Office, and the prices at which they were sold, and what number of them have since found their way into Ireland?

MR. CHILDERS: In reply to the hon. Member, I have to say that the War Department has no information whatever as to arms finding their way into Ireland. None were sold by the late Government during their last year of Office. I may add that on the 20th of March, 1879, my noble Friend the Member for Essex (Lord Eustace Cecil) answered a similar Question in these words—

> "I have to say that no revolvers or breech-loading arms have been sold that I am aware of. There have been two public sales of muzzle-loading rifles, all of which were unserviceable. These sales took place last year, and no further sales are contemplated at present."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxliv. 130.]

THE LICENSING SYSTEM—LEGISLATION.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend to introduce any measure during the present Session for carrying out the Resolution which the House passed last Session relating to the Licensing System and Local Option?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I hope my hon. Friend is prepared to receive a negative answer, which it is my duty to give. Her Majesty's Government, or, at least, many Members of it, have repeatedly and publicly expressed their hope that the Parliament assembled in May last may be able to deal with the Licensing Laws; but there were so many other subjects of quite as great, or even greater consequence, which were also put forward by many Members of the Government, and generally understood by the country to be questions of general public legislative interest, to which Parliament would be required to address itself. Those questions, or the greater ones amongst them, have, of necessity, been put aside in consequence of the extraordinary and very urgent calls made upon us by the state of Ireland, and the necessity of dealing with some questions of importance to that country. Under these circumstances, I am sure my hon. Friend will not be surprised when I say there is no likelihood of our being able to deal with the Licensing Question this year.

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX IN IRELAND.

Mr. BIGGAR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he intends to make arrangements for the levying of Property Tax from Irish landlords on the sum they receive from their tenants in excess of the Government valuation?

Mr. GLADSTONE: In reply to the hon. Gentleman's Question, I have to say that I have no power to make arrangements of that kind by law. The Income Tax in England is levied, under Schedule A, on the full rent. The Income Tax in Scotland is levied on the full rent with certain deductions. In Ireland it is not levied on the rent at all, but on the valuation. The tenant in Ireland, as well as the landlord, has the advantage of paying much less Income Tax, as a general rule, than the tenant in England. The tenant in England pays on half the full value of the farm; the tenant in Ireland pays on one-third of Griffith's valuation.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROHIBITED MEETING AT CULLOHILL.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (for Mr. Lalor) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state what were the represention which led the Government in Ireland to prevent, by military force, the meeting convened at Cullohill on the 19th December last, and also the meeting appointed for the same day at Durrow, both places in the Queen's County?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The meeting at Cullohill was prohibited in consequence of information received, and that appointed to be held at Durrow on the same day was presented as being merely a repetition of the other.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROHIBITED MEETING AT DROGHEDA, &c.

Mr. M'COAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has received from the magistrates or constabulary for the district of Newtown, Mount Kennedy, county Wicklow, any report of the arrest of Patrick Kelly, now in custody on a charge of having shot at one —— M'Alindon; and, if so, if he can state to the House the grounds on which the magistrate who remanded Kelly refused and still refuses to admit him to bail; also, on what specific grounds the public meeting announced to be held on the 2nd instant at Drogheda was prohibited by the Irish Executive; and, if such prohibition was founded on a sworn information, if he will lay a copy of that information upon the Table of the House?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that in the case referred to in the first Question, the magistrates had a discretion, by an Act of the 14 & 15 *Vict.*, to refuse bail, and it was not in the province of the Executive Government to control magistrates in the exercise of that discretion. As to the prohibition of the meeting at Drogheda, information was laid before the Government on oath which led them to believe that that meeting was called for the purpose of denouncing and intimidating certain of Her Majesty's subjects; therefore, they prohibited it. They could not undertake to lay copies of such information on the Table of the House. In the present state of Ireland their doing so might very much endanger the persons who had given the information.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROSECUTION OF LAND LEAGUERS AT TRALEE.

Mr. PARNELL asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Under what Act or Acts the prosecution against the Executive of the Tralee Branch of the Land League has been instituted; whether bail has been refused; and, whether such refusal is approved of by the Government?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): Sir, in the absence of my right hon. and learned Colleague, perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to answer his Question. No prosecution has been instituted against any such body as the executive of the Tralee branch of the Land League; but several persons, in their individual capacities, are charged with having, at a specified place in Tralee, illegally and seditiously formed themselves into a Court to try and adjudicate on questions touching the occupation of land and enforce coercive jurisdiction over the Queen's subjects, who are required, by summons written or otherwise, to attend before them. Lawful Courts can only be held by authority of Parliament or the Crown. This, therefore, is a usurpation of the Prerogative, and, at the lowest, is a high misdemeanour at Common Law, and may be a treasonable practice as an overt act of intention to depose the Queen from the exercise of her Royal authority in that part of her Dominions. The question of bail would arise if the accused should hereafter be committed for trial. At present the case is still at hearing before the magistrates, who, pending the hearing, have thought it necessary to detain the accused; and I see no reason for disapproving of that exercise of their discretion, even if I had power to review it, which I have not.

MR. PARNELL said, he desired to give Notice that he would, to-morrow, ask the Solicitor General, Whether members of the Tralee Land League who were under this charge included the editors of two country newspapers and three members of the Town Commission, which body had recently presented an address of congratulation to the Secretary of State for War; whether it was true that the investigation against these gentlemen was being conducted in the common gaol of the town; whether these charges, if proved, would in the opinion of the hon. and learned Gentlemen amount to anything more than a misdemeanour; and whether it did not constitute, in fact, one of the charges for which O'Connell was tried and convicted by a packed Jury, that judgment being subsequently reversed by the Law Lords in the House of Lords; further, whether the Government approved of the attempted intimidation of the people of Ireland by violent arrests, refusal of bail, and secret investigations in the gaols and prisons of the country, on charges which ought to be brought before the ordinary Courts of Summary Jurisdiction?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I may as well answer the Question at once. I believe it is a fact that two editors of country papers and three Town Commissioners are among the persons accused, and I believe that one of the editors has acted as president of the assumed Court. Whether the Town Commissioners presented an address to the Secretary of State for War I am not in a position to say, nor do I see that it is very material to the question. The investigation is at present being held in the gaol, on the ground that the public peace could not be preserved if it were held elsewhere. There is no resemblance between the present assumed Courts and the alleged Courts concerned in the indictment against Mr. O'Connell and his fellow-traversers. In that case it was contended that care had been taken to make them nothing but references to arbitration authorized by law, and the defence was that they were no more than that. The verdict against Mr. O'Connell was reversed in the House of Lords on a technical point, which had nothing to do with the merits of the case. It does not appear to me that there is anything further in the Question of the hon. Member which requires answer.

THE O'DONOGHUE asked, Whether the hon. and learned Gentleman would see that no unnecessary delay took place in the proceedings against these gentlemen, as, from a telegram, he learnt that the magistrates only sat an hour and remanded the prisoners?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): If I had control of this matter there should not be an instant's delay. The Executive do not approve of any straining of the law for any purpose, however commendable in the opinion of any person such a course may be. The law will be administered under the present Law Officers merely as the law authorizes it to be administered, with a facility and rapidity which the law requires, and with no exaggerations in any shape.

MR. PARNELL gave Notice that, to-morrow, he would put to the Chief Secretary some Questions relating to the treatment of those gentlemen since they had been in prison; also, whether it was true that the magistrates on Saturday only sat for two hours; and whether the three magistrates whose conduct was referred to in the newspaper report handed in as evidence adjudicated on the case?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he would cause inquiries to be made; but could not undertake to answer those Questions to-morrow.

TRACTION ENGINES.

CAPTAIN **AYLMER** asked the President of the Board of Trade, If his attention has been called to a recent explosion of a traction engine on the public road at Maidstone, and whether he intends to take any steps to ensure efficiency in the charge and maintenance of similar engines?

MR. **CHAMBERLAIN**, in reply, said, that the Board of Trade, at the instance of the Home Office, appointed two engineer surveyors to assist the Coroner in the inquiry into the case. The Board had at present no power either to make or enforce any rules for insuring efficiency in the charge and maintenance of those engines.

BOROUGH FRANCHISE (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.

MR. **BLENNERHASSETT** asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in the event of the introduction by the Government of a Bill to extend the Borough Franchise in Ireland, he will be prepared to insert in it provisions calculated to secure the proportionate representation of all classes of Electors?

MR. **W. E. FORSTER**, in reply, said, that the Government could not undertake to introduce such provisions as the hon. Member alluded to. The Bill would be for the same purpose as the one brought in last year—namely, for making the borough representation in Ireland similar to that in England and Scotland.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—INSURRECTION OF THE BOERS.

MR. **LABOUCHERE** asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, in the event of military operations against the Boers of the Transvaal State, they will be recognised as belligerents in regard to their persons and property; also, whether any Copy of the proclamation of the Boers, extracts from which have been published in the morning papers, has been received by the Colonial Office; and, if not, whether the Colonial Office will take steps to obtain a Copy by telegraph?

MR. **GRANT DUFF**: In dealing with the outbreak in the Transvaal the Government will direct that the operations shall be conducted with every regard to humanity; but no information has yet reached them which would require or justify the consideration of the question of belligerent rights between the Crown and the Boers. With regard to the proclamation, the Colonial Office has not received a Copy of it; but I will inquire whether it is possible to obtain it.

NAVY—LOSS OF H.M.S. "ATALANTA"—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

SIR **JOHN HAY** asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If it is intended to lay the Report of the Committee which inquired into the cause of the loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta" upon the Table?

MR. **TREVELYAN** in reply, said, Copies of the Report and the minutes of evidence with regard to the loss of the *Atalanta* were laid on the Table of the House on the first night of the Session.

LAW OF SETTLEMENT—LEGISLATION.

SIR **JOHN HAY** asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is the intention of Government to legislate on the Law of Settlement this Session, as recommended in the Report of the Committee 10th July 1879?

MR. **DODSON**: Sir, the recommendations of the Committee involve no less than the virtual repeal of the present Laws of Settlement and Removal; and this question is of so much importance, and involves so many important considerations, that I fear it would be hopeless to attempt to deal with it this year. While, however, I cannot hold out hope of dealing with the question at large, I will add that if the progress of Business should be such as to afford a favourable opportunity of treating the question so far as concerns the period for acquiring irremovability, I should be glad to avail myself of it.

STATE OF IRELAND—LAND LEAGUE PLACARDS.

MR. **FITZPATRICK** asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has any objection to place upon the Table of the House the placards issued by the Land League calling monster meetings in the counties of Mayo, Galway, Kerry, and Queen's County?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he would have no objection to present such a Return if the hon. Member moved for it.

MR. PARNELL asked if the right hon. Gentleman would include in the Return copies of all the placards that have been issued throughout the country calling land meetings together?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that he was not sure that the Government had got copies of all the placards.

NOXIOUS GASES—LEGISLATION.

MR. WILBRAHAM EGERTON asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he intends to bring in a Bill to carry out any of the recommendations of the Noxious Vapours Commission?

MR. DODSON: Sir, we are now engaged in considering the whole question, and hope very shortly to be in a position to state whether or not the Government will be able to introduce a Bill during the present Session.

STATE OF IRELAND—LAND MEETINGS IN COUNTY DOWN.

MR. PARNELL (for Mr. DILLON) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that a meeting held at Saintfield, in the county of Down, under the auspices of the Local Tenant Right Association, was advertised for a fortnight previous to day of meeting; that bodies of men were hired and organised in the towns of Belfast and Downpatrick with the avowed intention of "holding a counter-meeting at the same hour and in the same place;" that these two organised bodies of men arrived in Saintfield armed with heavy sticks and revolvers, and that they were led and marshalled by the following gentlemen: — Mr. Theown Boyd, J.P., his brother, Captain Boyd, Mr. Waring, J.P., Mr. Ward, J.P., Mr. Hamilton, J.P., and Mr. Finnegan, secretary of the Constitutional Association of the County Down; that the Tenant Right party, in the interests of peace, gave up their advertised place of meeting, and removed to another field at a considerable distance; whereupon the Constitutional party pursued them in military array led on by the magistrates, and were turned back in mid-career by 100 police drawn across the highway; and, whether, if those facts are as alleged, the Government intend that the above-mentioned magistrates should continue in the Commission of the Peace?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had obtained the following official information. The meeting was held on the 23rd of December, he could not say under whose auspices. The advertisement appeared to have been issued within less than a week previous to the meeting. Organized bodies of men came from Belfast and Downpatrick. He had no information as to whether they were hired. He was informed they were armed as described. They endeavoured to proceed to the place of meeting, but were prevented by a body of about 100 police. Mr. Lloyd, R.M., informed Colonel Waring and Mr. Boyd, both magistrates, and Mr. Finnegan, that they would not be permitted to proceed, and asked the former to assist him in preserving order. Colonel Waring called on his followers to retire and hold a counter-demonstration at the other end of the town, which they did. He was not aware whether the other gentlemen named were present. There was a large police force present, and a serious breach of the peace was thus prevented. With reference to the last part of the Question, he thought that Colonel Waring and Mr. Boyd, or any other magistrate, ought not to have organized such a body as they appear to have organized; but as they had listened to the representations of the resident magistrate, and did their best to induce the men to retire, he did not thing that any other steps ought to be taken.

CORN RETURNS AMENDMENT BILL—LEGISLATION.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he purposes re-introducing the Corn Returns Amendment Bill?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, he proposed to introduce the Bill whenever the Public Business offered any hope that he should be able to proceed with the Bill.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE DISASTER IN THE TRANSVAAL—THE 94TH REGIMENT.

MR. GOURLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he can inform the House the exact nature of the disaster to the Officers and Men of the 94th Regiment, who were attacked by the Boers on their march from Heidelberg to Pretoria; and if it is correct that those who were taken prisoners have been released?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Sir, I should have been glad if I could have given my hon. Friend any information which might have removed, in some degree, the very painful impression which has been made on the public mind by the accounts we have all read; but I regret to say that, owing to the interruption of the communications between the Transvaal and Natal, no further information has reached us. Some of the prisoners would appear to have been released, and some not.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE PROHIBITED MEETING AT MAGHERAFELT.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, For what reason the Land League meeting at Magherafelt, county Derry, was prohibited; will he furnish a copy of any affidavits on which such prohibition was founded; if he will give the names of the magistrates who issued the prohibition, and any reason given by them for said prohibition; and, whether or not he is prepared to protect peaceable meetings organised to advocate reform of the Land Laws?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: In reply to the hon. Member's Question, I have to inform him that the Land League meeting at Magherafelt was prohibited by the local magistrates on information sworn on oath that a breach of the peace was imminent if such a meeting were held, as a counter-demonstration had been called for the same time and place, which was also prohibited. I cannot undertake to give copies of the affidavits for reasons I have already stated. The prohibition in question was signed by the Clerk to the Justices, by their order. With regard to the last portion of the Question, I may say that the Government are prepared always to prevent a breach of the peace, and are very reluctant to interfere with Constitutional meetings called for any Constitutional purpose, whether we agree with that purpose or not; but we think that the magistrates generally must be allowed to exercise their best discretion as to whether meetings should be proclaimed or not.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked, Whether all or any of the magistrates who arranged the counter-demonstration were the magistrates who gave information that the meeting might lead to a breach of the peace?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked that Notice should be given of the Question.

STATE OF IRELAND—GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS—THE LAND LEAGUE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is true that officials under the Irish Government in different parts of Ireland represent that they have been summoned by local branches of the Land League to contribute to its funds; that (under the belief that to refuse to comply with the invitation would place themselves and their families in imminent peril) they wished to be informed whether it was consistent with their position as servants of the Crown to belong to or support an organisation now being prosecuted by the Government; and, if not, what steps the Government were prepared to take to effect their protection; whether such applications have not been particularly received by the President of the Local Government Board and the Postmaster General; whether the applicants have not been officially informed that they must act on their own discretion; and, whether copies of the correspondence which has passed on the subject cannot be laid upon the Table of the House?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: My right hon. Friend has asked me to answer this Question. I cannot answer for the Postmaster General; but with regard to the Local Government Board, I am aware that in two instances gentlemen holding situations under that Board, but not exclusively employed by the Government, and therefore not coming within the general designation of servants of the Crown, have asked for instructions as to what course they should adopt in subscribing to the Land League or not. The substance of the reply sent was that as they were not servants of the Crown, but only employed by the Department, the Government could not undertake to advise them, or to control their action.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the Postmaster General could answer the Question referring to his Department?

MR. GLADSTONE: In regard to that part of the Question addressed to the Postmaster General, what I understand to have been the case is that one person employed as a sub-postmaster, and therefore not in the service of the Government, made an application of the kind referred to, and was informed that the Government did not consider it necessary to advise him or interfere with his action.

TURKEY AND GREECE—THE GREEK FRONTIER.

SIR. H. DRUMMOND WOLFF begged to ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury the Question of which he had given him private Notice, Whether, considering the alarming accounts as to the relations between Greece and Turkey, he can conveniently make any statement to the House on the subject?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I have to thank the hon. Gentleman for giving me Notice of this Question. With respect to the alarming accounts to which he refers, no doubt he speaks of various rumours in the public journals. I hope he will not consider me as affirming, universally or generally, the accuracy of these statements. As far as the Government is concerned, it has been stated already, in the Speech from the Throne, that the Powers are engaged in endeavouring to effect a settlement of the disputed questions connected with the Frontier between Greece and Turkey. It has also been stated in debate that the Powers are not agreed upon any means for attaining that object; but, of course, it will be readily understood that, in speaking of means, pacific means in effecting a settlement are meant. I am not in a position to give any further information.

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

MR. J. COWEN asked if there was any arrangement come to as to the Business to-morrow? Was it intended to resume the discussion on the Address to-morrow—Tuesday—a day appropriated to private Members?

MR. GLADSTONE: I need not inform the hon. Member that the Government have no power to direct the course of the debate to-morrow, otherwise than in accordance with established usage; but, as far as I have observed, there seems to be an idea that to-morrow might be left for the continuance of the debate upon the Address in the event of the debate not being concluded to-night. If it should be concluded to-night, our duty would be to take the Report of the Address as the first Business to-morrow. After that would come the matters of which Notice has been given by my right hon. Friend and by myself.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE wished to point out that, looking at the Notices in the Paper and the announcement just made, it would appear that the order of Business had been reversed.

MR. GLADSTONE said, that a mistake had been made through inadvertence. But the order of Business would be as he had just stated.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

> At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to assure you that I shall not interpose in this debate for any length of time. I feel that the circumstances of the country, and the crisis in which we find ourselves, are such that words should be few, if possible, and well chosen. I feel deeply the circumstances in which Ireland is placed, and the serious position in which the House finds itself. I think it is due to myself that I should give my impressions of the state of the country, of the proposals brought forward by Her Majesty's Government to meet such a state of the country, and what I think of their sufficiency or insufficiency. Now, we have heard a good deal during the progress of this debate as to the state of crime in Ireland. In my opinion, there has been an immense amount of exaggeration in what I have heard. No doubt, the state of Ireland is very serious; but crime, in the ordinary sense of crime, is not, I believe, extravagant or very great. I have an opportunity myself of knowing pretty well the state of the country. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) stated that the whole of Munster and Connaught were in a state of unmitigated anarchy. Now, I live in Munster. I go about in that part of Ireland pretty freely and generally, and I can say that in the whole county of Cork, except some half-dozen spots that are rather unpleasantly situated at present, there is no such thing as anarchy. We are going about our business, we are attending our usual occupations quite as regularly and as peacefully as you are doing in England; and I say, also, that six weeks ago I went through the greater part of Connaught. Nothing like disturbance seemed to be taking place in that part of the country; but during my progress I was pursuing, to a certain extent, the state of disturbance, as when I came to one place I asked—"How are you going on here?" "Oh, pretty well," was the answer. "But such and such a place is terribly disturbed." Well, when I got to "such and such a place," I got the very same story; so that, in going about the country on public affairs, I found the tale of excitement very far remote from what it was represented. No doubt, the state of excitement in which the people of Ireland are now is calculated very much to increase day after day. When the public mind gets excited in that way, it is wonderful what horrors and crimes are imagined, very often from trifling causes. The landlords, as a matter of course, are very much excited now, and very often afraid, and they exaggerate everything that happens. The newspapers must live by excitement, and they exaggerate everything that happens. The agitators of Ireland cannot live but by excitement; but they naturally exaggerate everything that happens, because the greater the disturbance is the greater is their power. So all round, from one to another, we have very small things intensified and made to be great things. Now, I can myself speak as regards the business of the country—the manufacturing business of the country—and I appeal to hon. Gentlemen in this House from the North of Ireland; and I can speak from my own experience, for I am a principal owner of industrial concerns in the county of Cork. We employ every day about 1,000 people; and I can say that during many years, and during the past year, our business and connection with these people are now as peaceable and regular as if there was no excitement in the country whatever. I also can confirm the statement made by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) as to some of the monetary institutions of the country. They are the great test of the state of feeling in the country, and there is nothing whatever in their circumstances to show that the people are in any way alarmed about the permanent state of the country. I may say this also, as I have heard it set forth throughout this debate that there is dishonesty in Ireland—I believe there is no honester people in the world than the Irish people. Many of the banks have branches scattered about in every remote part of the country, and large sums of money are carried about from one branch to another. During the last 30 years no attempt ever has been made to interfere with the free circulation of that money. There was, I believe, one occasion during the Fenian outbreak when an attempt was made. A bank official was travelling through a remote part of the County Cork with a large sum of money. He was attacked on the middle of the road. Fortunately, he had his revolver. He drew it out, and had fired but three or four shots, when the enemy vanished; but it turned out, upon investigation, that the enemy was a flock of goats. The shots proved fatal. He shot his horses, and he found himself in the darknesss of the night in the middle of a sparsely-populated country, with a large sum of money, and no horse to take him to his journey's end. But he was able to get to his destination through the kindness of the people, and no person interfered with him. Any person that says that there is dishonesty in Ireland misrepresents the people most grossly. I will not attempt to hide, because it is perfectly impossible to hide, the state of excitement in which the country is at present in all directions; but I think it will be found that that excitement is no greater than what has existed at critical periods in England, and much less than what has existed at other times in Ireland. That excitement is in connection with the land, and in that connection the amount of excitement, and the action that is going on, is exceedingly to be reprobated and regretted. But what is the cause of that? Unfortunately, in Ireland, we have had three exceedingly bad years. The people have in their minds one sentiment deeply fixed, and that is the dread of famine. They had the distinct recollection of the horrors of 1848, and the Irish people were endeavouring to put by a little money in order to save themselves from a recurrence of the horrors of that terrible period. During 1878 and 1879 their savings were gradually melting away, and in the memory of living men there was no worse year than 1879. Did the landlords come forward and help them? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in Ireland there are some of as good landlords as there are in any other part of the Kingdom. I myself, from my own experience, have found—going about on the Commission on which I sat—that there are in Ireland landlords as good, as thoughtful, and as kind-hearted as in any other part of the world; but, taking them as a class, they did not come forward promptly to help the people at this crisis. In fact, the landlords of England had come forward months before, and gave considerable reductions to their tenants. Did the Government of the day come forward to help these people that seemed sliding into famine? I do not wish to revive old controversies; but I believe that the Government that then held the reins of Office did not do their duty to the people of Ireland. They might have done it easily; but they did not interfere. They did not realize the situation. They did not come forward and endeavour to stop the poverty and relieve the grievances that existed. The people, therefore, felt themselves in the face of famine and no help. The law did not help them, the landlord did not help them, and naturally enough, then, the people took it into their heads to help themselves. The hon. Members who have been conducting this agitation need not take credit to themselves for having by any wonderful eloquence brought the people to a true sense of their position. In fact, if I wanted eloquence to create agitation, I would not go to the hon. Gentleman that spoke from below the Gangway the other night, but to the hon. Gentleman that spoke above the Gangway—the fine rolling sentences and points that we heard the other night—but the oratory of the agitators, the gentlemen that are now before their country, though very telling, yet did not create the agitation. They organized it, no doubt; but the seeds of it were there. The people were in such a state that anyone almost going before them, and pointing out a remedy, no matter how absurd it was, they would follow in that course. I do not wish to criticize the action of the gentlemen who conducted the agitation. They had, I am quite sure, an entire sense of their responsibility, and they must have felt that they were speaking to an excited people, and that very often they extracted meaning from their words that their words never intended to convey, and, therefore, no doubt, they put a restraint upon themselves in addressing these excited crowds. But I will say this —that I do not believe you can trace crime to these meetings. I believe that, as a general rule, agitation meetings calling people together and discussing their grievances in other countries—and I do not see why it should not be the same in Ireland at the present crisis—give an outlet, and make people think that, at all events, there is something going to be done. I do not think that the gentlemen at the head of the land agitation are entirely to be held responsible for many of the performances of the branch associations of the League. I give Mr. Davitt credit for this, that in the very first speech he made after his return from America he earnestly set himself—and he is a man of great influence and great ability—to discourage anything like crime in Ireland, because he is a man too sagacious not to perceive that this crime was the very worst thing for his own cause. And as to these local societies, I believe it very likely that the Land League in Dublin, if it tried, could not control them; but I do say this, the mischief that is being done in connection with these local Leagues is discreditable and injurious to the peace and prosperity of the country, injurious not so much to the general interests as to the real interests of the people themselves. The question is, Is there any cause for that state of things? Were the people justified in doing so in any sense? I believe that in a great measure they were. I do not say that I would have led them in that direction. I am not going to defend all the things that were said on these platforms; but I believe this, that the state of the agricultural tenantry in Ireland is bad enough to justify the very strongest agitation that ever could be carried on in the country short of doing anything against the law, or detrimental to the interests of the people. I thought I knew Ireland very well; but within the last three or four months I have gone through various parts of the country, and I must say this—that I did not think it possible for human beings to exist, as I found tenant farmers existing in the West of Ireland. And I must say this—that I made a covenant with myself that I did not care what man led, or did not lead, I would give the best days of my life to rescue these people from the state in which they are at present. It is a disgrace to the landlords, it is a disgrace to the Government, it is a disgrace to every institution of the country, to think of it that now for years, for generations, this cry year after year has been coming up from the people. We pass a couple of Bills, we fling the Bills there and allow the people to perish. In some parts of Ireland human beings may be said to be almost rotting. I saw little children going to school, and their faces showed that they had not food enough; I saw them going into cabins, and knew that they were living in cabins that must bring death; and yet these people were paying high rents. I will not refer to the very poorest class, for everyone that has written a pamphlet has been writing of these; but I will mention two cases that came before my own knowledge, one in Connaught and the other in Ulster. The man in Connaught was in a good farm on an estate that had the name of being well managed. That man came to me himself, and told me his story. He had been engaged in business. His father was an old man growing near his death, and he wrote to the son to give up business, and come home and take up the farm. He did so, and the father died, and there was an increase of 20 per cent put on the rent. The house, the fences, every single thing like improvement had been done by that family. I believe the rent without the 20 per cent was as much as any person could pay, but the 20 per cent kept the man, and must keep him for ever, under water. That man was a Protestant and an active member of the Land League, and the feeling of that man was bitter against the landlords, and he had not the slightest confidence about the Government ever doing anything. The other case was in Ulster. A young man told me he got about 100 acres from his father. Thirty acres were undrained. He could not drain it without cutting through a rock. He went to the agent and asked him to give him or lend him money to drain the land. No, he would do neither one nor the other; but he told him to work away, that he had tenant right. He did work at it for five years, and when he had the land drained and cropped, the agent put on £30 a-year rent. That man, with his wife and seven children, came there and cursed the whole thing, and said if he could he would go away and leave the whole place there. Hon. Members who read the evidence given before the Commission that has recently been sitting in Ireland will find that all through the country such things have been going on. Good landlords had been injured by things of that kind. These are the causes out of which this agitation has sprung. The people have now but fallen back on their sense of justice, and, believing there is no one to help them, have said, "We will try to help ourselves." It is for the English Government to say whether out of the unfortunate dislocation of society in Ireland there would come good or evil. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that I am entirely satisfied with what is going to be done. I kept up my faith in the present Government, I believe, as long as any man could possibly keep it. The very last thing I did before coming away, at a meeting of the Corporation of Cork, was to express my unbounded confidence in the present Ministry, and their desire to remedy the state of things in Ireland. The Speech from the Throne might mean anything; but the speeches from the Treasury Bench that other night, I am afraid, did not mean what we want. At the same time, I do not want in any way to make it appear that the Prime Minister's speech had a meaning that perhaps it had not. I have not given up faith yet in the Prime Minister, for I cannot forget those two splendid measures, the Church Act and the Land Act; and I believe the man who brought them in and passed them through the House will now lay hold of this great question and settle it in a way satisfactory to the people of Ireland. I had a number of communications this morning, some from Ireland, but a great many of them from England. I have a long letter here from a leading and influential gentleman in one of the largest constituencies in the North of England, one sentence of which I will read, more for the benefit of hon. Gentlemen around me than for that of the Government. It is as follows:—

> "I believe that there is a real and strong detetermination among the rank and file of the Liberal Party to do full justice to the Irish people. A weak Land Bill will cause as great a dissatisfaction here as on the other side of the water."

I have a telegram here, which I received a few minutes ago from a gentleman who knows the condition and state of Ulster as well as any other person. He says—

> "Ulster repudiates proposed settlement of Land Question. All parties anxious for a settlement, but the case the Government are proparing would be disastrous to the peace, and hopelessly retard the prosperity of the country."

I have another letter from a leading politician in the North of England, a gentleman of high position and great sagacity. He says—

> "Do not be discouraged. Appeal to the Members who sit around you who represent great English and Scotch constituencies, and if they do not act in a manly way suitable for the occasion, appeal to the people of England."

He hoped, in accordance with that advice, to organize a series of meetings all round the great centres of population. The meetings will probably begin in Manchester and end in Birmingham; and I hope that at these meetings I may have the pleasure of seeing the local Members present. Now, is it not for the interests of England that this question should be settled? Is it not a disgrace to statesmanship? Far be it from me to do or say anything against the English people—the land of liberty, the land that has been the fountain head of the Constitutional liberties of the whole world. Why should any man be against England? But if you want a dark spot in the history of England, you will find it in the fact that she has not, after the lapse of centuries, and with all her power, and influence, and money, done a single thing to conciliate or improve Ireland, which is just as miserable now as it was 60 or 70 years ago. Why, if you had tried a partnership or a business for that length of time, and the result had been similar, would not you feel that it was a disgrace to you? I think my hon. Friends here well understand that, as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, you have an interest in doing what is right. There is not a single man in Ireland whose condition would not be improved, and who would not be pacified. The working men would consume double more than they are consuming at present, and the manufacturers would be benefited. At present, they are not able to buy anything. But the question will always come up beforehand when this subject is approached—namely, is there anything that can be done to bring about the condition of things I have described? Oh, the Government say, We are going to do it; we are going to coerce. And then we will bring in a Land Bill. They are going to bring in the very last thing they they should bring in—brute force; and then they will come in with their Land Bill. I do not think, myself, that we know exactly what this Land Bill will be. I will not draw conclusions from the speech of the Prime Minister; I will wait and I will hope; but I say distinctly—I say it not merely for the working farmers of Ireland, but I speak on behalf of the landlords whom I know —that better not touch this question at all than not settle it completely and finally. The country is in too serious a state. The landlords of Ireland are aware of the importance of settling the question; and now the Government, if it wishes really to lay hold of it, must work a complete and fixed settlement on a basis that will secure prosperity to the country. I may be asked what I would do? Surely, the country is in a fearful state. It cannot go on that way; but you are proposing that it shall go on. Your coercion will, perhaps, after a few months' struggle in the House, become the law of the land. By this coercion you sow the seeds of distrust, suspicion, and doubt in the very soil in which you want to sow your good seed. In that way you will have one influence working against another, and destroying it, and not letting it come to maturity and strength. Is that what great statesmen should do? If I were asked my advice—a very absurd presumption, because from the lowest doorkeeper to the highest position under Government, no Irish need apply—we have as little to do with the government of our own country as we have to do with the government of Russia. We are told that we are taken into equality, that we are on equal terms with this great English people; but we have not seen it. Occasionally an Irishman has been allowed within the sacred circle of power, but very occasionally indeed, and he must be of a certain class before he is admitted. It is just as bad on the other side as on this; only occasionally is an Irishman placed in any of those positions of importance, which seem to belong entirely to Englishmen. One of the best debaters of this House —a man of high character, and a man who had the respect of all Parties—was allowed to sit there for years, and at last was insulted with something worthless; so that we have really no chance whatever of influencing the Government except from outside. But on this subject I need not dwell at greater length. There is the more pressing question, How is the present condition of the country to be dealt with? As I said before, if I were responsible, I would give Notice of a Bill to-night, I would bring it in to-morrow; it would be passed within 10 days, and you would want no coercion. You might consider that a very presumptive statement; but I believe it really. I may, I think, without impropriety, say that there was one subject on which every Member of the Land Commission —on which, in fact, we are all unanimous, and also in the evidence you will find the same thing—that there was a most extraordinary unanimity on the part of the tenant farmers, land agents, and landlords of Ireland, with hardly an exception, that in future there must be some tribunal placed between the landlord and tenant to regulate the rent. If we leave the position as it is at all, if we think of maintaining the relationship between landlord and tenant in Ireland, it will be quite impossible to continue that relationship unless there is some independent tribunal of great authority and power which will be used in all cases to adjudicate upon questions of rent between landlord and tenant. Now, this is the very question that the tenants are at this moment agitating about all through Ireland. I would at once appoint that Commission—and you must appoint it in the long run—and I would send it out before the end of this month to decide those questions that arise between landlord and tenant. You would thus meet the difficulty—you would meet the cases of the tenants who are now complaining of their rent all through Ireland—you would bring peace to the mind of the landlord, and you would, I believe, bring to an end the disturbance and excitement that exist at present. At once you ought to bring that to an end, if you did what I have suggested. You would, furthermore, have your machinery there for future purposes. It may be said, "Oh, it is impossible to get men to do that." I believe you can get all through Ireland in the different districts men for that purpose, who would have the confidence of the tenant farmers. I do not mean professional valuators, but men who understood the land, and who could act immediately in the direction I have pointed out. In this way I think you would meet the case, and, in the course of time, you would manipulate your Land Bill in a statesmanlike way, having plenty of time for it. The question is one of great importance. It is one that has impressed itself so deeply on my mind that I cannot use language strong enough to bring the matter before the House and before the people of this country. You may be quite sure that the state of Ireland is a state that cannot be trifled with, and that your proposed coercion will not effect the results. What is the use of coercion when the evil is in every house of 500,000 or 600,000 tenant farmers? Where you have the whole country banded together in this way, I say, with an almost complete knowledge of the subject, that no Coercion Bill you bring in will root out the disease. You cannot root it out except by just legislation. You should at once take that in hand; you should impress the people that you are about to do something for them; you should show them that you are going to meet the worst part of their case, that you are going to create a proper tribunal for the regulation of rent between landlord and tenant. I still believe that the Government will re-consider the decision they have come to—if they really have come to any decision—and that the speech of the Prime Minister reflects faithfully, not what he has thought, but that it reflects what is thought by the antedeluvian Whigs, whose tirades we see paraded, from time to time, in the columns of *The Times.* I am sure it reflects that. I am sure it reflects the views of the English landlords, who think that if this thing goes on, or if it is allowed to go on, their own institutions are in danger; but if it is what the Prime Minister states, it does not reflect the matured opinions of the people of Ireland, either landlords or tenants, and it will do nothing to meet the case, but will leave it in a worse position than they found it in. I hope, Sir, that we shall see even better legislation than we have already had.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he never listened to the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw), who had just spoken with such great moderation, without wishing that his counsels carried more weight with them in Ireland. If the Irish people had been guided by the spirit which animated the hon. Gentleman, there would have been no necessity for calling Parliament together at that early period, and introducing what might be considered exceptional legislation for the protection of life and property in Ireland. He declined, however, to follow the hon. Member into his digression on the Land Question, which was not before the House. He did not believe that it was in the power of any man in the House, or even of any single Minister on the Treasury Bench, to say anything definite as to the measure which the Government intended to propose for dealing with the relations between the landlords and tenants in Ireland. The Speech from the Throne seemed to hint at one thing, the words of the Prime Minister at another; while the noble Marquess at the head of the India Office had, within the last day or two, given expression to sentiments on the subject which might have emanated from the Leader of the Opposition. He would not follow the hon. Member for the County of Cork into what he had said on the subject of crime in Ireland. The House could not go beyond the statements of the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary for Ireland; and he thought no amount of persuasiveness on the part of either the Member for the County or for the City of Cork would suffice to persuade the House that crime was not rife in Ireland at the present time. The hon. Member for the County of Cork also referred to the prosperity of the banks in Ireland. Without doubt, there was an immense deal of money in the Irish banks, and that for the very good reason that the farmers of that country, who were the principal monied class, had not paid a single penny of rent. It was well-known that all banks dealing with farmers in Ireland — the Munster Bank amongst the number—were in a good condition owing to the measures they took for the past few years for the recovery of their debts. On the other hand, the banks connected with the landlord classes were in an extremely critical, if not perilous position. [Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA: No, no!] Well, at any rate, so he had been informed on good authority. His right hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) having dealt exhaustively on Friday last with the general question of the administration of the law in Ireland in the past year, he would now only touch upon one or two points directly raised by the speech of the Prime Minister, in order, if possible, to elicit some further information concerning them. In the first place, he wished to enter a strong and earnest protest against the principle laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, that it was not the duty of the Government to ask the House to acquiesce in any strengthening of the Irish Executive until they could secure a moral unanimity in support of the proposals they had to make. He (Lord Randolph Churchill) doubted whether—using the word in a strictly political sense—a more cynical or unprincipled position had ever been taken up by an English Prime Minister, because it came to this, in other words—that the object of the Government was not to protect the lives and liberties of the Irish people, not to maintain the supremacy of the law, but to consider whether by so doing they might not endanger the unity of the Liberal Party. It was avowed that this motive, which might have been plausible enough if only matters of comparatively domestic legislation were involved, was the sole and only one which guided the Government at a dangerous crisis, and the only reason why Parliament was not called together in the autumn to prevent the establishment of a reign of terror in Ireland was because the Cabinet feared they would not be supported by a large number of their followers. That was certainly a novel, and not very respectable, view of Ministerial responsibility. The object of the right hon. Gentleman was not the peace of Ireland, not the good name of the Government, but only the unity of the Liberal Party. Accepting that principle, however, and making a note of it, in order that it might be properly appreciated by the House and by the public, he could not help remarking that the Prime Minister had been, even as it was, premature, not to say impetuous, for he had noticed in the progress of that debate, to which he had listened with great attention, a simmering and surging on the Benches opposite which led him to believe that in the Division Lobby the Government Whips might fail to recognize some of their most trusted and ardent followers. He had also been informed that the Liberal candidate for Wigan (Mr. Lancaster) had pledged himself to oppose tooth-and-nail the coercion measures of the Government, and had also undertaken that, when Irish questions arose on which he was not well informed, he would consult, not the Prime Minister, but the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). If the Prime Minister had only waited for a few more murders, or attempts at murder, a few more cruel and inhuman outrages, or, better still, if he could only have had the supreme good fortune of a general armed rising of the Irish people, he might possibly have carried with him an united Party. Fortunately for himself and his Government, and fortunately for Ireland, he was now able to rely upon support from other quarters; but he was bound to attribute this somewhat tardy conversion of the Prime Minister and his Colleagues to principles of sound and moderate government to the activity displayed in the Recess by Members of the Tory Party, and to the graphic manner in which they delineated the condition and prospects of Ireland on numberless platforms, and before thousands of interested and most anxious electors. There was another matter which he would like to allude to, in order that the Government might not have again occasion to allude to it. The Prime Minister had animadverted with great severity on the prosecutions undertaken by the late Government against certain members of the Land League in Ireland in 1879, and he had contrasted them proudly with his own magnificent State trials now going on in Dublin, remarking that the late Government only prosecuted the humblest followers of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and did not dare to touch the leaders of the Party which was now on its trial; and that, having begun to strike, they feared to drive home the blow. With all due respect, he must say that that was a complete misconception on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. The late Government, acting on the principle that "prevention is better than cure," instituted certain prosecutions against some individuals who were reported to the Government to have used seditious language at various public meetings in Ireland in the winter of 1879. This was the simple and clear charge, and the hon. Member for the City of Cork could not then have been prosecuted, for the reason that up to that time neither he nor any of his colleagues had used language that by any amount of legal ingenuity could be said to have been seditious. The principle of making one man liable for what another man had said, on which the present Government were acting, did not commend itself to the late Government. The charge of the Prime Minister that these prosecutions were not proceeded with admitted of the simple answer that the arrests produced a marked effect upon the character of the language used at the meetings. The sole aim of the late Government was not to persecute individuals for using what might have been only hasty and ill-judged language, but to prevent the passions of an excitable people from being dangerously aroused. That object was attained by the time that the late Government went out of Office. The language changed, however, as soon as the present Government acceded to power, and became far more violent than any that had been used before. He ventured to suggest that if the present Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had prosecuted Messrs. Barry, Gordon, and Brennan, for the speeches which they made in June and July, he thought that they would have been saved the ridiculous spectacle which was now going on in the Four Courts in Dublin. He brought those speeches under the notice of the right hon. Gentleman at the time they were made, and hinted that criminal proceedings might have some effect; but he was most effectively snubbed. Yet, curiously enough, these were the very speeches upon which the Crown based their whole case against the Land League. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland devoted a whole day to those speeches; in fact, it seemed as if he could not get away from them. It would, therefore, be seen, he thought, that in this matter, as in others, he (Lord Randolph Churchill), at that time, was right, and that the Chief Secretary for Ireland was wrong. As to the present prosecutions, the Prime Minister had maintained that the proceedings instituted by the Crown had been prosecuted as expeditiously as was possible; but he ventured to assert, without fear of contradiction, that the proceedings had been of the most dilatory and costly character, costly not only to the country, but to the traversers. The other night the Prime Minister made a very humble apology to the hon. Member for the City of Cork for the inconvenience to which he had been put. He would suggest that to that, in order to make it more perfect, should be added a further apology for the unnecessary expense to which he had been put. If the Government had chosen to take the ordinary November Sessions of the Queen's Bench, or the ordinary Winter Assizes, they would have ascertained the practical effect of their prosecution before the close of the year. But they had chosen to demand a trial at Bar, as it was called, which possessed no single advantage, which would cost some £50,000 or £60,000, which would possibly be proceeding long after the present Government had ceased to exist, and which had brought the administration of justice in Ireland into an absurd and contemptible position. If the Prime Minister had been in Court, as it had been his (Lord Randolph Churchill's) advantage to be on the opening day, and if he had seen the grin which spread over the face of everybody in Court—not only the Bar, but, Heaven forgive him, he had been almost going to say the Bench—when the jury were finally sworn, he thought that, instead of referring to the trials with pride and delight, he would have avoided them as his deepest shame. He could not help adding that these State trials were never alluded to in any society in Dublin that they did not provoke ridicule and mirth; and he had been interested to observe in Friday's newspaper that, during the examination and the cross-examination of the witnesses, the jury were wrapt in profound slumber. The hon. Member for the City of Cork was perfectly right when he said that this was the first State trial in Ireland in which the jury had not been packed—by the Crown. He would now, with the permission of the House, make a remark or two with reference to the Royal Irish Constabulary. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. W. E. Forster) alluded to that force on Friday night, and paid to it a tardy tribute; but he (Lord Randolph Churchill) felt bound to point out that the Government had allowed the most unfair denunciations to be uttered with regard to it, both by speakers and by their organs, in the Metropolis and in the Provinces, without the slightest reproof falling from their lips. The police of Ireland had been accused of inactivity and of inefficiency; and, so far from deprecating that charge, the Government had distinctly accentuated it by a Circular which they published on the 20th of December, conveying a censure upon the force. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, the other evening, said that he could not understand how that Circular had become public, and he insinuated that the late Lord Lieutenant had been instrumental in getting hold of it improperly. No doubt, the public and the late Lord Lieutenant did get hold of the document in a remarkable way, and in a way which illustrated the insidiousness of the late Government—they had read it in the columns of *The Times* newspaper. They had not obtained possession of the document in the ordinary course, but they had gone out of their way to read *The Times* newspaper. That Circular, he maintained, did convey a distinct censure upon the Royal Irish Constabulary. He freely admitted that he had never himself been an enthusiastic admirer of that force, because it had often occurred to him that too much attention was paid by it to preserving a military appearance and dignity, while its duties as civil police were, to some extent, neglected. If, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman contemplated introducing any reforms into the force to remedy this defect, he, for one, should be the last to oppose them. He, however, would remind the House that if the Irish police had not done all that could be fairly expected from them at the present emergency it was not their fault in any way, because they had given most clear, distinct, and warning information as to the state of the country, and as to the movements which were in progress and in contemplation, movements which they told both the late and the present Government could not be met satisfactorily without exceptional powers. The present Government had summarily rejected their information; and while they gave the signal to the ill-disposed that they might work their will, they let the police understand that their information was distrusted, discredited, and disbelieved, and, at the outset, deprived them of their greatest powers. There was another matter; and although, for obvious reasons, he could not give his authority, he yet stated boldly, from information he had received from the best source, that since the decision of the present Government not to renew the Peace Preservation Act had been arrived at, the Royal Irish Constabulary throughout the country had been actuated by the irresistible conviction that any extra activity on their part, which might bring them into collision with the people, would be highly displeasing to the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Castle authorities.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I think, Sir, when such a statement is made—[" Order, order!"]—with regard to the Constabulary by any individual, it should not be accepted. [" Order, order!"]

Mr. GORST rose to Order, and wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman was in Order in interrupting the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock in his speech?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, on the right hon. Gentleman resuming his seat, proceeded to observe that he deemed his information as good as, and more disinterested than, that which the Chief Secretary for Ireland had obtained on that subject. It was only just recently, when the Government had changed their minds on the state of Ireland, that the police had adopted a different line of conduct. Had the police shown greater activity last summer, and had tumults been caused in which lives were lost, that would have shown that the country was in a disturbed state, and that the decision of the Government not to renew the Peace Preservation Act was rash and unwise. He had been surprised that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) had had the face to contradict the assertion of the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) that an agreement had been come to between the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the hon. Member for Cork City as to the conduct which the police were to adopt at public meetings. ["Oh, oh!"] He recollected perfectly well the agreement being entered into. It was made in the progress of the debate on the Constabulary Vote. But if any further proof of such agreement being entered into was required, it was furnished by a Circular which was issued by the Irish Government on the 21st of September, 1880, and he asked the House to consider what effect the terms of such a Circular would have upon the minds of the Irish Constabulary. It was as follows:—

> "Royal Irish Constabulary,
> "Dublin Castle, Sept. 21, 1880.
>
> "When, in obedience to the instructions of the local magistrates or of Government, the Constabulary are assembled for the preservation of the peace at Land League meetings, the following instructions are to be observed:—
>
> "1. If the meeting is held in the neighbourhood of a police barrack, the men are to be confined therein, and no armed men are to be permitted to appear during the time the meeting is being held, except in case of actual necessity."

Then came an extremely amusing paragraph, which he did not believe the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had penned himself, because he had never known him to make anything like a joke in that House. It was as follows:—

> "2. Where there is no police barrack in the neighbourhood, the men should be placed somewhere in the vicinity, and if practicable out of view, in all cases in which the police are reasonably satisfied that men armed with truncheons only will be able to protect the Constabulary or Government reporters.
>
> "3. The truncheon party shall consist of as few men as is compatible with safety."

Then came a paragraph which appeared to be written in the usual trade circular style—

> "4. Arrangements have been made by the Government to have speeches at the more important meetings reported by professional shorthand writers. These gentlemen will be provided in every case with a letter of introduction to the sub-inspector of the district, with instructions for him to afford them every assistance and protection in his power. The sub-inspector should afford them any protection they should require, and, if they require none, should not order any police to protect them."

He submitted that the terms of that Circular completely controverted the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland the other night, that no agreement with regard to the conduct of the police at these meetings had been entered into by the Government. He did not say the arrangement had been carried out; but it had been entered into, and it was a perfectly good indication of the conduct of the Government towards the police. But mark this. On the 21st September they issued a Circular intimating that the police were not to come into collision with the mob, and on the 20th December they issued a Circular censuring the police for not having come into collision with the mob. [*Cries of* "Read!"] Unfortunately, he had left the document at home; but he would undertake to produce it in half-an-hour's time. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary probably had it in his pocket; if not, he was quite aware of its terms, and he (Lord Randolph Churchill) maintained that that document did convey a censure upon the Irish police. He asserted that if the Irish Constabulary had failed in their duty, it was because they knew that if they performed it they would not receive the support of the Government. The Prime Minister had been very much displeased the other night because the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition in that House had referred to the practice of "Boycotting," and had very properly insisted that the Government had allowed that practice to be carried to improper lengths. The Prime Minister had described the practice to the House as merely a sort of "exclusive dealing," with which the Legislature could not interfere; and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland also told the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin that it was extremely doubtful whether it was an illegal offence. As to "exclusive dealing," he was not sure that the definition was accurate, for he thought that however much exclusion there might be in that practice there was very little "dealing" in it. But the manner in which the Prime Minister alluded to the practice showed the imperfect manner in which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had impressed upon his Colleagues the real condition of Ireland. They seemed to look upon "Boycotting" as a sort of joke; but, in his (Lord Randolph Churchill's) opinion, it was very far from being so agreeable as that. A graphic description of the practice had been given by one of the individuals who was now upon his trial in Dublin. In one of his speeches he said—

> "You must refuse to take the farm of the evicted"—never mind, justly or unjustly—"you must let that farm remain idle as a testimony to the fidelity of the people. But should there be such a wretch in the community found to deal in stolen goods, to make money on the misfortunes of his countrymen, then you must visit him with the severest sentence of social ostracism. You must not allow your children to speak to his children; you must not deal with the baker who would sell him bread, or the butcher who would sell him meat; you must refuse to enter a house the threshold of which he would be allowed to cross; you must leave him alone, and let him wither under a people's curse."

The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Law), in commenting upon those words, had said—

> "I do not yet believe that if you make by a systematic and joint-stock association a man's life so miserable, wilfully so miserable, that he would rather die than live, the law is so absurd as to make killing him a crime, but letting him live a life of prolonged misery—prolonged under the system of 'healthy sentiment' and modern humanity and Christianity—I do not believe the law is so absurd as to brand the one as a crime and punish it, and the other only as a piece of inhumanity."

He thought the House would pay more attention to the words of the Attorney

General than to those of the Prime Minister. There was one passage in the Royal Speech which required a brief comment—namely, that in which the establishment of County Boards in Ireland was announced. He did not mean for a moment to go into that question; but the occupation of the present Government simply seemed to him to be that of trying various experiments on that unfortunate country. Last year they had tried the experiment of governing Ireland by the ordinary law, "relying," as the Queen's Speech of that day put it, "on the good sense and loyalty of My Irish subjects," and that experiment had ended in hopeless disaster. And now they proposed, at a moment when Ireland was in conflagration—from the Giant's Causeway to Cape Clear—when landlords, who had to pay the greater part of the public expenditure, were, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had written, apparently with malignant glee, "running for their lives;" at a moment when the Government were obliged to suspend the Constitution, they proposed to try the interesting experiment of granting popular control over expenditure, and extending the habits of local self-government. They had heard repeated, *usque ad nauseam*, the stupid Birmingham motto that "Force was no remedy." The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin gave a very effective disproof of that statement by the figures he adduced. But if the House would allow him, he (Lord Randolph Churchill) would like to give figures of a time more closely analogous. In the year 1833 a Coercion Bill was brought in by Earl Grey. He proposed the strongest Coercion Bill ever introduced with regard to Ireland. In the month of March preceding the passing of that Act the agrarian outrages were 472. In the month of May following the passing of the Act the number of agrarian outrages was 162. In the county of Kilkenny, the worst county at that time in Ireland, the offences in March were 121, and in May, 15. In the year ending March, 1833, when there was no Coercion Act, the offences were 1,590; and in the year ending March, 1834, they only numbered 335. After that, he hoped they would not hear the statement repeated that force was no remedy. He was bound to say he was very glad to hear his right hon. and learned Friend's (Mr. Gibson's) objection to the use of the word coercion, and his suggestion that the word protection should be substituted for it, because coercion was naturally a harsh sounding word to English ears. They did not wish for coercion for any persons but the Turks. Coercion applied to a British subject was a most objectionable word, and he therefore used the word protection. He would quote the words of the High Sheriff of the County Limerick in a letter to the Lord Lieutenant, in which he said that—

> "Protection was wanted for landlords, who had many demands to meet, and whose rents were commanded to be withheld from them by force and fraud. Protection for honest tenants who were willing to pay their rents, but feared to do so. Protection for professional men, in order that they might not be insulted or assailed for doing their duty to their clients. Protection for the merchant, for the shipowner, and for the good priest, who, confining himself to the duties of his sacred calling, refused to give his consent to doctrines which he believed to be Communistic, and to conduct which he considered to be infamous: whose horse was therefore left unshod, and whose house was left unroofed. Protection was wanted for labourers, who were now idle, and would soon be destitute."

It was for protection that Ireland had loudly cried. It was protection that ought to have been granted months ago. The Prime Minister had exhibited an admirable feeling, when he declared that the present Government asked the House for exceptional powers with a sense of the deepest shame and humiliation, and he would respectfully tender to him his deepest sympathy, because he could fully appreciate the mortification of himself and his Colleagues at finding that the prophecies made by their opponents last Session had proved to be severely accurate. But what he could better understand was the mortification of the English people imposed upon them by the condition of Ireland and the appearance it presented to the outside world. The Prime Minister made a sort of appeal, as far as he dared, to hon. Members on that side of the House, to lay aside Party feeling, and consider only how Ireland could best be pacified. That appeal would not fall upon deaf ears. No doubt, much had been said and done by the present Advisers of Her Majesty, when they occupied a different position, which might fairly be considered to justify the Tory Party in almost any lengths in Opposition; but he had heard nothing which would lead him to suppose that the Tory Party would be actuated by any vindictive or ungenerous motive; and with regard to those measures which the Government proposed to introduce and push on without delay, they might rely upon the loyal and numerically strong support of Members on that side of the House, who believed in their hearts that by maintaining the present Government in its present frame of mind, and in its present policy against the wild and destructive fanaticism which prevailed on those Benches below the Gangway, they should best contribute to the true interests of their common country; and they would endeavour to promote, by all the means in their power, the progress of those measures which had for their object not, he regretted to say, the preservation, but the restoration of law and order in Ireland; and which, even in the hands of the present Government, might possibly afford some measure of tranquillity to that distracted and misgoverned land.

MR. CHARLES RUSSELL said, he would not pause to examine in detail the speech of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), or to consider whether he had contributed to assist the judgment of the House on the serious questions before it involving the liberties of Ireland. He referred that to the judgment of the House. The noble Lord had, no doubt, intended to make a Party attack upon the Government; but it seemed to him (Mr. Russell) that he had, in fact, paid the Chief Secretary for Ireland substantial compliments. For had not the noble Lord made it matter of complaint that the Chief Secretary had hitherto shown some regard for the great right of public meeting in Ireland; that he had cautioned the police against interference, and to avoid collision with the people; and did not the noble Lord wind up with the singular charge that the trials now proceeding in Ireland were the first State trials in that country in which the jury had not been packed? [*A laugh.*] He (Mr. Russell) rose to speak with some anxiety; and he desired to state why he felt bound, but reluctantly, to vote against the Government. He desired this all the more because he belonged to a small and decreasing class of politicians in that House—namely, Members of Liberal views sitting for Irish constituencies, who were neither Home Rulers nor Land Leaguers. Indeed, if he (Mr. Russell) did not misread the policy of the Liberal Party as disclosed in the Queen's Speech, the class to which he belonged was threatened with speedy extinction. He should be glad to find he was wrong; but he had listened with painful interest to the speech of the Prime Minister, and he read his forthcoming policy towards Ireland as one of strong coercion and weak Land Reform. He believed such a policy would be injurious to the best interests of Ireland and of the Kingdom, and he should vote against it. He understood the feeling of impatience he had heard expressed from time to time at the constant reiteration of the cry of Irish grievances. Men who had grown grey in that House recollected that cry in their youth; and now it was as strong as ever! Surely it was a matter of some importance to face the question why that was so; why, in the face of efforts honestly made by that House, that cry was still the cry of the Representatives of the Irish people? Why was it? It could not be a cry wholly unreasonable; for were they not, at that moment, face to face with the results of an agitation not concerned in any high question or problem of politics, but face to face with an agitation based on the contention of a large number of the people for bread—that they might be, under the rule of Government, housed and fed, as well at least, as the horses in the stable, and the dogs in the kennel? He must confess he had read with some pain a speech by an hon. Member of the House (Mr. Thorold Rogers) at Reading, in which he said he listened to the speeches of the Scotch Members because they knew what they wanted, and they were always sure to get it; but when Irish Members spoke he never listened, because they did not know what they wanted, and they were sure never to get it. He thought, however, it was not intended to be made in an unkind and ungenerous manner; but that the hon. Member could not resist the opportunity of saying a smart thing; and he regretted to find that Mr. Froude, who wrote ably, and brilliantly, if not very accurately, on matters of history, had thought it decent, at a time when, surely, dislike raged high enough against them in England, to speak of the Irish, a people just escaped from famine, as ravening wolves, to whom any concession was so much waste of time, and as only tending to whet their appetite for more. After all that had been done—and done principally, he was glad to acknowledge, by the Party of which he was, and hoped to remain, a humble Member—he said it remained true that the great mass of the Irish people were still the worst clad, the worst fed, and the worst housed people in Europe. Well, for these people in their terrible condition, just escaped a famine, and still with the impress of distress upon them—for these people, the Government were going to propose weak Land Reform and strong coercion. It seemed to him that in order fairly to understand the position of the Irish Question—in order to fairly gauge the character, meaning, and extent of the alleged lawlessness, it was necessary the House should remember what had happened last year. He was glad to know that many English Members had visited Ireland to inform themselves as to its condition. He hoped the House would hear the experiences in Ireland of the Secretary of State for War, of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), and also of the new Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Courtney), if his light was not temporarily hidden under the official bushel. [*A laugh.*] Famine was no new thing in Ireland; it had, unhappily, occurred again and again, but it never would be so borne as it had been borne in times past. He was happy to say that, because he thought it was a sign of wholesome discontent. It gave good reason to hope that the Irish people would make some effort to respond to such assistance as the Legislature could give them for the bettering of their condition. The country had been to a great extent of late years Americanized—not always to its advantage, but yet in many respects to its advantage. These people last year were reduced to the position of being beggars for charity; and the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), in his official capacity as the Lord Mayor of Dublin, in that House, last year, told them that at the time which he spoke—namely, June—there were, through the agency of the fund with which he had to do, as many as 600,000 people receiving relief. Well, the Government thought the landlords were not wholly to be trusted in that condition of things. They thought, in the condition of things, something ought to be done to protect the tenant farmers. Notwithstanding the glowing, but, he feared, wholly unreal, description of the harmonious relations which, according to the hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham), existed between the landlords and the tenants of Ireland, the Government thought the tenants could not be trusted safely to the tender mercies of the landlords. He wished it to be understood that he desired to discuss the question in as impersonal a way as possible. There were bad landlords — the temptation to be bad landlords in Ireland was great; and yet there remained many good ones. He was pointing to the defects of the system more than to the landlords. The Government brought in a Bill which he thought then, and thought now, a small Bill; but a Bill which no man of high and generous impulses, who truly realized the condition of the people, would oppose. What happened to the Bill? It went up to the House of Lords, and the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General (Mr. Fawcett), the other day, expressed his (Mr. Russell's) opinion, when he said that the conduct of some men who sat on these Benches and called themselves Liberals was some excuse, even if not justification, for the conduct of the Lords with regard to that Bill. Undoubtedly, in place of being supported by the united power of the Liberal Party, the Bill was opposed by men who were not superior, he was afraid, to their class prejudices and class interests. Those who had justified the conduct of the Lords had said —"Why should the Lords pay any respect to a Bill which went up supported by the votes of the Home Rule Members?" And that was actually put as a reason why the vote of that House should not have full effect given to it—because the men whom Ireland had sent to represent her, because she thought they knew her wants, because those men gave their support to the Bill, therefore the Lords were justified in not supporting it! Well, the Bill having failed, what was to be done? And here a question arose in reference to those hon. Members who were called the Third Party in the House—a question which deserved attention not yet given to it, however pressing it might be in the minds of hon. Members—who and what were these men, and why were they there? As to them he had one or two remarks to make. He intended to speak with freedom, and without disrespect; and he held that the explanation why those Representatives of Ireland professed the opinions they did was one which Ministers should take to heart. As long as he (Mr. Russell) could recollect, with certain spasmodic intervals, until recently, Members were returned for Ireland who, with great regularity, ranged themselves with perfect decorum under the Party banners. They committed no Obstruction, and he was afraid they too often displayed a higher devotion to Party than they did to the interests they were sent to represent. As to the present Representatives of Ireland, it needed no close scrutiny to see that there was at the bottom of their action a feeling of patriotism prompting their proceedings, however much the majority of the House might think their conduct improper. Those Representatives were neither as to position, but with some exceptions, nor as to means, nor as to age, what might be called the natural leaders of the people—many of them were there not much past the threshold of manhood. They were sent there by what was practically a revolution in Ireland, but a revolution carried out by Constitutional means. They were the men, undoubtedly, who founded the Land League. He asked whether, after what had happened to the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in the House of Lords, it was even to be expected from human nature that the Irish tenant farmers were to fold their arms with meekness, and make no effort for self-protection—that they were to be left to the tender mercies of a minority of landlords carried away by the spirit of cupidity? What happened in the Famine years of 1846, 1847, and 1848? Did not the landlords of that time depopulate whole districts of fertile land, driving the people who had occupied those districts to seek their homes upon tracts of soil of the poorest character to be found, such as in Mayo and other places, where the poorer inhabitants of Ireland lived, and this in exercise of the rights that, no doubt, the law gave them; and were the landlords of the present day a different class? It was such proceedings as these, unchecked by the Legislature, that had led to the state of things often now existing—namely, that the greatest congestion was on the poorest lands. With these things before them, it was an object worthy of the highest effort of patriotism to try and save the tenant farmers from what seemed their impending fate. Then the Land League was started, or became active. He wished at this point to draw a distinction between what was legal and what might be considered illegal in relation to it. He (Mr. Russell) unhesitatingly laid down that in its conception the Land League was legal, in its avowed objects the Land League was legal, and in its avowed means the Land League was legal. It was an organization for self-protection, and to focus public opinion. Its principal avowed object was the prevention of unjust rack-renting and eviction. Its avowed means was the bringing of public opinion to bear on individuals who acted, or were disposed to act, contrary to its objects. He spoke of its avowed object, and of its avowed means, because he (Mr. Russell) could not for a moment deny that things had, in fact, been said and been done in the name of, and by, members of the Land League which could not be legally justified, and which must be deplored—which he (Mr. Russell) most heartily and most entirely reprobated. It was necessary, therefore, to distinguish between what was of the essence of the movement and what the indirect results of it might be. Schemes of coercion were not to be entertained on light grounds. There must be an imperative necessity for some such measures; and it must be shown that coercive measures would alone meet the case. He was glad to hear the Prime Minister say the other night that it was impossible to base a claim for coercion upon the occurrence of increased crime in consequence of the action of the Land League. In truth, there was no doubt that, as regarded serious crime—he meant attempts upon life, unhappily frequent in Ireland, but more frequent in proportion in England—there had been a smaller number in the last year than for a number of years back; therefore, it could not be that the coercion was justified because of the increase of serious crime. It was said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) that not one-tenth of the outrages in Ireland ever met the public eye. He (Mr. Russell) had taken some trouble to inquire about that; and, if it were not tedious, he would like to state the result of the inquiry. [“Hear, hear!” “Go on!”] Hon. Members, seeing in a number of papers an account of a particular outrage, with date, and place, and circumstance in detail, were apt to give credence to it. It was not safe to do so always. He learned, when he was in Ireland last, that the principal agency by which accounts of outrages were collected was a central agency called *The Central News Agency*, who had got what they called agents all over the country, whose business it was to send up accounts of each particular which was likely to be of interest to the public. These agents were not persons always selected on account of their respectability. Their instructions consisted of a bundle of printed telegraph forms, which they were told to fill up when anything of interest occurred, and they were informed that for so much of their telegrams as was used they would be paid. It very soon came to the knowledge of these intelligent people that there was one class of information for which there was an insatiable appetite, and that was outrage. The telegraph forms accordingly were filled up rapidly, and the accounts of outrages were spread broadcast and believed. Through this agency, practically, the entire Press was supplied. It was thus apparent that the repetition of the same story in several papers afforded no additional authenticity. Each came from the same source. He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen noticed it; but just at the end of last year, and at the beginning of this, at a time when he was in Ireland, he noticed a remarkable falling off in the number of the reports of outrages, and he asked the reason. The answer which he got was this—“Oh, these gentlemen have just been paid their quarter's remuneration, and they are temporarily incapacitated from pursuing their business.” [*Laughter.*] One of the stories he took some interest in, because the *locus* happened to be in the county with which he was connected. It was reported that a young lady, whilst driving a pair of ponies, had been fired at from behind a hedge by a murderous and skulking Irishman who had lost all sense of chivalry, once so famous in his countrymen; that the lady alighted, and, with the greatest intrepedity imaginable, pursued the assassin, overtook him, and took his gun from him. He (Mr. Russell) inquired into the matter, and he learned that the man was a poacher, that he was behind a hedge, that he did fire—not at the lady, but at a hare; that the lady coming up, the man ran away, dropping his gun, but that he came humbly next day and begged that it should be returned to him. [*A laugh.*] That was the story of one of the outrages. Now, one other thing the Land League was said to do. It was said, judging, as he understood, from the Charges of the Judges, and especially from that of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald—Oh, if the crime was not so grave and so serious, there was a state of terrorism which operated to prevent the fulfilment of contractual obligations, which meant rent; which operated to prevent witnesses coming forward to prove crimes; which operated to prevent juries from being empannelled, and which prevented them, when empannelled, from giving verdicts of guilty. There was, undoubtedly, to some extent, a system of terrorism prevailing in Ireland. That was, unquestionably, the danger which was to be apprehended from setting in motion a great national force such as the Land League. There was the risk of its being diverted from a just public purpose; there was the danger of its being used against individuals and for private purposes of malice. That was the reason why priests and Bishops in Ireland, some of them at least, had not joined; not that they did not realize the difficulties of the people, not that they did not sympathize with them, not that they did not believe that the land system was in its present condition like a cancer eating into the very vitals of society, but because priests and Bishops at large knew the injury to the best interests of society which might result from setting in a state of excitement the passions of the people. But it was idle to speak of it as a sectional movement. Did anyone suppose that unless this was a movement with which the majority of the people of Ireland really agreed—and by the people of Ireland was meant, not the landlords, who were a small but powerful class of men, but the tenant farmers in the country districts, shopkeepers in towns —in other words, the people of Ireland meant the members of the lower and upper middle class, those who made up the great bulk of the population of the land—it could have lived? If the land movement had not had their hearty concurrence it would soon have been dead. What was the Land League—and of whom did it consist? It consisted, for the most part, of a number of gentlemen, of whom he had spoken—many of them young, many of them active, many of them of great ability and enthusiasm, but who, unless they had the sympathy and support of the great mass of the people, must be powerless. They were told that the majority of the people of Ireland were against the Land League, that they did not sympathize with its efforts, but that they were, forsooth, terrorized by the Land Leaguers! The truth of the matter was this—that this was a case, if of terrorism at all to any extent, of terrorism exercised by the people of Ireland, not by sections, but by the people of Ireland. Let him recall to the minds of hon. Gentlemen what was said when it was sought to pass measures of coercion upon 2,000,000 of our American Colonists. What did that great man and great statesman, Edmund Burke, say on that occasion? He said—

> "It looks to me to be narrow and pedantic to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to a great public contest. I do not know the way to draw up an indictment against a whole people."

But Her Majesty's Government had, in effect, attempted to carry out such a task; for the coercive legislation which was now proposed meant the drawing up of an indictment against the whole Irish people. He would ask further—How would such a movement as this be dealt with in England, supposing that the same unanimity of opinion existed upon the question of Land Law Reform in England as was shown to exist in Ireland, how would it be dealt with? Would it be dealt with by coercion? Had the Minister ever lived strong enough to face the indignation which such a proposal would meet with? He maintained that any Minister, however strong, who tried anything of the kind would be hurled from power by the English people. Ought not a Minister, in the face of such unanimity of opinion upon such a question affecting the very primary conditions of human life, to set himself the task of discovering the cause, and of removing it promptly and thoroughly? He now came to the last thing which was attributed to the Land League. It was said that they had impressed upon the people the repudiation of their contracts, and that they had deterred them from paying their rents. Language had been used on that subject which he unquestionably regretted. He thought, under all circumstances, it was dangerous to tell a people, many of whom might be able to pay, that there might be reasons why they ought not to pay what they had contracted to pay. It was dangerous, because it was liable to misconstruction, because of its being, as he was afraid it was in some cases at least in Ireland, taken advantage of by dishonest people to avoid the payment of their just debts. But let it be remembered by hon. Members that it stood on the confession of the Government—it stood on the confession of Parliament in their Land Act of 1870, and in the Disturbance Bill of last Session—that the Irish tenant, especially of the smaller class, did not stand in the position of an independent contracting party, that he did not stand upon an equality with his landlord, and that the weaker party required protection. Why did he urge this? For this reason—To suggest to the minds of hon. Members whether rent repudiation in Ireland, where it had happened—and it was not general—might not have some relation to the fact that the tenants believed that the contracts into which they had been obliged to enter—that the rents which they had been obliged to contract to pay—were not just. He did not say this was a reason which applied to all cases, nor was it, at the best, an excuse; but it was some explanation and some palliation. He (Mr. Russell) admitted, and admitted with regret, that many Irish landlords had been placed in positions of great difficulty in consequence of non-payment of rent. Many Irish landlords of to-day were suffering from the sins of cupidity and of unthrift of those who had gone before them. Recent events but increased their difficulties. But were landlords in England free, in these recent years, from trouble? Were

English tenants always found able and willing to discharge their rent obligations? Were there not cases in England in which the tenants had found difficulty in paying rents? Aye, and in which, as the hon. Member for Cork County (Mr. Shaw) had pointed out, the great landed classes fairly and generously recognized that a disaster had fallen upon agriculture, which was a disaster common to landlords and tenants. He did not mean to say that in Ireland there had been no remissions of rents, and large remissions of rents; but he did maintain that there were no voluntary movements towards that remission, and that, unfortunately for themselves, the landlords of Ireland left it to be inferred by the people that the remission was not the result of their own spontaneous generosity, but the result of agitation, by which it had been forced upon them. Now, it would be asked, What was the remedy for all this? He believed the state of things in Ireland to be grossly exaggerated. He believed the wide and varied existing powers of the Executive were ample to meet any existing difficulty. He believed all people in Ireland admitted that the country was in an abnormal unhealthy state, but that that state could not, and would not, continue. He believed it would greatly, nay, entirely, and soon disappear if the Minister who now held the reins of Office had seen it in his power to come down to the House with a large and generous policy of Land Reform. If he had framed a measure—and the right hon. Gentleman would forgive him for saying so—which, instead of bearing upon its face, as foreshadowed—because it was only imperfectly foreshadowed—in the Queen's Speech the marks of unhealthy compromise and the marks of having been framed to reconcile what might otherwise be a divided Cabinet—if he had introduced, instead of that, a measure with the impress of his own strong will and clear intellect —a measure adequate to the occasion, and calculated to thoroughly grapple with the Land Question, it would have been better for his own reputation—and his reputation was a national possession. Nay, more; he (Mr. Russell), speaking in all seriousness, would still say it were better for the Prime Minister's name as a statesman; better for the enduring settlement of the question; better for the permanent peace and ultimate happiness and contentment of Ireland, if he left the question untouched, rather than deal with it by introducing a measure narrow and inadequate, and framed in a spirit of compromise. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson), had made a brilliant Party speech, marked by an energy and ability worthy of the late Chief Justice Whiteside, and, he (Mr. Russell) might add, manifesting about an equal breadth of statesmanlike capacity! It was a great Party speech, but only a Party speech. "Put them down—stamp them out!" That was the policy of the great National Party in the State. The right hon. and learned Gentleman, further, had appeared in an entirely new character—that of an apologist holding a brief for the priests and Bishops of Ireland. The right hon. and learned Gentleman quoted a passage from the Pastoral of the right rev. Prelate the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. M'Cabe, in which he condemned some of the proceedings of the Land League; but the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not read that part of the Pastoral in which there was a strong desire expressed by that Prelate for the reform of the existing Land Laws in Ireland. He (Mr. Russell) had in his possession a letter, received by him that day, from that most rev. Prelate, in which he expressed his views of the probable effects of coercion, unaccompanied by thorough Land Reform. Had not the Prime Minister been told the real feeling which existed in Ireland? Was the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland aware of the blank astonishment which fell upon a large section of his supporters below the Gangway when the announcement from the Throne was made which shadowed some Amendment on the lines of the Land Act of 1870? Had anyone told the Prime Minister that the noble Lord the Member for the County of Down (Viscount Castlereagh) had, like many other prominent Conservatives in Ulster, made a speech far in advance of anything that had been gathered from the Speech from the Throne? Surely on this question, which he (Mr. Russell) affirmed was "the Question" in Ireland, the Liberal Leader, whose advent to power the Irish vote had done something to help, would not be found below the low-water mark of Irish Conservative opinion. He must now proceed to read the letter he had referred to. It was dated yesterday, and said—

> "Such measures will do incalcuable mischief. I have reason to believe that the tenant farmers are ready and willing to meet the party who will deal with the question fairly on friendly terms; but if this opportunity be lost and they and the people are handed over to the extreme section of the Land Leaguers by a half-hearted attempt at legislation the results will be very disastrous. Better a thousand times for Mr. Gladstone's Government not to touch the question at all than to trifle with it. The cancer which threatens the life of society had better be left alone if the last fibre be not cut out. I take the liberty of writing this because I have incurred odium in this matter. I asked the people of Ireland to set their faces against the speakers of extreme views, because I had faith in Mr. Gladstone's determination to introduce a thorough reform of the Land Laws. If that belief should be a delusion, however I and others may regret the popular excesses arising therefrom, I fear we must regret their occurrence in silence."

He must ask the House to beware of this—that by lending their sanction to a coercive policy, which was necessarily a repressive policy, and which might take the form of putting down open and above-board healthy agitation, they would inevitably run the risk of driving the people into the dark and devious channels of secret action. All coercive policy in history had shown the same thing. He was reading, a short time ago, an account of the history and results of a former policy of coercion in Ireland. He had read with pain and dismay how the short-sightedness of Governments had, by their repressive policy, changed societies, in their nature open and Constitutional—though at times attended with results which the law could not recognize — into secret combinations, dangerous and illegal. It had been so before 1798, and it had, he feared, been so since. He hoped the error would not be repeated. The Government must be slow to do anything which even seemed to interfere with the great right of public meeting, which in every free country ought to be regarded as a great Constitutional right—a healthy safety-valve—with which it was most dangerous to tamper. He had noticed several meetings stopped without, so far as appeared, any sufficient ground; but he (Mr. Russell) would be slow to express an opinion without fuller information. He had read, too, accounts of proceedings against individuals which seemed extremely high-handed. He (Mr. Russell) desired fairly to recognize the difficulties of the Executive. But he had read with astonishment some of the things which had appeared in the newspapers. There might be justifications of them forthcoming. He had read accounts which had surprised him. He had read an account of a man — a householder — in Tralee, who was taken from his residence to a station and sent to gaol; refused bail, brought before a magistrate and again refused bail; and, as the magistrate himself said, this was done on the authority of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the sole offence charged being the holding of a Land League Court. There should be some explanation of this It was a proceeding which must properly be characterized as extremely high-handed. He would like hon. Members to mark by what a small thread the right of public meeting in Ireland hung. It was most extraordinary, but true, that when a person is found to swear that an impending meeting is likely to create a disturbance of the peace, that the magistrates should promptly act upon such an affidavit, and be acting legally in so doing, thus putting an end effectually to the right of public meeting! Let the House recollect how much depended upon that right. In England public meetings could not be prohibited except for the gravest cause; but in Ireland magistrates were found to prohibit such meetings on affidavits signed by mere understrappers, and for which there often was no adequate foundation. Let them recollect what that implied, when the reins of the Administration of the country were held by a single class—that of the landlords and agents. The English people would never allow, for one moment, such things to be done in their own country. If the state of Ireland was a pain and humiliation to Irishmen, was it not also humiliating to Englishmen? The Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) had, with proper spirit, referred to and resented the Resolution of the Representative House at Washington, recommending England to look after the condition of Ireland, and to reform her Land Laws. Had it struck the right hon. Gentleman that this was more than the voluntary expression of the opinion of an independent State? For was it not the opinion of a State largely re-inforced by men whom English legislation and misgovernment had driven from the shores of Ireland with bitterness in their hearts? Was it, could it be, the perverseness of the people of Ireland that, while they clung to memories of Ireland with passionate affection, they carried across the Atlantic often but little else than contempt and hate for this country? Let statesmen ponder on these things. He (Mr. Russell) had, some time ago, been in conversation with a man who, in 1866, had suffered punishment for having joined the Fenian movement. He asked him if his motive were love of country and passionate recollection of it? He had come from America. His answer was that, until 1866, he had never been in Ireland since he was five years of age. But, he said, his earliest memory of Ireland had never left him. His first recollection was seeing men who were, as he afterwards learned, sheriff's officers, battering down with crowbars the humble house in which his earliest days were passed. He recollected being driven away in a cart across a river—the Shannon—to the nearest convenient town, to be deported from his native country—with his mother's tears before his eyes, and the bitter curses of his father ringing in his ears. That father afterwards told him, far away from Ireland, that his expatriation was due to the injustice of the law; and thenceforth he resolved, if the opportunity offered, wildly, blindly, unreasoningly it might be, but still he resolved, to strike a blow for his country, as he believed, and against her enemy. He (Mr. Russell) feared this case was but typical of too many. Was not this history repeating itself in another form? Or was it a misleading tradition that attributed to the Second George the words—"Cursed be the laws which deprive me of such subjects;" when the chivalry of England fell back before the attack of Irish troops in foreign service? Would that statesmen—even at this day—would take those words to heart, and win to the side of order the feelings of a people now largely hostile. He believed a great opportunity was now offered. Was it going to be lost? He said, with pain, he could derive but poor hope from the policy dimly outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and in the words of the Prime Minister. He would rejoice, sincerely rejoice, if he should prove to be wrong in this view. But, in all the doubt and gloom of the hour, he (Mr. Russell) did seem to see a bright gleam of hope rising, but rising beyond a sea of trouble, tumult, injustice, suffering, and bloodshed, if the coercive policy were to be carried out—hope, springing not from the promises and professions of statesmen, but from the fact that the Irish people were that day welded together as they had never been welded together before, in spite of base appeals to weaken and divide them—a hope which was strengthened and became strong by the belief that, on the question of the land of Ireland, the great heart of England was stirred, and that the people of England were resolved to support a great Minister in any measure, however great, which should bring to the settlement of that question a character of completeness, of thoroughness, and of justice.

The O'DONOGHUE rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

The O'DONOGHUE said, that although the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell) had stated that he was neither a Home Ruler nor a Land Leaguer, they all felt that both inside and outside the House he had rendered great service to the cause of the tenant farmers in Ireland, and he might add that in Ireland there was a general expectation—which it was to be hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would not disappoint—that his name would yet be intimately associated with the triumphant settlement of the Land Question. He (the O'Donoghue) was not surprised at the character of the Speech from the Throne. Many years' experience in that House made it impossible for him to be sanguine enough to imagine that Her Majesty's Government could so divest themselves of their past traditions, leanings, and objects as suddenly to rise to the patriotic excellence required to deal justly with the great question of the Irish land. During the Recess he had attended many meetings held in Kerry under the auspices of the National Land League, and at each of them he was careful to warn his countrymen against indulging in the delusion that justice was immediately about to be done. He pointed out that Her Majesty's Ministers were almost as much landlord-ridden as was Ireland; and he expressed his grave apprehension that, no matter what superficial touches the land system might receive, the Government of the right hon. Gentleman would leave its substance still the same, and that, consequently, the landlords would be able to continue rack-renting and exterminating the people. It was not the Government who were wholly or even chiefly responsible for the policy indicated in the Speech from the Throne. If Ministers were permitted to do as they pleased, it was only natural they should take the line in accord with their own peculiar feelings and interests. The shame and discredit of all this trimming and delusive policy must be laid at the doors of the Liberal Party in England and Scotland. They were accountable for this demand of justice of which Ireland complained. There was a time when the Liberal Party might have pleaded expediency, and urged that they could only exist by virtue of an alliance with Whiggery; but that time had passed. They were now masters of the situation, and yet they did nothing, but left the policy of the Party to be directed by men who were, at the best, only nominal Liberals. He should be sorry to say anything irritating to those with whom he had always voted in favour of an extension of the political power of the people of England and Scotland; but his criticism would be halting, partial, and cowardly if he refrained from stating that the Liberal Party of Great Britain, at least in that House—and it mattered little what they did out of it—lacked the courage to give effect to its principles either by word or action. Everything seemed to yield to the importance of keeping My Lord this or My Lord that in the Cabinet, instead of simply adhering to principle, and showing no weakness to those who were obstacles to progress or in any way a clog to its wheels. The true Liberal Party in the House was to be found on the Benches occupied by the Irish Members, and the sign of the quality of their politics was the fidelity and fearlessness with which they endeavoured to carry out the wishes of those who sent them to Parliament. If they were less truly representative and faithful they would be as agreeable to the Liberal Party as were the Irish Members when they represented only a small class of the Irish people. It was this genuine character of the Irish representation that brought it into violent antagonism with a section of the House. He said a section advisedly, for he could not think that the Liberals of Great Britain—although their Liberalism was in abeyance—did not in their hearts sympathize with the aspirations of the Irish people after freedom. The position of the Irish Members was unfortunate and anomalous. They were the Representatives of a nation, but were unable to give effect to its wishes. Hitherto they had only been able to try and get a hearing for their case. If there was any shadow of reality in the representations about the security of Irish rights under the Union, then England was bound to afford the utmost latitude for discussion. Neither in the principles nor the general action of the Land League was there anything hostile to the interests or offensive to the honour of England. Ireland was not unmindful of the teaching of history, nor could she fail to recognize the good qualities of Englishmen. Side by side Irishmen had stood with her in many a field, ever as eager to be in the front, and yet they were denied the exercise of any power. There was something shocking in the thought that the Representatives of the democracy of England should commit themselves to support a policy by which this great social question should be settled amid the roar of gunpowder, the clash of sabres, and the groans of their fellow-men. But that was the policy which had been indicated as plainly as decency would permit in the Speech from the Throne. Such a policy, carried out with the consent of that House, against the wishes of the Irish people, on behalf of the selfish oligarchy from whom they had helped the English people to wrest their liberties, would be unspeakably iniquitous. The Speech from the Throne informed the Irish people of what they were to be deprived. They were, in the first place, to be deprived of their Constitutional liberties, and then they were to be put off with a Land Bill which the Government had made up their minds they must be satisfied with, whether they liked it or not. That that result would follow was taken as a matter of course, because due provision was promised to be made for repressing the expression of all public feeling. The position of Ireland would be this—no man would be able to say what he thought, or do what he liked, without rendering himself liable to be seized and carried off, most probably in the dark hours of the night, by the emissaries of the Government, and locked up for an indefinite period. Surely that was not the best method of eliciting public opinion on any subject. They were, in fact, to be treated by this Liberal Government in the old-fashioned manner—namely, like children who must take what it suited certain persons to administer to them. The events of the last few days had created, if not a panic in Ireland, at least a widespread fear that the Government had entered upon a course of lawlessness at the instigation of the landlords, and that they were determined to make use of the public force of the country to obtain a momentary victory over the people. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, on Friday evening, in a moment of enthusiasm, seemed disposed to give way to some delusions. He (the O'Donoghue) should be sorry to see the right hon. Gentleman indulging in any weakness of that kind; and it would be well if he were at once acquainted with the fact that the Government, as a whole, did not possess the confidence of the people of Ireland, and certain Members, to use a homely phrase, possessed it only partially. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was little more than the organ or mouthpiece of the Government; and they could not forget the memorable occasion last Session when he elicited their cheers by denouncing the House of Lords, and then came down afterwards and "bolted" his words, at whose bidding it was unnecessary to inquire. They had heard a great deal about "Boycotting;" but had anyone taken the trouble to inquire what that meant? It might be, and commonly was, the exclusion of an individual who had rendered himself obnoxious in his social or business relations with his neighbours. Now, if he disliked a man, he could not be compelled to walk or talk with him, or deal with him, or take his money in exchange for his labour. What was now called "Boycotting" was a mode of showing dislike and disapproval common to all times, places, and sections of society; and it was, moreover, a legitimate manifestation of feeling, beyond the control of the law to regulate. The only remarkable thing about "Boycotting" was, that Ireland was the only part of the civilized world where it had not been extensively practised before; and the people of Ireland had been driven, by the neglect of Parliament, to employ some weapon of this kind. The fact that year after year Bills which would have satisfactorily settled the Land Question had been introduced into that House, and had received the support of the Irish Members, but had been thrown out, had shown the Irish people that it was hopeless for them to appeal to Parliament for redress. Then he came to the outrages which were such a comfort and consolation to those who were in search of something which would give Parliament a pretext for destroying the Constitutional liberties of the Irish people. By far the greater number of the so-called outrages consisted of threatening letters—the authorship of which must remain a matter for speculation—or of firing guns in the air near houses. It was, unfortunately, true that deplorable murders, such as those of Lord Mountmorres and of Mr. Boyd, had been committed. But what had happened on the commission of these crimes? The suspected persons were arrested, and kept in prison as long as it was thought necessary. The perpetrators of these bloody deeds were in the possession of all the deterrent knowledge possible, and they knew what awaited them if either taken red-handed in the act or suspected. What more could have been done, even suppose the Habeas Corpus Act, or any other of their Constitutional rights, had been abrogated? The ordinary law enabled a person to be arrested and kept in prison when a necessity could be shown for so doing. What more was required or ought to be tolerated? But when the Constitution was suspended, a man might be imprisoned without any reason at all, while the police might almost commit murder with impunity, and millions of persons would be put in terror for the safety of their persons and their homes. He submitted as a conclusion which would gain the acceptance of every thinking man that the substitution of despotism for liberty had no special efficacy for the prevention of crime. If it had, liberty itself would be a crime, and despotism the only admissible form of government. If they passed these Coercion Bills, every magistrate and policeman would be able to commit any act short of downright murder, because the Government would be obliged to give a latitude and credence, and would not be able to punish the villainy of its subordinate officers. The whole nation would be smitten, while the few whose prerogative had encroached upon the rights of the people would go about crowing and provoking deeds to which the people could never be goaded under the protection of freedom. He lived in Kerry, which was a proclaimed district. As to the outrages reported against the Irish people in the county of Kerry, he might say he knew of no outrages which, when compared with the measures proposed by the Government, did not deserve the name of "trumpery." He had traversed the county from end to end, by day and night, and had never heard anything which would ever give colour to the stories which were in circulation, nor anything which could justify this interference with the Constitutional rights of the people. One Sunday, when he was proceeding, in company with some hundreds of people, to attend a Land League meeting in the neighbourhood of Killarney, he encountered a car filled by a Protestant, with his family, who had rendered himself odious and unpopular by taking a farm from which the previous tenant had been evicted. Although it was well known who he was, not the slightest violence was offered to him, and only kindly expressions of regret that he had put himself outside of the pale of the people were uttered, although not a single policeman was present. This showed that the Irish people were not addicted to violence or to murder. The people of Ireland, however, were grieved and indignant that the power of this great Empire was to be brought to bear upon them for the purpose of enabling the landlords to continue their unjust oppression of them. He believed that the Land Question would have to be settled, not by piecemeal legislation, but by a full and immediate measure of justice. The policy of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had banded all his countrymen together, and every day increased their confidence in the wisdom and thoroughness of his leadership. While avoiding bravado, they intended to continue in the course they had marked out for themselves; they would rely upon the justice of their cause, and would look with confidence towards their natural allies, the people of England and Scotland, to secure for them the firm possession of the soil of their country.

MR. BRADLAUGH said, he could well conceive that the Government might be in possession of facts not within the knowledge of individual Members which might have prompted the suggestion, which seemed to him like coercion, in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. However that might be, he felt that the position of Radical Members like himself was an extremely difficult one in the present juncture. They did not wish to embarrass the Government on the one hand by voting against them, as they were aware that the worst measure from the Liberal Party would be better by far than any which could be hoped for from the opposite Party; but, as a Radical, he was bound to remember the fact that the matters referring to Ireland had not been dealt with in a manner similar to those of England and Scotland. As a Radical, he believed that, so far as England was concerned, the worst measure likely to be proposed by the present Ministry would be better than the best proposal likely to come from Gentlemen occupying the opposite Benches. He felt difficulty in justifying to the House the vote he was about to give; he had no difficulty in justifying it to himself. The action of the Government might arise from the fact that they were in possession of information which was not at present before individual Members; but, as a Radical Member, with only the facts stated to the House to guide him, he would be obliged to vote in favour of the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), and he would have to repeat that vote, if that which was now shadowed forth should be the only proposition of law. He wished especially to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), and hoped that right hon. Gentleman would pardon him (Mr. Bradlaugh) when he said that there was a grievous disappointment felt by many Radicals in this country, because, after a speech in which he led them to hope that some wide measure of

Land Law Reform would come, they had instead one of punishment, of repression, and coercion. The Government should have given an opportunity for redress, prevention, and amelioration. He did not mean to say that the right hon. Gentleman pledged the Government of which he was a prominent Member; but the disappointment was great that there was now no promise of that. There was now only the smallest promise of possible Land Law Reform, and that only after the alleged protection of life and property, but which was, in reality, the suspension of Constitutioual rights of the people without knowing when or where it would end. In the hints thrown out by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in his speech, which were so heartily cheered by the sturdy Radicals around him, it was expected there might be employment on the waste land in Ireland which would give food and drive away the misery which caused the discontent in the country. The power to cultivate waste land would give some promise and hope —not of generosity from our side—but of justice. It was only now, however, proposed to smite. If both were to go together it would be hard enough. He would not have been surprised if an Act of repression had come from the other side of the House, because that was what hon. Members were used to; but the Party on his side of the House were not supposed to infringe their liberties. The whole traditions of the present Ministry, in fact, consisted in their supposed hostility to any encroachment on popular liberties, and the Radicals feared that if such a course was taken in regard to Ireland it would not be surprising if, on a future occasion, the Constitutional liberties of the people of England would also be suspended. They felt, therefore, that it was their duty to protest that we had no right to coerce the Irish people, until we had tried to remove every wrong from which they suffered. Coercion would cause secret agitation, and secret agitation under those circumstances would be justified. ["Oh, oh!"] Yes; secret agitation would then be justified. They had no right to stifle the people's voice. One who had sat as Chief Justice said, in defending traversers, that if you took away from the people the right of Constitutional agitation, you left to them only one right—that of secret conspiracy. He appealed to the Government to pass their remedial legislation first, to frame it in a generous spirit, and not to allow themselves to be influenced by whispers from "another place," which professed to be strong, but was in reality weak, to swerve from their duty. The proposal for coercive legislation was justified by reference to "unlawful meetings" which had been elaborately defined by the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University. Since the definition of the Judges in the King *v.* Hunt, almost any large assembly might be declared unlawful on the oath of some timorous or hostile person. All the Land League meetings had been peaceable and without disorder. A forbidden meeting had not been held, whereas in this country the contrary had resulted. He remembered two meetings prohibited by Government—one by a Government the Members of which were now on the opposite side of the House, and one by a Government the Members of which were now on the Ministerial side of the House —and not one word was said about suspending the Constitution. It was the people's right—aye, their duty—not to remain silent when labouring under a sense of wrong. As regarded Ireland, only read of their misery, their homes unfurnished, their rags, and diseases arising from lack of food. These were not things made by the Land League, but the things that made the Land League. It was, in fact, one of the causes of misery to Ireland that for so long a period her people had not self-reliance enough to agitate for the remedy of their wrongs. The landlords had expected the Government to protect them, whereas they should have such self-reliance which would result from actions of justice and generosity towards their tenants. The people also lacked self-reliance, but only in their own land, because of the manner in which the landlords clutched at the result of their labours. He had a direct mandate from his constituents to vote against coercion, which mandate the people of England, as far as he had had an opportunity of meeting them, thoroughly endorsed. What answer would Birmingham give to the prohibition of such meetings in Ireland, or Sheffield, Hackney, or the densely populated valleys of Lancashire?

They would all say that justice should be done to Ireland before remedying the law, and before they should be prevented from agitating for the redress of their grievances. The need for agitation was not their crime, it was their misfortune. They should be fed first and struck afterwards; but not in their hunger, when they could not be so philosophical and calm as when they were well fed. He would only make one more appeal to the Government, and it was a warning not to mistake the feeling of the people of England upon this subject. He had no right to speak except for the rough and poor; but he had some right to speak for them. They made the wealth of this country. Their influence brought the present Government into Office. There were men in Office whom they loved because of the traditions with which they had identified themselves. He asked those men not to allow whispers from "another place," which seemed strong, but which was, in reality, very weak, to frighten them from doing their duty. Let them do justice to Ireland first by introducing a wide Land Reform Bill; let them act with generosity and thoroughness, and if they did not then break up the agitation they could appeal to coercive law.

MR. FITZPATRICK remarked, that too little had been said in that discussion on behalf of the law-abiding classes of the poorer sort who inhabited Ireland, who had stuck loyally by the Crown and by their contracts in the midst of the terrorism to which they had been exposed during the last few months. He therefore appealed to the House to protect the small farmer and the shopkeeper, whether Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Presbyterian, who had not joined the Land League. The hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) asked them by his Amendment to declare that peace and tranquillity could not be promoted by suspending any of the Constitutional liberties of the people of Ireland. Surely the hon. Member forgot that it was he himself who had suspended liberty. [*Dissent.*] Could any man now speak above a whisper in Ireland without the leave of the Land League? The hon. Member for Cork City had publicly avowed that Irishmen would not be satisfied until they had destroyed the last link which bound Ireland to England; and he had advised the tenants to treat every man like a leper and a pariah if he did not agree with them. Surely the violent organization which the hon. Member and his associates created had curtailed all liberty. The hon. Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Shaw) declared that everybody exaggerated the terrorism established by the Land League, and had described that movement as a great upheaval of the general feeling of dissatisfaction, misery, and trouble after a famine, and had suggested that the landlords were apparently to blame for that famine. He denied both of those assertions. The banks, and especially the bank with which the hon. Gentleman was connected, had given unlimited credit to the farmers for years past, and their interest in their farms had been pledged to the banks; 22,000 processes had been instituted by the Munster banks in 1880 against the farmers; but they could not shoot the banks, and the result was that they paid them, but did not pay the landlords. There were hundreds and thousands of Irishmen who did not believe in the Land League, and who would have nothing to do with it. These could only be coerced into it by the terrorism which had and still was being exercised. The League had taken possession of the people by working on their greed for land, and also on their hatred of England. He could testify to the extreme agony of men who, with tears in their eyes, had asked whether they were to be compelled to bow down to an Association which was believed to be illegal. He would read to the House a short letter from a farmer paying £100 a-year. [*Cries of* "Name, Name!"] In the present state of Ireland it would be as much as that man's life was worth to name him; but he was perfectly willing to give his name to any hon. Gentleman sitting on the other—the Ministerial—side. The man had been asked by his landlord to pay his rent. The letter, dated December 5, 1880, was as follows:—

"Sir,—In reply to your letter of yesterday, I can assure your Honour I feel myself awkwardly positioned. I had a threatening notice posted on my door last Wednesday morning if I paid more than Griffith's valuation it would cost me my life; but for this difficulty I would have my rent paid at once, and I hope it will please your Honour to give me time until you arrange with the other tenants. I always paid my rent, but now life is sweet. It is easier for me to suffer a few pounds costs, if I am forced to it, than have my life taken in this disturbed locality. Hoping it will please your Honour to take my case into further consideration, for which I shall feel obliged."

Here was another letter illustrating the state of things which prevailed—

> "Hon. Sir,—First I must tell you a tenant named ——, who holds a portion of ground from me at £20 a-year—my chief support—tells me to settle with the Land League. My servant boy is sent away from me, my horse won't be shod, nor would a tenant who holds lands from my brother bring me a message. Under such circumstances, hon. Sir, I hope you will put me in some place or situation out of this unfortunate country place. My name or what I say to you I must ask you not to make public while I am here; but when I am away from this you can do as you wish."

He would quote one more instance. A correspondent wrote to him thus—

> "On November 20 I attended in Cork to receive rents from a property near Mill Street. There are 34 tenants, of whom one had paid his May rent in the summer. Of the remaining 33 about 15 or 20 came in. Most of them produced threatening letters, and said they were willing and able to pay as the year was so good, but were afraid to so. I gave them to December 20 to think it over. On November 23 I received one tenant's rent in full by post. On November 25 his ricks were burnt, and he has been, I hear, under police protection since. On December 21 about half-a-dozen paid their rents."

Other and numerous instances could be brought forward, and yet they were told that there was no terrorism. Again, the small shopkeepers were in many cases nearly bankrupt owing to the intimidation they were subjected to because they would not join the League. In one case a shopkeeper refused to join, and soon afterwards two women came into his shop and bought dresses. When they left the shop they were met by agents of the League, who took the dresses away from them, threw them in the mud, and threatened to do the same to any other article they might purchase at the same shop; yet, there was no terrorism! The Government had allowed this agitation to go on too long, and now many of the landlords who gave work to the labourers were obliged to leave. Claims to compensation for injuries sustained would come in rapidly, and the whole social system of the country was being overturned. The farmers who by timidity or by collusion helped that agitation would be the first to suffer. He implored the House to unite together in the matter, irrespective of Party. Let them vindicate at once the majesty of the law with rapidity and vigour. Let them protect the loyal and the weak against the strong and the rebellious.

Captain O'SHEA said, he occupied a peculiar position. He and those who thought with him lay under a very great imputation, because they were charged with moderation. The fact was that they had had hopes that the Government were willing, able, and determined to pass a great measure of Land Reform. These were the hopes he endeavoured to inspire at a meeting held in County Clare only three months ago, at which a vote of thanks to Members of the Government was passed. That was but a brief while ago, yet it seemed a cycle in the history of Ireland. He was not going to extenuate the state of Ireland. He considered that Ireland was in a most dangerous state of revolution. They had conjured up within the last few days the names of great statesmen of other days, such as Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington, who wrote to the Queen that it was absolutely necessary to grant Catholic Emancipation. He said Ireland would otherwise be driven into a state of rebellion; that the people would refuse to pay rent or taxes, and the whole power of the Empire would not put it down. Ireland was, broadly speaking, in the position into which those great statesmen prevented her drifting. But there was still hope. A power had greatly increased since then. There was now an alliance which was worth buying with a great price—that was the alliance of the Irish people. Coercion was a folly of 1881, with a vile pedigree of 700 years. When Englishmen had asked for great reforms the ordinary way of life had not been obstructed. Take, for instance, the agitation for Reform. There was a great deal of intimidation then, and many excesses took place; but coercion was not attempted. Yet the Judges were insulted; at a meeting at Manchester one of the speakers hoped that the men of Bristol would hang the Recorder, Sir Charles Weatherall, higher than Haman. At Manchester, a more important occurrence took place. At a great meeting threats were freely made that the people would refuse the taxes, and it was asked —What auctioneer would dare sell if the Government distrained for non-payment; what man would dare buy? Had the Land League taught anything new? But that meeting passed a vote of thanks to Lord John Russell, who actually returned a sympathetic answer. Imagine, if they could, any British statesman returning a sympathetic answer to an Irish meeting of similar character. He was happy to say there had been a great improvement in the feeling amongst Englishmen towards Ireland. This was specially marked in the case of English Members who had a large Irish element in their constituencies. Before they enforced coercion in Ireland they ought to exhaust every form of justice and generosity. Notwithstanding the improvement of temper, had England been generous to Ireland? No; it had been far from it. Had her artists and historians respected the sensitive feelings of the Irish Celt? Colonel Gordon had pointed out the folly of drawing the typical Irishman as a baboon without its native grace. Mr. Froude, forgetting the great men whom Ireland had given to the Continent and to the world, had recently declared that the Irish were a danger and a torment to every country to which they emigrated. As an historian he might have remembered that, during the present century, there had been at least three Marshals of Irish blood whose names stood out amongst great men. On one of them Napoleon conferred the proud epithet of the Organizer of Victory; another restored for a season glory and prosperity to Spain; a third has been President of the French Republic. To-day the descendant of Irish exiles is Prime Minister of Austria; another is Captain General of Madrid. But there was not a single Irishman on the Treasury Bench. Whigs and Radicals, Scotchmen and Opportunist Republicans, were there; but not an Irishman. He had heard with great regret the Chief Secretary for Ireland state that his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had by speeches knowingly incited people to commit outrages. Now, he would not call, even in the conventional language of the House, the hon. Member for the City of Cork his hon. Friend if he did not know that he was utterly incapable of conduct of that kind. The Chief Secretary had certainly not gone so far as to accuse him of inciting to his murder. He would have had a respectable precedent. In 1843 Sir Robert Peel, in the House of Commons, accused Mr. Cobden of such a crime. That was an old arm of polemics; it had been used against the Prime Minister often, against the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster oftener still. Although he (Captain O'Shea) was not a Land Leaguer, and was suffering inconvenience, as a landlord, owing to its action, and although he regretted that those who had the ear of the Irish tenant should be given the advice that a fair rent was a rent fixed by himself, he must confess, as an unprejudiced person, it was the Land League which had brought the Land Question, one of the most dangerous to the Empire, nearer settlement. What that settlement was to be of course they could not tell; they were oscillating between hope and fear; but he hoped the Prime Minister would rise equal to the occasion; and if he was counting the cost of doing justice to all, let him, on the other hand, count the saving in the establishment necessary for coercion—more, the saving in blood. A great measure, a worthy rival of the mightiest feats of statesmanship, would, without coercion, restore law and order in Ireland; law founded upon justice, order upon the contentment of a hopeful people.

MR. LITTON said, he was unwilling to trespass on the time of the House; but he felt he would be abandoning his duty if he failed to express his opinion upon the important issues raised in the debate—a debate which placed the Ulster Members, of whom he was one, in a position of embarrassment. That embarrassment was caused by the action of the Government. The Prime Minister had expressed a hope the other evening that hon. Members would disregard any personal motive, be it what it might, as well as any Party motive. He (Mr. Litton) desired to give to that appeal a loyal response; but when he recollected that they were now asked to apply coercion to their fellow-countrymen, and when they recollected, further, that Her Majesty's Gracious Speech merely recommended an extension of the Land Act of 1870, he, for one, must give expression to the widespread and bitter disappointment which had been diffused throughout the whole of Ulster. Now, what was the essential principle of the Land Act? He could not give a better exposition than that which had been delivered by a noble Lord, an Irishman, high in Office, though not in the Ministry, and one who, he rather thought, had inspired in some degree the lines of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. He alluded to Lord Dufferin, who said—

> "The leading principle of the Land Act of 1870 was very clearly stated by several Members of the present Government. It accorded to the tenant compensation for his improvements, as well as further compensation in certain cases for capricious eviction."

But what was the recognized principle of the proposed remedy which had acquired an enormous and wonderful consensus of opinion in its favour as a remedy for the Irish Land Question? It was fixity of tenure, qualified if they pleased; but fixity of tenure, nevertheless. There must also be fair rents, and a free power of sale. Nothing short of that would satisfy the people of Ireland —at all events, in Ulster—or the Liberal Members of that House. He said the Ulster Members had been embarrassed. Let him explain. He, with others, had had hard work since Parliament was prorogued last autumn. They had no sympathy with the Land League or the Home Rule Party. They, in going through the Northern Counties of Ireland, had not spared themselves, and had, in meeting after meeting, pressed upon the people to keep the law; to look to that House as the object of their hope; that they had a case grounded in honesty, and at the head of Her Majesty's Government a statesman upon whom they could rely. By their exertions in that way they had kept the North of Ireland free from the excess of the West and South. ["No, no!"] Hon. Members on the other side of the House could hardly question the accuracy of that statement. There was none of that system of "Boycotting" in Ulster, which rendered the people afraid to express their feelings or exercise an opinion of their own. He did not say whether that was due to the action of himself and hon. Friends who came from that part of the country; but certainly they had impressed upon the people the duty, in the first instance, of obeying the law; secondly, of keeping within the limits of reasonable agitation; and, thirdly, of looking to the present Government for relief. They had also pointed out the progress of public opinion by which the principles which he had mentioned had come within the range of practical politics. Conservatives and Orangemen had given in their adhesion to the principles of the "three F's." At a great meeting at Killylea—a meeting exclusively of Orangemen—resolutions were passed adopting the principles of the "three F's." Lords Lifford, Emly, Powerscourt, Monteagle, Monck, and others had supported it; and now, after all their exertion, they found the ground cut from under them, and they were made almost ridiculous in the eyes of their constituents. The Land Act of 1870 had gone on the lines of compensation. But that would not suffice for the present emergency. They did not want compensation, but fixity in their holdings. No measure would be satisfactory which did not give a proprietary right in his holding to the tenant. So long as the man paid a fair rent he ought not to be evicted—so long as he paid that rent and observed fair conditions as to not wasting his land, and did not sub-divide his holding. There was no disposition in the North to interfere with landlords or landlordism. They were now led to expect that the Government Bill would go on the lines of the Act of 1870. Such a measure, he thought, would be inadequate, and could not receive his support, or, he thought, that of Liberal Members generally. His right hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) had claimed a monopoly of independence and courage, and had called attention to his position in that House. It was true, he represented a constituency which never changed, which had stereotyped its opinion some 50 years ago, and was incapable of advance in political reform. His right hon. and learned Friend was himself an example of fixity of tenure, for he held his seat without danger of change. He (Mr. Litton), on the other hand, represented a constituency which had changed its opinion at the last Election, and that change was due to a desire to settle the Land Question on just and equitable principles. But though his constituency might change its opinions—he had no fear of their changing, notwithstanding that certain hon. Members opposite had been poaching on his preserves, and endeavouring to take away from him the allegiance of his constituents—yet he was not afraid, in the face of change, to express his opinion as freely as his right hon. and learned Friend. He condemned the Land League and the way in which its principles were worked out, notwithstanding the risk of exciting the displeasure of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). But while he condemned the Land League, he could not shut his eyes to the injustice and the suffering under which the tenants had lived many years in Ireland under the present system of Land Law; nor could he shut his eyes to the temptations to which they had been subjected—temptations which they would be more than human or less than human to resist. While condemning Land League action; while abhorring the system of terrorism which undoubtedly prevailed in the West and South of Ireland, he could not but make allowance for what the people had suffered, and "love the sinner while he hated the sin." Having regard to the circumstances of the country, he could not vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City; but, at the same time, he could not support the Government in the division which was about to take place on that Amendment; and he must only express a hope that in the progress of the debate they might have some further indication of the intentions of the Government. The result of the announcement of the Government proposals was well indicated by a telegram which he had received from Mr. Dickson, of Dungannon, a gentleman well known to many Members of that House, and a gentleman of unswerving Liberal principles. The telegram was as follows:—

> "Government proposals most disappointing to Ulster Liberals, and universally condemned; agitation over Ulster will now be intensified, and Government may make permanent their coercive legislation."

If that was a true representation of the state of facts, and if the House was asked to look forward to permanent coercion for Ireland, there was not a Member of that House who would listen to it for a moment. In conclusion, he earnestly hoped that Her Majesty's Government, and more especially the Prime Minister, to whom they had looked up for the last four months, would indicate more fully the course intended to be taken in regard to Land Reform in Ireland, and so bind together the two countries as a United Kingdom, by the ties of amity, friendship, and love.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, they had heard from time to time certain statements put forward to show that the wealth of Ireland had increased; but it might as well be asserted that because a man had grown fat he had grown strong. It might as well be maintained that because a country had grown comparatively rich in the item of money, that that country had grown relatively more prosperous. The possession of money in an agricultural community where industry languished, because there was insecurity of tenure for farming operations, was a species of fatty degeneration of the heart of that community. It denoted no strength whatever. What was the cause of the condition of Ireland? The hon. Member for the City of Cork had said it was a question of £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 a-year. He believed it was quite a question of £3,000,000 per annum; and the question was, further, who was to forego that £3,000,000? He believed that the rents of the land in Ireland had been increased £3,000,000 since the Valuation Act of 1852. If the only additional burden the people of Ireland had to bear was this increase of rent, he believed there would have been no such disturbance as there was now in that country. If the increased rent were their only additional burden, he did not believe that the people would have been worse off in the year 1880 than in 1852, but a great deal better off. But from 1852 to 1877 the revenue raised from Ireland by Imperial taxation was increased from £4,000,000 to £7,000,000—he was speaking in round numbers, but still within the figures. This amount of money was taken, on the one hand, by the landlord, and on the other by the Government; and, as a result, the general community was yearly impoverished to a proportionate extent. It had been stated in the course of the debate on the Address that England bore many burdens which Ireland did not, and he believed that that was a fact. Nevertheless, the Irish were taxed on the whole, in proportion to their income, at the rate of 5*s.* in the pound on all the visible income as shown in the various Income Tax Schedules and property tax levies, whilst the gross Imperial taxation of Great Britain was only 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound on like Schedules. This ought to be remembered, when dealing with the problem of the land, as it was a question which the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government would not be able to settle equitably without coming to the House for a handsome sum to be granted, in order to set in motion the "Bright Clauses" of the Land Act of 1870. The taxation of the people of England and Scotland, taken together, only amounted to 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound. That disparity of taxation was, to his mind, a practical portion of the Irish problem which must never be lost sight of. Ireland required exceptional legislation now, because, and inasmuch as, the people were impoverished by the extraordinary amount of Imperial taxation. Both sides of the House were to blame in that matter. He sincerely hoped the Prime Minister would not introduce any Land Bill that was not flanked by the grant or the advance of a large sum of money to make it effective in the manner shadowed forth, and he regretted to say only shadowed forth, by the "Bright Clauses" of the Land Act of 1870, and to enable the people to become part proprietors of the land, and that the existing proprietors might, by its operation, be fairly compensated, in certain cases, for the loss of the land. It was most expedient that the course he indicated should be pursued, and he cautioned Parliament against attempting to do anything without payment of money. The landlord would have to sacrifice much, and it was only fair that he should receive reasonable compensation for it. No one regretted more than he did the language used by certain speakers at local Land League meetings; but he was not a member of that body, and, therefore, did not feel himself responsible for their utterances. In conclusion, he hoped the Government would take to heart that something must be done in the shape of finding a large fund to be available on reasonable terms for solvent farmers, who were ready to buy their land from the present proprietors on terms acceptable to both parties.

Mr. J. N. RICHARDSON said, as an Ulster Member, one of the few faithful among the faithless, as his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo termed them the other night, perhaps he might be allowed to make a few remarks. He must admit that it was with much regret he noticed the vagueness of the Gracious Speech from the Throne with regard to Land Reform in Ireland, especially when such prominence was previously given in the same Speech to the requirements of extra powers by the Executive; and though the remarks of the Prime Minister following shortly afterwards were more re-assuring, still they were not so distinct as some of his admirers in Ulster could have desired. Some little time back a public speaker, and, he believed, a Member of that House, said something to the effect that Scotch Members generally put their wants and requirements into definite and formal shape; but Irish Members did not do so in the present instance. The Ulster Liberal Members were not open to that charge. About a month ago they met in Dublin, and unitedly placed a Memorial in the hands of the Government embodying their opinion as to what was required to meet the acknowledged grievances under which the tenants had been suffering. To be brief, the pith of that Memorial was to the effect that besides a scheme for creating a peasant proprietary the programme now widely known as the "three F's" was loudly called for. As the Government Bill was not yet before them, they might, he trusted, live in the hope that when it appeared it would, in effect, embody those principles; and when Conservative landlords were at public meetings in Ulster adopting that programme it was hardly likely that the tenants would rest contented with any less. Let him not be misunderstood. The Ulster Liberals had not lost faith in Her Majesty's Government. They knew well that a Government so well open to the cry of the Irish tenant never sat on those Benches, and, perhaps, never would sit there again. They had not forgotten the efforts of his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary during the trying Session of last year when pushing forward the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill. They had not forgotten how the Prime Minister, at the risk of alienating old and tried supporters, and at the risk of his health—he was about to say at the very risk of his life—pressed on this measure, which he declared was necessary for the protection of the Irish tenant. And, further, they believed that the Government were anxious to bring in a measure as favourable to the claims of the tenant as would find acceptance among those of the more timorous of their own followers, or stand a chance of passing unscathed through the hostile broadsides which would be sure to be poured upon it in "another place." But if he might, with deep respect, be permitted to say so, he almost doubted if the Government were fully aware of the great consensus of opinion which there existed in Ireland in favour of the "three F's." Certainly, nothing less would satisfy the respectable tenantry of Ulster. The Roman Catholic clergy had declared in favour of it. More remarkably still, the Ulster Conservatives were pronouncing in favour of it. Would the House permit him to read part of a speech made by the noble Lord the junior Member for Down? He said when a dispute arose as to what was a fair rent that dispute should be settled by a Court of Arbitration. He would also allow the tenant to sell his interest to the best advantage. *The Belfast News Letter*, the ably-conducted organ of the Ulster Tories, stated in a leader soon after that the duty of Ulster Conservatives at the present crisis was to aid the Government in passing a good measure. A Conservative meeting was lately held at Monaghan. There were present Lord Rossmore, Lord Mandeville, Lord Templetown, Sir William Verner, and many other gentlemen of position; and at that meeting a speaker said Sir Stafford Northcote called the "three F's" "folly, force, and fraud." ["Hear, hear!"] He noticed those cheers, and appreciated their meaning; but let him read a little further. The same speaker proceeded to say that if the Conservative Party continued to talk about force, fraud, and folly, those who up to the present time had followed them would do so no longer. What did hon. Members opposite say to that? Knowing that the House did not appreciate its time being taken up with too many extracts, he would refrain from reading more of a similar description, but would, in conclusion, express a respectful hope, in view of the great consensus of opinion just alluded to, that the Government measure when produced might embody at least the principles of the "three F's," and a rose by another name would smell as sweet; and if the Government should happen to lose a few Whig votes, perhaps they would find them replaced by those of Ulster Conservatives, who could not, after what had passed, stultify themselves by opposing such a programme. One thing was certain—that if they did at once and for ever take away from before the eyes of his fellow-countrymen the spectre of an unfair rent and unfair eviction they would soon have a different Ireland.

Mr. DALY said, there never was a Government which came into Office which possessed more of the confidence of the people of Ireland than the present Government. There never was a Government to which the people of Ireland were more disposed to give fair play to, by reason of their anticipations of good from a Cabinet of which the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister was Chief, and in which were to be found the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and the right hon. Gentleman who filled the Office of Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. But, by reason of the great anticipations of the people of Ireland, the greater had been the disappointment which they had experienced. It was impossible for gentlemen resident in England, who simply read the accounts in the newspapers, to view questions connected with Ireland in the same light that Irishmen did. There was not an Irishman who was not painfully conscious that cries had reached this country by appealing for the relief of their distress, and that, up to the present time, those cries had remained unanswered. He did not purpose to enter into the subject further than to say that, at the present moment, the English people had no right to refuse justice to Ireland on this question, especially as they had had plenty of opportunities of late of mastering it. They had had the attention of the whole world directed to the state of the occupying tenants of Ireland. During the last three or four months they had had accounts from hon. Members; they had had newspaper correspondents describing the state of Ireland; they had had letters appearing both in the Liberal and Tory newspapers, showing what was the real state of the country. There had been letters in *The Daily News* and letters in *The Standard*, all of which showed that the Irish tenant was badly lodged and worse cared for. He need not, therefore, pursue that subject further than to express his disappointment that the question had received so little appreciation at the hands of Her Majesty's Government as appeared to be the case, if they were to judge from Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech. There was, however, one gleam of satisfaction, and he was proud to acknowledge it, and that was that he was glad to hear from the speech of the hon. Gentleman who represented Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) that through the influence of the Radicals and the Democracy of England the Government would be forced to give the question full consideration. In the few observations which he had to offer he intended to confine himself to the necessity expressed by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant for coercion. The right hon. Gentleman said—and said with truth—that the first duty of the Government was to preserve law and order. The hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Slagg), in his speech in seconding the Address, said, with regard to the Land Act of 1870, that it had not prevented the unjust and arbitrary advance of rent. It had not secured the tenant in his right of occupancy, nor had it prevented the landlords appropriating that which was the property of the tenants. He considered those observations important, because they were referred to subsequently by the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, who did not dissent from them; and the hon. Gentleman went on to say that there were, he feared, only too many instances in which the Act was ineffectual to prevent a state of things, the existence of which was a standing menace to law and order in Ireland. If the existing laws were a menace to law and order, it was the duty of Parliament to remove that standing menace. The South and West of Ireland had been described as being in a state of unmitigated anarchy. He was connected with a business in Cork and Limerick, which had agencies scattered throughout the entire Province of Munster; and he could say that during the last three or four years small debts had never been better paid than in that Province. Among those who took part in the present agitation were Bishops, priests, merchants, and shopkeepers, and it enlisted every fair and honest man who recognized that a reform of the Land Laws might be obtained. He had a long experience of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, having served under him both as a juror and as a grand juror, and he would describe him as a man utterly wanting in sympathy with his countrymen. His recent Charges were delivered for the House of Commons and for the London Press. He himself had seen Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, soon after the Charge was delivered, walking alone on the bank of the Lee, smoking a peaceful cigarette. If the state of that part of the country had been such as Mr. Justice Fitzgerald described, he did not think that that Judge would have been found alone at half-past 5 at night, two miles and a-half from the city of Cork. In the cases in which verdicts had not been obtained, he was able to say that many of the charges were supported by such evidence and witnesses that the defendants had every right to the benefit of reasonable doubt. The Irish people had passed through 30 or 40 years of great privation, during which period they had seen the Imperial Government spend £100,000,000 on the Crimean War and £30,000,000 on a scientific Frontier in Afghanistan and the war in Zululand; and while Ireland had been required to contribute more than its fair proportion of the cost of these wars, they had a right to insist that Irish questions should receive as much attention as English questions. He condemned the action of the Government in suppressing public meetings, and said he believed the adoption of such a course led to secret conspiracy. The Government might smother the flames by coercion; but they would not extinguish the fires, which would smoulder and burst out in every crevice. They could no more crush the agitation than they could crush the Gospel of God. There was no remedy but justice; and it was of no use asking the Irish Members to satisfy the Irish people with the assurance that the Land Act of 1870 was to be amended, and that the doctrine of compensation was to be extended.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, he was not one of those who objected to the language employed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) in moving his Amendment to the Address. He was not only content to accept what he had said, but he was content even to go a great deal further. He not only believed that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland could not be promoted by the suspension of any of the Constitutional rights of the Irish people, but he was prepared to say that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland had for five centuries and a half been prevented in consequence of those Constitutional rights having been interfered with. He was perfectly certain that the policy which had been adopted for so many centuries towards Ireland had been full of peril to this country, productive of inordinate expense, and had weakened its reputation. The question now imperatively called for a solution. He believed that one of the very earliest Resolutions on the subject ever come to in the House was 550 years ago. [*Laughter.*] He did not think that the laughter which greeted his remark was precisely to the purpose; and he would remind those hon. Gentlemen opposite that it was their "No surrender" policy that had caused that country to be in its present condition. This ancient House then passed a Resolution in the following form:—

> "It is ordained that the King shall go to Ireland, and to prepare his way a certain number of forces under able commanders shall be sent before him, and those especially who hold lands there shall go speedily over to the defence of that people, and that all learned in the law who may be appointed as justices shall by no means be excused on any pretence whatever, and that search be made in his Majesty's records to see what methods have been previously adopted for civilizing and well governing the people of Ireland."

That was the policy of the House more than five centuries ago, and he was sorry to say it was still so in consequence of want of wisdom and knowledge which prevailed. The Liberal Party had some reasons of complaint with those who called themselves Home Rulers. If the House desired to hear what he said at Reading—["No, no!" *and* "Hear, hear!"]—at all events, the effect of it was that he considered the Scotch Members had sense and wit, and determination to follow their game and bring it down; whereas the Irish Members did not follow any game, but were engaged at howling at the moon. He said also that he conceived there was no greater misfortune to the Irish people, and no greater aid could come to the English people, than a severance of the two countries. Another complaint the Liberal Party had to make of the Home Rulers was that they made no legislative proposals. Their practice was constant obstruction and no work. They seemed now, however, to have a policy: for the first time since the days of Wood's halfpence Irishmen were united. A certain class of the Irish had been induced to adopt the rule, copied from the worst ages of Roman history, of *aquæ et igni interdictio*. There could be nothing more detestable than constraining men to forego the fellowship with one's fellows; nothing more detestable could be devised. There could be no more utter abuse of liberty than that of forbidding the right of dealing with their fellow-countrymen which had been effected by some among the people of Ireland. The time would come when hon. Members opposite would regret that they had ever introduced the most barbarous method of any of those practised in Imperial Rome. He was obliged to admit that the hon. Member for the City of Cork had a very strong case—stronger almost than any which had occurred within the history of the English Parliament—and Irish Members might, indeed, be justly indignant with the results of last Session. The Chief Secretary for Ireland was induced at an evil moment to divide his Bill. The Bill for the relief of the landlords was, of course, passed in "another place;" but they all knew the result of the other half of the scheme to redress the wrongs of the tenants. The rejection of that measure was a deliberate attempt to embroil Her Majesty's Government with the Irish people; but he asked the Irish Members whether it was worth while to adopt the tactics pursued by them; whether it would not be better for them to agree with the people who meant them well, rather than to play into the hands of those who practised the "No surrender" policy of the last 550 years? Was there a single Member of the Opposition that had said a single word that was consolatory to the Irish people? He read a report of a speech of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote), who represented that the policy of the whole Irish people in this emergency was one of "fraud, force, and folly;" and he said that that was the most wicked and foolish speech—["Oh!"]—if it was correctly reported; yes, he repeated it, the most wicked and foolish speech that he had ever read; but he hoped the Irish

Members would see where justice, common sense, and order would be found. The position of the Opposition reminded him of the saying that persons who continually said that crimes were being committed were themselves guilty of crime, of the criticism of the great Roman historian—"*Scelus cose fæctum loquuntur, faciuntque.*" The hon. Member for the City of Cork had certainly achieved the result pointed out by the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell), of uniting Ireland, as almost the whole of that country was unanimously asking for Land Reform on the broadest basis. The hon. Member for the City of Cork had reason to complain of the London newspapers. Many merely imaginary cases of outrage had been reported. In fact, the statements were cooked for the London Clubs. His hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) talked about the sacredness of land contracts; but when they came to an Irish land contract it was a man holding in his hand an instrument of extortion inflicting beggary on his tenant. It was one man with a settled estate trying to grind to the utmost the man with a precarious tenancy; one man who was secured by an atrocious law—the Law of Distress—against the unprotected debts of the rest. A dozen years ago, before the hon. Member for the City of Cork was heard of, he came to the conclusion that a radical change in the Irish Land Laws in the direction of what was now called the "three F's" was inevitable. He had distributed pretty widely among Members of the House a pamphlet which he had written on the subject, and in which he had not altered a single word. He would tell them the history of his experience when he was travelling in Ireland. He went into the West, and tried to find out what the facts really were. In one of the districts to which he went—he thought Irishmen called it a barony—a term which appeared to be a relic of a vile feudal age—he found some 8,000 or 10,000 in a state of terrible distress. It happened that the whole district was possessed by an English nobleman, one of the most generous and considerate of landowners. His people had thriven, not under a legal system, but under an honourable understanding common enough in England, but which he wished was commoner in Ireland than it was. But just at the time he was there, there came down an intimation that his eldest son had been indulging in what is called "plunging" on the turf; there was a rumour that he had done worse. These people did not know what plunging on the turf was; but, at any rate, the news came down of the young gentleman plunging on the turf. They knew very well that the father of the nobleman had been a very hard landlord, and had introduced that form of white slavery in which nothing was left but a bare subsistence to the tenant, all the rest, according to our detestable laws, being the property of the landlord. The whole district was thrown into confusion and alarm lest the old days of the grandfather should come back in the days of the grandson; and he came to the conclusion that 8,000 or 10,000 people ought not to be left to the casual virtue or the probable vice of a single landowner. When no public opinion was felt in Ireland that kind of oppression was not only possible, but frequent. He knew very well that since the Land Act of 1870, which hon. Members on the other side were rather disposed to abuse, a good many Irish landlords had put their house in order. There had been a great deal more good done in Ireland since the passing of his right hon. Friend's Act than was ever done before. If the Act of 1870, which various foolish and dishonest persons abused, were thoroughly amended in certain directions, it would, he believed, not only satisfy the Irish people, but give the hon. Member for Cork City a new field in which to employ his unexhausted energies. And now a word as to the question of rent. It was the hardest thing in the world to increase rent in a purely agricultural country. It could be fairly and properly increased only when the country was at once manufacturing and agricultural. Why there were not manufactories in Ireland was a question of history, one which ought to be stated, would be stated, and must be stated. Ireland was a country of wasted experiments, simply because the law had wasted the energies of its people. Having stated what he thought of the case with regard to Ireland, and what his experience had been in relation to it, he would be expected to say why, unlike the hon. Member for Salford, he should feel it his duty to vote with Her Majesty's Government in relation to the present Amendment. It was not his business to pronounce a eulogy on the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. But he would ask hon. Gentlemen opposite whether they ever had an Irish Secretary who had been historically more sympathetic with the Irish people? Would hon. Members opposite compare him with the late Chief Secretary, the genial and right hon. James Lowther? The difference between them was that the one was always trying to please them, the other was continually insulting them. For many years, even before many of them were born, the Irish Secretary did good service for Ireland; and though it was sometimes rather hard to be just to people who perpetually thwarted one, one must be generous and just. It was the creed of those who sat on the Liberal Benches—"Be just and fear not." So far as he could gather, the means which the right hon. Gentleman intended to adopt for the pacification of the country which he governed would not be means of violence, nor such as would cause any serious injury to the liberties of Ireland. Something would perhaps be done to protect witnesses who might give evidence in cases of outrage; but the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) would still be able to hurl the denouncements of his fiery wrath against the Saxon. And with regard to other Members of the Government, he could not suppose that the Prime Minister was going to be cowed by another House or by the voices of hon. Gentlemen opposite, or to be frightened from a sound economic experiment. Such a supposition was an outrage on his own impressions, which were also the impressions of united Europe, of all civilized nations, of everybody who was not a tyrant, and most unaccountably, of all other Englishmen except some hon. Members who sat on the opposite Benches. He ventured to say that as a result of the intended reforms, Ireland, from being a reproach and a scandal to us, would become a Belgium or a Switzerland; for he was satisfied the people of Ireland were quite as capable of developing their wealth under another system as they had shown themselves capable of fighting against the malign influences which had been exercised upon them for five centuries and a half.

MR. PLUNKET said, that he should not have risen to take part in that debate if he thought that what he was about to say was likely to lead to bitter or prolonged controversy between the two great Parties in that House. He was most anxious to avoid, at the present moment, any such contention, for it must be abundantly clear to everyone that each day, each hour that passed before these great questions were settled were of the utmost importance to Ireland, and might abound with dangers to the Empire. Therefore, he should not that night arraign Ministers for their long neglect—their abandonment of the government of Ireland. On Friday night his right hon. and learned Friend and Colleague (Mr. Gibson) had dealt with that part of the subject; and every fair-minded man must admit that his words of censure were as just as they were strong and moderate. He (Mr. Plunket) entirely adopted his right hon. and learned Friend's language; but to-night he felt it his duty to give to Her Majesty's Government all the support he could in that wiser policy that they had at last accepted, and thus to hasten the restoration of law and order to Ireland. He confessed that he was not a little surprised at the two speeches which were made at the beginning of that evening from below the Gangway opposite. The hon. Gentlemen who spoke them seemed to him to have ignored the fact that the Ministers now responsible for the safety of the Government and of the country were the Leaders of their own political Party, and he thought they must also have forgotten the extreme gravity of the present crisis, as described in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. Her Majesty had been advised to make that Speech by a Cabinet which contained within it men who could not, even by the most ardent Radical, be suspected of any desire to sacrifice liberty, or to ask an hour too soon for the exceptional powers that were necessary to enforce the law in Ireland. How, then, explain the conduct of the two hon. Members? If he was to characterize it briefly, he should say that it was an attempt to "Boycott the Whigs." After a long indictment of Whig views, not upon the present issue, but upon the Land Question, one of the hon. Members ended with the agreeable intimation that an agitation against his own Government should begin forthwith at Manchester, and, carrying the fiery cross throughout all the great Parliamentary boroughs of the North, should end in Birmingham. And it was even intimated that the right hon. Members for Birmingham would be expected to attend the indignation meeting in that town! Well, he (Mr. Plunket) had latterly observed that when there was anything disagreeable for the Liberal Party it was pretty sure to begin and end in Birmingham. Indeed, some irreverent Tories—of whom, he feared, he was himself one—had hinted that those two right hon. Gentlemen did not always make matters very pleasant within the family circle of the Cabinet; but he must own that it would be something startling, if not indecent, to find them openly denouncing their Colleagues upon a public platform. Were not these two speeches made with the view of delaying the progress of a measure which those hon. Members knew must and would be passed? Were they not made to embarrass the Ministers in their proposals for the protection of life and property in Ireland, and thus to force the hand of their own Government over the Irish Land Question, and to compel them to shape their measure—the details of which were still unknown—in the direction desired by those hon. Members? If that were so, he would ask the House and the country whether such tactics at such a crisis were fair, or English, or patriotic? He must confess that the speech of the hon. Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Shaw) was such as he did not expect to hear from him. The hon. Member did all he could to minimize the serious nature of the crisis; he said that he had gone all about his county, and had not found anarchy in the ordinary relations of life, though he must know perfectly well that it was not with the ordinary relations of life that they were now concerned; but as to any question touching the land agitation, he had to admit that the utmost tension, and even danger, was apparent. The hon. Member for the County of Cork had also assured them that the bank of which he was himself the chairman was doing very well. At that he (Mr. Plunket) was not surprised, inasmuch as the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had told them that in consequence of the action of the Land League there were in the pockets of the tenantry about £5,000,000 which otherwise would not have been there; and of that £5,000,000, no doubt, a considerable proportion had found its way into the excellent bank of the hon. Member (Mr. Shaw), which was popular with the farmers of Munster. Then the hon. Member for Cork County recalled the failure of the potato crop a year previously, in order to attack the late Government for neglect of the people during that affliction. In many previous debates the late Government had fully vindicated their conduct in that matter. And what useful purpose, he (Mr. Plunket) asked, could now be served by re-opening that old controversy, at a time when Ireland was enjoying the fruits of the best harvest known for 40 years? Neither would he (Mr. Plunket) now challenge the present Ministry for their attempts to alleviate that very grave distress; for the truth, of course, was that both the present Government and their Predecessors had attempted all that could be well and wisely done to mitigate the sufferings of the unhappy people during the time of their want. The hon. Member for the County of Cork had said that he did not believe that the public meetings had anything to do with the outrages. On that point he (Mr. Plunket) was willing to rely on the testimony of the Chief Secretary, that those meetings were immediately followed by outrages. But then the hon. Member proceeded to admit that the local organizations were very dangerous. He (Mr. Plunket) agreed that, but for the co-operation of these local conspiracies, the meetings and the displays of eloquence would do comparatively little harm. In point of fact, the people became excited, and then they fell back upon their old organizations of Ribbonmen and Fenians. [*Cries of* "No!" *from below the Gangway.*] He would afterwards, if time permitted, explain in detail, with reference to this subject, not what he had read in newspapers, but what he knew from his own observations on the spot. At present he merely wished to remark that he entirely agreed with the statement made by his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland the other day, in the course of the State trials, that there was a net-work of small conspiracies throughout the whole of the country co-operating with the general conspiracy. Next, as to the Land Question, he must say that it was hardly fair for the hon. Member for the County of Cork to give to the House his general views on the land agitation, for the hon. Member was one of the Royal Commissioners who were appointed to report to the Government the evidence when it was complete; and the hon. Member should have reserved his opinions until, upon due notice, the House would have an opportunity of carefully considering the conclusions at which he and his Colleagues had arrived. In these circumstances, it was most inconvenient; he must repeat, it was hardly fair, for his hon. Friend to state those conclusions on the present occasion. As to the able speech of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell), it was not really directed to the important issue now raised. That speech was, in part, an attack on the present Government, on account of their supposed intention to introduce an insufficient Land Bill; and, in part, an attack upon the Tories; but it was not just—it was not in accordance with fact—to impute to the Conservative Party an utter unwillingness to consider grievances with regard to the Land Question. It was a matter of history that, in 1870, the Conservative Party almost unanimously supported the Government of the present Prime Minister in carrying the Land Bill of that year; and the new schemes of legislation now-a-days proposed had been quite as strongly resisted by Members of the present Cabinet, and by their principal Law Officer for Ireland, as by any Member of the Conservative Party. When the evidence and Reports of the two Land Commissions, together with the deliberate proposals of the Government, were before them, he, for one, and he believed he might speak for all those about him, would give the subject the most perfectly frank and fair consideration. Turning now to the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell), and his attempts to minimize the state of anarchy and the reign of terror now prevailing in Ireland, he had certainly, on the last night of that debate, made a most crafty, or, perhaps, he ought rather to say, judicious speech, from his point of view. He aggravated his voice, and "roared them as gently as any sucking-dove—indeed, and 'twere any nightingale!" But hon. Members who had had an opportunity of studying the speeches made by the hon. Member for Cork City in Ireland must have been astonished at the difference of tone displayed between his utterances within that House and outside of it. He (Mr. Plunket) had been rather amused the other night by the vehemence of some of the followers of the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell), who, in demanding the retraction of a certain criticism passed upon the hon. Member's speech by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, showed themselves *plus royalistes que le Roi*, for they seemed to forget that the hon. Member had himself admitted—

> "That every politician who attempted to originate any movement in Ireland must know that if that movement had for its object the relief of distress, murder and outrage would surely follow."

MR. PARNELL said, the report of his speech in *The Times*, from which the right hon. and learned Member was probably judging, was not correct.

MR. PLUNKET said, the report in *The Times* was always extremely correct, and in this instance it entirely agreed with his own recollection of what had been said. Whilst dealing with this question of the amount of crime and outrage attending this land agitation, he must, in passing, notice that the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk had found fault with Mr. Justice Fitzgerald for his remarks upon the state of Munster, as to which he thought he had been influenced by the Grand Jury. Now, everyone acquainted with Mr. Justice Fitzgerald knew that there was no man in Ireland less likely to be unduly influenced in the discharge of his duty than he. He had been all his life a man of the highest character, a Liberal of the Liberals, and a Roman Catholic; and his testimony was, not only that his task in vindicating the law had been a hopeless one, but that even while the Judges were on that Circuit an increase of lawlessness had taken place around them, and that some measure for remedying that state of things was absolutely necessary. It was not his intention on this occasion to quote statistics, or to give detailed examples of the system of terrorism and outrage which had almost been raised to the dignity of an exact science in Ireland for the purpose of intimidation; but he wished to tell the House one or two circumstances of which he knew of his own personal experience, and which were, he thought, good illustrations of the state of the country. He would not now refer to some very painful and awful scenes of which he had been a witness; but he might mention, as one proof of the paralysis of law which had so long been suffered to prevail, what had happened when, in the end of last October, he was travelling on the borders of Mayo and Galway with a friend, who was one of the most popular and respected landlords in that part of the country. They were met by the officer of constabulary, whose duty it was to protect, as far as he could, life and property in that district; and he, in effect, thus spoke to his friend—"You, no doubt, consider that you are perfectly safe. You may suppose, and it is probably perfectly true, that 19 out of 20, or, perhaps, 99 out of every 100 individuals on your property or in the county would be horrified if any attempt were made on your life; but," he added, "if there be anyone on your estate, or anywhere else, who harbours a grudge against you, and who for any cause chooses to take your life, though there might be plenty of persons present when the crime is committed who wish you no ill-will, they dare not arrest the criminal. Even if arrested, it would be next to impossible to produce evidence against him; and even if such evidence were forthcoming no jury would convict." It therefore comes to this—that evil-disposed persons know that they have absolute immunity unless there be retaliation on the spot; and so this officer advised his friend to take police protection. This he spoke from his own knowledge of the facts, and he thought it was high time that the English people had such information given to them at first hand. He might also state, from his own observation, that within an area of 10 miles of Mr. Boycott's farm there were 10 persons under police protection, none of whom dared to move from his house, night or day, except under the protection of armed men, whose assistance they had obtained on the advice of the authorities. He could say a great deal more on this subject of the unhappy fate of persons in the position of landowners or their agents; but he would refrain. He had said it all before in the presence of a large meeting of English working men, and he felt certain that every law-abiding man of every class, no matter how he might be divided from him by Party politics or religion, would admit with him that the present state of things in Ireland was intolerable. But this tyranny was by no means applied only to the landlord classes; and, as an instance of this, he might say that some time back he was walking across one of those black peat bogs in Ireland from which the peasants gathered their supplies of fuel. They build up their little stacks of turf against a stone wall, and afterwards take it away from time to time as they want it during the winter. Two of these stacks had been burnt. Nothing remained but the whitened stones. The owners had displeased the Land League; and, on an inquiry being made as to why they did not demand compensation, the answer was that if any such claim was made the same persons who fired the stacks would next burn down the owners' houses. There was another case of a tenant farmer paying some £40 or £50 a-year of rent—an altogether different person from the poor creatures who owned the peat stacks, and who, as they could not even speak a word of English, might receive sympathy without danger to the sympathizers of showing too much consideration for the "English garrison"—an honest, industrious man, who had raised himself by his own exertions. This man asked for assistance, because the herds who attended his cattle had been warned that they must not tend them longer, and the animals were scattered about the country. This strong man—he was about 45 years of age—said, with tears upon his cheeks, that he had been trying for 18 years to keep a roof over the head of himself and his family, but that there were people about now who would not let any man live who wished to earn a shilling honestly and spend it peaceably. The hon. Member for the City of Cork had brought forward his Amendment because he said the Constitution was about to be suspended; but the fact was that in such cases as he had now described the Constitution was already suspended for the Irish people. It was not now a question between the ordinary law and exceptional law, for the ordinary law was dead; but it was a question between exceptional law, which had been rendered necessary, and the Land League law. The hon. Member for Cork City said, further, the object of his agitation was to put an end to rack-renting, and he boasted that he had been the means of causing some £5,000,000 to remain in the hands of the tenantry, instead of, as would have been the case under the ordinary law of the country, finding its way into the pockets of the landlords. As far as he could see, the effect of the proposal of the hon. Member for Cork City came to this—that a third of the income of the landlords was to be taken from them and handed over to the tenants. This was simply plunder, and he ventured to ask the English people whether this was a proposal which they would for a moment sanction? The hon. and learned Member for Dundalk said he thought his right hon. and learned Friend and Colleague (Mr. Gibson) ought, in his speech the other night, to have shown some charity towards the views of those who differed in opinion from him. This was all very well; and as far as he (Mr. Plunket) was able to judge, his right hon. and learned Friend was not open to the charge of having shown any bad feeling on the subject. Speaking for himself, he had no intention of saying one word against the Home Rule Members personally. As to their motives in this land agitation, he said nothing; but what he had to deal with was the result of their policy and with their public acts as public men, and on those he meant freely to comment. And now, he said, that the results of that policy and of those acts had been most disastrous to Ireland, and that they tended directly to break up the Empire. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Member for Cavan laughed at that remark, and, no doubt, he would rejoice at such a prospect, for his Friends had often pointed to that ultimate object, and had said that but for the hope of obtaining it they would not have thought it worth their while to go into the movement. What was the character of these five millions of solid money which the hon. Member for Cork City offered the people of Ireland? No wonder he was proud of it, for it was the talisman with which he had achieved his wonderful popularity. It was such a bribe as was never offered to a people before. The hon. Member commenced by saying that he would only put down the rack-rents; but then he proceeded to tell the people that they themselves should be the judges of what they should pay. He further advised them that they should first pay the shopkeeper and the tradesman and then provide for themselves, and after they had done all this they were to consider what they would give their landlords. Never since the days of the famous Jack Cade had such a bribe been offered. The hon. Member for Cork City and his confederates appealed to their patriotism, and told the Irish people that there had been historic wrongs in other times and that former generations of landlords had inflicted great grievances upon them which should efface the memory of recent kindness, that the rights of the landlord class were all equally founded upon confiscation and robbery, and that the title even of him who had bought his property in recent times and with money earned by the sweat of his brow was tainted with these ancient wrongs. When the people were thus prepared for what was coming, when they were excited by these enthusiastic appeals to their patriotism, when they were maddened by this recital of their ancient wrongs, when they were bewildered by these communistic theories, then came the tempter with this enormous bribe; and was it to be wondered at that the man, however honest, found the bribe irresistable? He (Mr. Plunket) believed that the ordinary Irish tenant—he knew it was true of those amongst whom he had lived—were by habit willing, and by the teaching of their religion enjoined, faithfully to observe their obligations and honestly to discharge their debts. But the House must remember, when they saw them taking part in this gigantic scheme of repudiation, how they had been worked upon. Was not this sufficient to account for what had occurred? And when they were told in that House by enthusiastic reformers to lift up their eyes and behold the grand and noble spectacle before them of a nation awakening to a sense of its rights, he maintained that the people were being taught to take and keep in their pockets that which was not theirs. He had been looking the other day at a description of a state of things which was not unlike what was now to be seen in Ireland, and it was written by one who well knew human nature. The lines of Shakespeare applied to some, at least, of those who had taken a prominent part in this Irish agitation. It was Shakespeare who made his Jack Cade to say—

> "Be brave then; for your captain is brave, and vows reformation. There shall be in England seven halfpenny loaves sold for a penny: the three-hooped pot shall have ten hoops; and I will make it felony to drink small beer: all the realm shall be in common, and in Cheapside shall my palfrey go to grass; and when I am king, as king I will be, there shall be no money: all shall eat and drink on my score; and I will apparel them all in one livery, that they may agree like brothers, and worship me their lord."

Further, he went on to say—

> "And you, that love the commons, follow me,
> Now show yourselves men; 'tis for liberty.
> We will not leave one lord, one gentleman:
> Spare none but such as go in clouted shoon;
> For they are thrifty honest men, and such
> As would (but that they dare not) take our parts.
> Away, burn all the records of the realm; my mouth shall be the Parliament of England."

But, turning now to the practical effects of this teaching, and to what was no laughing matter, he referred to the case of Colonel King-Harman, who was well know to have been a good landlord—one of the kindest and most popular in Connaught. Well, his property was let under Griffith's valuation, and yet his tenants had demanded a reduction of 25 per cent on their rents. They came to him the other day 500 strong; they were headed by two bands, and marched in military order to the office. He told them that on his large estates in Roscommon, Sligo, and Queen's County, the rents were under the Government valuation—Griffith's valuation was £24,732, and the actual rental was only £22,000. Before his assembled tenantry he asked whom had he distrained for rent, whom had he threatened, whom had he pressed, whose crops had he seized? He then went on to say God knew he had worked not alone for the good of the tenantry on his own estate, but of the people of the whole of the West of Ireland, for whom he obtained thousands of pounds in the time of their distress. He called them to witness how he had spent his time, his money, and his energy trying to befriend his people—and what had been his thanks? Any paid adventurer might get up up a meeting at his gate and call him what name he liked. "Not one of your tenants has done so," was the reply to that. He said, "You allowed it to be done." He then went on to say he was afraid the demand for a reduction of 25 per cent of rent was one he could not entertain; his property had many charges and calls upon it; but he would tell them what he would do. If any tenant had a grievance, his case would be carefully considered. He told his tenantry that if he were to assent to their demands and forfeit one-fourth of his property it would be simply his ruin. Then there were cheers, and they went away to consider what they should do; but they were met outside by Jack Cade. He told them—"Hold the harvest;" "keep a firm grip on your land;" "pay only what you like"——

THE O'DONOGHUE asked whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman meant to say that the rents paid by the tenants were all under Griffith's valuation?

MR. PLUNKET: Was that the morality openly preached in the House of Commons?

MR. PARNELL rose to make an observation, whereupon——

MR. SPEAKER said, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman desired to give way, the hon. Member might make a remark; otherwise, not.

MR. PLUNKET said, that the last interruption had not been such a happy one as to induce him to give way on the present occasion. He had, he feared, already trespassed too long. ["Go on!"] Of course, it was not for him to say one word as to what measures of protection for life and property were now necessary in Ireland. That question was not then before the House. He was well aware that the responsibility and the difficulty of the Government were very great. This matter had been allowed to grow to a maturity which was extremely difficult to deal with. The Land League had seized on many important interests, coigns of vantage from which it would be difficult to dislodge them. If the Government gave way to this anarchy, they would drive out of Ireland all the most educated and influential in the upper and middle class. Too few already, they would be altogether banished from the land, and then the agitators would attain the end desired—they would succeed in throwing off all connection with England and in breaking up their ancient Empire. But if, on the other hand, they even now, at the eleventh hour, would only act with firmness, and, treating these combinations as criminal, would meet them not with palliation, but with punishment, they would rally round them many men who were now suffering from an intolerable tyranny, but who would then gladly flock to the standards of law and order. They had, no doubt, to deal with a most difficult and dangerous conspiracy. But other conspiracies more difficult and dangerous had before now been confronted and overborne by Governments having the courage to believe in the justice of their country's cause, and to enforce the authority of the law entrusted to their keeping. If they did so, those storms of popular passion that at that moment raged on the other side of the Channel, as though they would devastate society and leave the Empire in wreck and ruin, would pass away but as a sudden squall in comparison with the tempests of other days. Then order and prosperity might return to the land, and his countrymen again devote themselves to the material advantage and the union of all classes of the people; and whilst they retained, proudly retained, their own nationality—which he, for one, had no wish to see impaired—they would still prosper in the same Union with England which Scotland had long enjoyed, and would share in the wealth and the power and the glory of that Empire, whose greatness Irishmen had done so much to build up and to maintain.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Mitchell Henry.*)

MR. PARNELL remarked, that, of course, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister would not propose to take the first reading of either of the Coercion Bills to-night? He asked the Question, because if the debate were not adjourned until half-past 12, the right hon. Gentleman would be prevented by the Rules of the House from doing so. He was sure it was not the wish of the House to take those measures at a late hour.

MR. GLADSTONE: In answer to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say there is no intention whatever of making a Motion for the introduction of either of these Bills now. Indeed, they are down for to-morrow. I wish now to give Notice that to-morrow, in conformity with established precedent for continuing the debate on the Address without intermission, that I propose to move at half-past 4 that Notices of Motion be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned debate on the Address to Her Majesty has been disposed of. I have no intention of offering any opposition to the adjournment.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

MR. TREVELYAN: I beg to move for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the "Naval Discipline Act, 1866," with a view to abolish corporal punishment; and for other purposes relating thereto. I trust that this Bill will provoke no debate, and certainly I shall say nothing to provoke one. It is a Bill introduced in consequence of repeated promises to deal with the question of flogging in the Navy. Its provisions are extremely brief. It withdraws all authority to inflict corporal punishment in the British Navy under the sentence of any court martial, or under any other circumstances whatever. It enables commanding officers, after summary trial, to inflict somewhat longer terms of imprisonment than at present upon offenders. I need not say anything in regard to the other provisions at the present stage. I trust that the House will give the Bill an unopposed first reading, on the assurance that it represents the opinions of the Board of Admiralty and of very eminent naval officers who have been consulted.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he intended to offer no opposition to the introduction of the Bill that evening. As the hon. Gentleman had made a statement in introducing the Bill, it ought to have been a little more full and complete. It must certainly be understood that the measure, in its future stages, would be opposed if its provisions were found to be unsatisfactory.

MR. ONSLOW expressed a hope that his hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan), before he placed the Bill upon the Paper for a second reading, would state to the House the nature of the opinions which he had received upon the subject from naval officers. A promise was given last Session that naval officers and others connected with the discipline of the Navy should be consulted on the matter; and before the second reading was taken, he hoped his hon. Friend would allow him to move for a Return of any opinions which had been received from the authorities who had been consulted before the Bill was introduced.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to amend "The Naval Discipline Act, 1866," with a view to abolish corporal punishment; and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. TREVELYAN and Mr. BRASSEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 52.]

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE.

LORD KENSINGTON moved—

"That a Standing Committee be appointed to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms in the department of the Sergeant at Arms attending this House."

The noble Lord said, he knew that, at the present time, there were many shortcomings in connection with the Kitchen and Refreshment Department; but he hoped that hon. Members would make some allowance, seeing that the late caterer only resigned just before the close of last Session, and there was very little time for selecting a successor and making the necessary arrangements. The present contractor was quite new to the work, and, with things not in working order, he had a great strain upon him on the opening night. He (Lord Kensington) assured the House that the Committee would do all in their power for the comfort and convenience of Members. He hoped, and had reason to believe, that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Callan), who opposed the appointment of the Committee on Friday, would not renew his opposition; and with regard to the hon. Member's proposal to add the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Clare (Captain O'Shea) to the Committee, he was sure there would be no objection, and that the Committee would be very glad to have the advantage of the hon. and gallant Member's assistance.

MR. CALLAN said, he had opposed the appointment of the Committee on Friday, and he wished to explain why he had done so then, and why he did not persist with that opposition now. He withdrew his opposition because he was given to understand that provision had been made for a new caterer, and because there was to be an infusion of new blood into the Committee. The noble Lord had gracefully yielded to the nomination of the hon. and gallant Member for Clare County, and probably the hon. and gallant Member, like most military men, would have had a large experience in matters such as those which were likely to be brought before the Committee. He (Mr. Callan) had had the honour of a seat in that House for 12 years, and he well remembered that when he entered the House first the kitchen arrangements were excellent and the dinners were well provided. They had since been gradually getting from bad to worse, until last year they became intolerably bad; and it was with the view of securing an improvement that he opposed the nomination of the Committee the other night, and suggested the addition to the Committee of the hon. and gallant Member for Clare County. If anything was desired by the Committee they had only to apply to the First Commissioner of Works, who would see that their wishes were promptly attended to. The day before Parliament assembled, with natural curiosity, he inspected the House, and he saw that accommodation had been provided in the Reporters' Gallery for an increased number of gentlemen of the Press. He believed that upwards of 50 new hands had come into the Gallery; and as they were gentlemen on whom the House would very much depend for the transcription of their speeches, he thought the Kitchen Committee were bound to see that the wants of the gentlemen in question were also attended to. He hoped the First Commissioner of Works would be asked to pay a visit in the course of the Session, during luncheon hours, to the rooms now occupied by the reporters, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman would at once see the necessity of providing additional accommodation. In consequence of the increased number of reporters an additional room had been provided for the transcription of notes, and he thought that some further dining accommodation was absolutely necessary. It was the duty of the House to be as considerate of the reporters, to whom they owed so much, as of themselves. It was also desirable that something should be done to provide the strangers, who were their constituents, with proper means of obtaining refreshments in the corridors upstairs when they visited the House during the sitting of the Committees. The nature of the present provision in this respect was a matter of much complaint. The wants of both the reporters and the strangers should be equally attended to with those of Members of the House. As he had already intimated, he did not intend to oppose the present Motion, and he presumed that the noble Lord, in moving the names, would add that of the hon. and gallant Member for Clare County.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that he had been for some years a Member of this Committee. Although hitherto the Press Department had been served by one contractor and the Members by another, they were now all under the same contractor. He believed, however, that the Kitchen Committee had nothing to do with the refreshments supplied to the gentlemen of the Press upstairs. If it should be otherwise, he thought that as much attention should be paid to the comfort and accommodation of the gentlemen of the Press as was paid to those of Members of the House.

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That a Standing Committee be appointed to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms, in the department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House:—Mr. MAURICE BROOKS, Sir WILLIAM DYKE, Mr. EDWARDS, Sir EDMUND FILMER, Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY, Mr. GUEST, Sir ARTHUR HAYTER, Lord KENSINGTON, Mr. MONK, Mr. MUNTZ, Mr. RICHARD POWER, Lord HENRY THYNNE, Sir HENRY WOLFF, and Captain O'SHEA:—Three to be the quorum.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HINDE PALMER, Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Property of Married Women, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HINDE PALMER, Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY, Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, and Mr. HORACE DAVEY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 50.]

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (WARNINGS TO REMOVE) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Sir ALEXANDER GORDON, Bill to extend the time of Warning to Remove in the case of Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir ALEXANDER GORDON, Mr. M'LAGAN, and Mr. BARCLAY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 51.]

LOCAL INQUIRIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. P. J. SMYTH, Bill to provide for the establishment of a Tribunal for the conduct of Local Inquiries relating to Private Bills in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. P. J. SMYTH, Mr. FAY, Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, and Dr. CAMERON.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 53.]

BARRISTERS' ADMISSION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CALLAN, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Admission of Barristers in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CALLAN, Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, and Mr. GRAY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 54.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. STEVENSON, Bill to prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. BIRLEY, Mr. WILLIAM M'ARTHUR, Mr. CHARLES WILSON, and Mr. WALTER JAMES.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 55.]

LUNACY LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. DILLWYN, Bill to amend the Laws relating to the custody and treatment of Lunatics, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DILLWYN, Sir GEORGE BALFOUR, and Mr. BENJAMIN T. WILLIAMS.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 56.]

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 11*th January,* 1881.

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of KENMARE) reported Her Majesty's Answer to the Address as follows:—

MY LORDS,

I THANK you sincerely for your loyal and dutiful Address.

I rely with confidence on your cordial co-operation in all My efforts to improve and strengthen the Laws and Institutions of the Country, and to promote the welfare and happiness of all classes of My People.

LAND LEAGUE MEETINGS AND AGRARIAN CRIME (IRELAND).

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

LORD DUNSANY, in rising to move for a series of 24 different Returns relating to events in Ireland, and including almost all the phases of the present land agitation in that country, said, that, in doing so, he was sorry to be compelled to make a statement, which, however, he would make as brief as he could. He understood that the Government were not inclined in favour of the Motion, and he would admit that the number of Returns he asked for was unusually great; but the circumstances of the case were also very extraordinary and very unusual. It did not follow that because the Returns were numerous that their production would entail any more trouble or expense than a Return under a single head; and they were, in fact, nothing more than the Police Returns, which he should imagine were all to found in the office of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. Not one of the Returns was of a frivolous nature; but, on the contrary, they all bore on the present grave and alarming condition of affairs in Ireland, and the information contained in them was of such public interest that they ought to be unhesitatingly granted. His difficulty had been to confine within any reasonable limits the facts which he thought ought to be made public; and it would be seen that he had asked no questions about two incidents which would certainly be memorable in Irish history—the Boycott incident, and the remarkable strategical operation of Mr. Bence Jones. Mr. Bence Jones being unable to carry on any operations upon his land, was compelled to send his cattle to Cork for embarkation; but finding Cork in the hands of the Land League he counter-marched them to Dublin, to be forwarded from thence to the English market. When, however, he got them to Dublin, he found that owing to the influence of the Land League he was no better off there; but he ultimately contrived, some way or other, to smuggle them out of the country. If these Returns were granted, he believed they would be found to prove one of two things—the one of permanent, and the other of very great temporary importance. They would either prove that the ordinary law, to which alone he referred, was wholly insufficient when any strain was put upon it; or that, as was thought by the Government, if sufficient, that it had been insufficiently administered. One of these two consequences would appear; and surely it must be of very great importance that it should be placed beyond a doubt whether the law was sufficient for its primary purpose—that of protecting life and property. As to the inefficiency of the law, it would be nothing to the purpose to say that Her Majesty's Government were going to apply for extraordinary powers, which, no doubt, would be granted. Those powers would only be temporary, and the same answer would apply to the argument that the Government were going to propitiate the Land League by giving them another slice of the landlords' property. He did not mean to say that Her Majesty's Ministers meant to do anything of the kind; but in attempting by new concessions to ameliorate the condition of the tenants, they would really be a second time punishing the landlords who had been very great sufferers already. The first Return he asked for referred to the meetings convened or held by the Land League, and he rather thought it had been promised in the other House. These meetings were often held in greatly disturbed districts, and among a population, as *The Times* said, "armed to the teeth." It was not very pleasant for landlords in those districts to be told that such meetings were being held in their neighbourhood. With respect to others of the Returns, he could not help thinking that if the police had had orders, at an early stage of the insurrection, to tear down inflammatory placards denouncing some loyal subjects of Her Majesty and dangerous meetings had been proclaimed, the proposed extraordinary remedies might have been unnecessary. The fourth Return, which related to the dates of the forcible re-instating of persons who had been legally ejected, he conceived to be necessary for the honour of their Lordships' House, for it had been said or written by the Prime Minister, that their Lordships were to blame for the terrible state of things in Ireland, in having thrown out the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last Session. If these Returns were granted they would completely negative the charge. They would show that many of the outrages were committed outside the area which their Lordships were asked to legislate for, and that many of the tenants who had been restored to their holdings had been evicted some 30 or 20 or 10 years ago by the Courts of Law, which the legislation of last autumn, unless it had been made retrospective, could have nothing to do with. No one could help noticing the activity, decision, and boldness with which the Land League had begun to act in certain districts, and the action of the authorities showed that there was something unsound in the administration. He would again say that if their Lordships would look over the Returns for which he moved, they would see that there was nothing unreasonable in them, and he believed that the conclusion to which their production would lead would be either that the ordinary law required some great amendment on that score, or that some persons were very much to blame for the scandalous state of things that existed in Ireland. In certain districts meetings had been put down with a strong hand, and the activity of the Government left nothing to be desired; but, in other cases, they had not thought it necessary to comply with the request of the local authorities that certain meetings announced to be held should be prohibited. Possibly the reason might be that the Government regarded these assemblies as of an innocent character; but the character of such gatherings might sometimes be gathered from the placards announcing them and the banners displayed, and on one of the occasions on which interference was refused, a banner carried bore the significant emblems of a block and an axe and a headless man, with the motto, "Bide your time." A meeting held under such a banner could hardly be expected to be of the most peaceful character, and would not be likely to be followed by good results in the neighbourhood. It was clear to him that there was something to be done in looking into the present administration of the country, and something in strengthening the ordinary law in some quarters. Things, in fact, had reached such a pitch that the Royal Irish Constabulary were sometimes defeated, not being strong enough unsupported by the military. He knew there was a kind of superstitious fear about interfering with the liberty of the subject; but in many parts of Ireland obedience to the Land League was a necessity, and there was no liberty to obey Her Majesty's law. He wanted some information as to the orders given for patrolling disturbed districts. All who read newspapers knew that those districts were patrolled very strongly, not by the forces of Her Majesty, but by those of Charles Stewart—he did not mean the Pretender, either old or young, but the person who was generally known as Charles Stewart Parnell, and who might possibly be aiming to become Charles III. He believed he had made out a very strong case for the Returns he moved for, and hoped the Government would consent to grant them. The noble Lord concluded by moving for the Returns of which he had given Notice.

Moved, That there be laid before this House—

1. Return of all public meetings convened or held by members of the "Land League" in Ireland from the 1st of June 1880 to the present time, with the place and date of each meeting, copies of the placards or bills summoning it, and estimated numbers attending:

2. Copies of orders given to the police to prevent the posting of such bills or notices or to tear them down when of illegal character and dangerous tendency, with dates of such orders:

3. Return of all agrarian outrages in Ireland from 1st of June 1880 to present date, with the locality and date of each, specifying the distance from the place where the last Land League meeting was held in that district, with date of that meeting:

4. Return of all tenants ejected in due course of law (with date of eviction) and forcibly reinstated by order of the "Land League" or by illegal assemblages believed by the police to act under such orders, distinguishing cases in which dwellings had been erected or restored by such assemblages, or where farmhouses or other buildings lawfully occupied by any of Her Majesty's subjects have been burned or destroyed by order of the "Land League" or their agents, or where fences have been levelled and cattle driven off the land by order of such persons in pursuance of the declared purposes or policy of the "Land League." The Return to state whether the Royal Irish Constabulary were present at the time, in what force, and by whom commanded, and whether they attempted to prevent such illegal proceedings by force and

made any arrests, or, if not, for what reason: (Same period):

5. Return of all cases in which land or houses forcibly re-occupied are still illegally retained, or where the fences having been levelled the land remains useless to the owner: (Same period):

6. Return of all cases where land or houses lawfully occupied have been surrendered in consequence of intimidation by the "Land League" or its agents, or persons assumed by the police to act under the orders of the conspiracy: (Same period):

7. Copies of placards or notices or speeches made in the neighbourhood of such lands or houses aiming at such intimidation: (Same period):

8. Return of all persons denounced by the "Land League" for exercising their lawful rights, and subjected to the persecution known as "Boycotting," and of all outrages connected with such persecution in each case: (Same period):

9. Return of all applications made for police protection, and of the protection afforded in each case; also, of any outrages committed on the persons or property of any of Her Majesty's subjects notwithstanding such protection: (Same period):

10. Return of all cases in which public notice was given by the bellman that individuals were to be persecuted or "Boycotted" (or would be so, failing submission to the Land League), and in which the police did not interfere with the giving of such notice; also of any orders given to the police relative to such illegal notices by bellman or otherwise, with the date of such orders: (Same period):

11. Return of all cases in which persons concerned in giving such illegal notice have been made amenable to justice: (Same period):

12. Return of all cases where it is known to the police that individuals or companies have been intimidated into contributing to the funds of the "Land League" or joining them in persecuting or injuring their fellow-subjects (the names of persons so intimidated not to be given), and of all cases known to the police where loyal subjects of Her Majesty have been endangered in person or property for disregarding the orders of the "Land League" or other illegal societies co-operating with them: (Same period):

13. Return of all persons known to the police as able to give evidence of "Land League" outrages who have refused to do so, specifying the cases of persons so refusing, though they had been assaulted or wounded or were believed to know their assailants but to be intimidated: (Same period):

14. Return of all cases in which writs or other orders of the courts of law or of the high sheriffs of counties had been forcibly resisted, distinguishing the cases in which such resistance was successful, and stating whether and at what date the authority of the law has since been vindicated; and, if so, what force of the Royal Irish Constabulary or of the Army were employed: (Same period):

15. Return of all bailiffs or officers of the law killed or wounded, or maltreated in the execution of their duty; also, of other persons killed, wounded, or maltreated while endeavouring to enforce the law or assert their lega rights: (Same period):

16. Return of any cases of soldiers serving in Her Majesty's Army or the Militia accused of complicity with riotous attacks on the police, of illegal drilling, or acts of disloyalty: (Same period):

17. Return of all seizures of arms or ammunition by the police, and of all robberies of arms or ammunition: (Same period):

18. Return of all "Land League" meetings prohibited by the Lord Lieutenant, with date of such prohibition, and of "Land League" meetings not prohibited since the date of first meeting prohibited: (Same period);

19. Copy of Mr. Forster's late circular to Irish magistrates, and the answer of certain magistrates:

20. Return of magistrates who have resigned their commissions on the ground that they were not supported in the discharge of their duties, and of persons who have refused to act as high sheriff, from the state of Ireland making the discharge of the duties of the office impossible in their opinion:

21. Return of all persons known to Her Majesty's Government to have left their residences in Ireland on account of threatening letters, attempted murder, or intimations from the police that their lives were in jeopardy; such Return not to specify names, but to give dates (if known) and the counties: (Same period):

22. Return of cases in which the police have met parties of men marching or assembled at night, or disguised and apparently having some illegal purpose, or engaged in drilling, stating whether the police made any prisoners or were prevented by superior force: (Same period):

23. Return of orders given to the Royal Irish Constabulary or to the military to patrol the disturbed districts, with dates of such orders:

24. Return of persons who have taken part in the "Land League" proceedings and are convicts holding tickets of leave, stating the conditions under which those tickets of leave have been granted: (Same period).—(*The Lord Dunsany.*)

EARL SPENCER: I think your Lordships will feel grateful to the noble Lord opposite (Lord Dunsany) for not having gone *seriatum* through the very long list of Returns on your Lordships' Votes which he wishes the Government to give. I am sorry to be obliged to say that I am unable, on the part of the Government, to agree to give this large quantity of Returns. The Government do not refuse on account of any unwillingness to give every possible information to your Lordships and the country on the state of Ireland at this moment; but they are obliged to refuse for several reasons. The first reason is this. These Returns, as asked for, would take months to prepare. Many of them would not be ready at the end of the Session, and the labour they would give to the already overburdened officials of the

Irish Office would be quite prodigious—a great deal more than the Government would think fair to impose upon them, or care about proposing to Parliament to give them. But there are further reasons, and I may say that the Government have already given some of the information which the noble Lord asks for. For instance, Returns have been laid on the Table of the House, showing the number of Land League meetings each month for the year 1879-80, and the number of agrarian outrages, taken from the Constabulary Reports. Such a Return as that is asked for by the noble Lord; but I think the Returns I have already moved for give all the information which is necessary for your Lordships' House. I have undertaken already to lay on the Table of your Lordships' House every Return which has been asked for in "another place." Several are in the process of being printed, and will soon be in the hands of your Lordships. Again, some of the Returns asked for by the noble Lord are hardly worthy of being embraced in a serious Parliamentary Paper, and these I can answer in a few words. For instance, the last Return, No. 24, is a Return of persons who have taken part in the Land League proceedings, and are convicts holding tickets-of-leave, stating the conditions under which those tickets-of-leave have been granted. It is perfectly impossible for Her Majesty's Government to know who are the people attending these meetings. As far as the Government know, there is only one prominent person who is a convict-on-leave who has attended their meetings. There are other Returns, such as the list of forcible entries, which it is impossible to give; a number of prosecutions have taken place for illegal possession; but in the public interest it is not advisable to give the names of the people who have demanded protection or have been denounced by the Land League. I need hardly point out to your Lordships that, in the present unfortunate and deplorable condition of Ireland, we shall be doing a most unjust, nay, a dangerous thing, if we proclaimed in Parliament the names of the people who have been denounced by the Land League.

LORD DUNSANY: No, no!

EARL SPENCER: The noble Lord differs froms me on the point; but I maintain that the Government would be doing that which would be unjust and dangerous at this moment if they brought in such a Return. Some of the Returns asked for by the noble Lord are so voluminous that your Lordships would have to increase the shelves of your Library if they were granted. For instance, the noble Lord has asked for copies of placards or speeches made in the neighbourhood of such lands or houses, aiming at such intimidation. Such a Return as that would fill many volumes, and it would be perfectly impossible for Her Majesty's Government to give such a Return. The Return, No. 6, of cases in which land or houses lawfully occupied have been surrendered in consequence of intimidation by the Land League, could not be given, as the information is not in the possession of the Government. As to Return No. 3, since June last there had been about 1,000 agrarian outrages, and if for every one of those outrages the police had to calculate where the nearest Land League meeting had been held, the complexity and difficulty of the work would be enormous. Therefore, that, also, is a Return which it is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to give. Again, some of the information asked for could only be given on surmise, and such a Return would be of no value whatever, because, to be useful to Parliament, the information contained in a Parliamentary Paper should be such as could be relied on with certainty. Such is the Return of all tenants who, after being duly ejected in course of law, had been forcibly reinstated by order of the Land League. How is the Government to know whether persons have been so re-instated "by order of the Land League?" I come now to another class of Returns asked for by the noble Lord, Returns which should not be given, because they involve a slur upon Her Majesty's military forces in Ireland. I refer to the Return of cases of soldiers accused of complicity with riotous attacks on the police, illegal drilling, or acts of disloyalty. No doubt, one or two of these Returns might be given without any difficulty; but I think I have given sufficient reason why it would be perfectly impossible to give many of them. There would be no difficulty in giving the number of bailiffs or officers killed, wounded, or maltreated in the execution of their duty, for instance. The noble Lord asks for a Return as to the seizure of arms; but we could not give such a Return, because, since the expiration of the Peace Preservation Act, there has been no seizure of arms, because no licence is required for keeping arms. No doubt, Her Majesty's Government could give Returns of the Land League meetings prohibited by the Lord Lieutenant, and of the Circular of Mr. Forster. If the noble Lord would be content with those, and will move for them, I shall be happy to agree to them; but, otherwise, I must ask your Lordships to refuse the Motion which the noble Lord makes.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—INSURRECTION OF THE BOERS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord BRABOURNE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the telegram may be accepted as authentic which describes the massacre of a large number of British soldiers by the insurgent Boers of the Transvaal; and, whether he has any fuller information upon the subject than has appeared in the newspapers? The noble Lord furfurther said, that a considerable portion of the Press was endeavouring very earnestly to convince the public mind of two things—In the first place, that the annexation of the Transvaal was a thing wrong and unjustifiable; and, in the second place, that the Transvaal Boers were a quiet, well-disposed, peaceable, inoffensive, and respectable sort of people, who had been unjustly deprived of their independence by England, and who were now engaged in attempting to regain it by efforts which should command our sympathy and approval. With regard to the first point, he had nothing then to say, except to remark that he believed now, as he had done at the time, that with the information before him, and under the circumstances, the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) took a course which it would have been most difficult for any British Minister to have avoided taking. If that step had not been taken, it was more than possible that the Transvaal would have been in a very much worse condition than it was at the present moment. But as to the second point, he was most anxious that the public mind should be disabused of that which was being so earnestly pressed upon it by a portion of the public Press. It was rather more than 10 years since he (Lord Brabourne) went as Under Secretary of State to the Colonial Office. It happened to be his duty to pay special attention to South African affairs, and he began with being rather prepossessed in favour of the Transvaal Boers than otherwise. But he had gradually become convinced by an overwhelming mass of evidence that it was most consistent with the truth to form a very different and much less favourable estimate of the character of these Boers than that which was now presented to the British public. There were two prominent characteristics of the Boers which ought not to be forgotten by the people of this country, and which from time to time had caused them to break away from British rule. The first was an insatiable desire to hold land possessed by the Natives, and in seeking to gratify that desire they had, he feared, too frequently adopted means which no British Government could have sanctioned. The other characteristic was their determination to preserve among their institutions what they called the domestic institution of slavery. One charge against the Boers, often made and supported by much evidence, was that of cruelty and oppressive conduct towards the Natives. If the statement in the telegram regarding the attack on the detachment of the 94th were true, it threw some light upon the character of the Boers as regarded cruelty. The story was that as a convoy of the 94th regiment were marching, they were met by two men, who summoned them to surrender. No British officer could possibly obey such a summons when, not only had he no knowledge of the presence of a superior enemy, but no reason to suppose that there was any enemy, or any state of war, since none had been proclaimed. Thereupon, after the lapse of two minutes, the ambushed Boers opened fire and shot down in cold blood near upon a hundred British soldiers. He (Lord Brabourne) did not know the diplomatic language in which to describe this transaction; but to him it appeared that, if the statement as he had given it was correct, it was as wanton, cruel, perfidious, and barbarous a massacre as was ever perpetrated. He did not wish to throw any blame upon what the Government had done, for in the Speech from the Throne, and in the despatch which had been presented to them that morning—containing Sir Hercules Robinson's instructions — expressions were used which showed that the Government were fully aware of the emergency of the case, and were fully determined that the authority of the Crown should be vindicated before they considered what the future of the Transvaal should be. He trusted that the noble Lord might be able to contradict the statements in the telegram to which he had referred; but if not, he hoped the Government would succeed in bringing to condign punishment all who had planned and perpetrated as atrocious an act of massacre as had ever disgraced Colonial history. Before he sat down, he would remark that the recent appointment of Mr. Courtney—who had identified himself with the cause of the Boers—to the Under Secretaryship of State of the Home Department, had been interpreted by some people as indicating the views of Her Majesty's Ministers upon this question; but he was certain that the qualifications of Mr. Courtney were such as amply justified the appointment without any reference to Transvaal policy, and that none such was intended.

VISCOUNT BURY wished to ask a further Question as to the murder, or at any rate the destruction, of Captain Elliott, of the 94th Regiment, when he, in company with another officer belonging to the 21st, was crossing the Vaal river. He did not know exactly whence they were coming, or whither they were going. The first telegram said that they were on parole, and were being escorted across to Natal; but since then there had been an intimation in some portion of the Press that they were making their way in defiance of their parole, to another part of the Transvaal. He should like to hear this latter statement contradicted, if his noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley) could do so, because the assertion which had been made cast an imputation upon two British officers?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, in reply, said, he hoped his noble Friend (Lord Brabourne), and their Lordships as well, would excuse him if, upon that occasion, he declined entering upon the general subject of the annexation of the Transvaal, which certainly was not raised by the Notice of his noble Friend, though he (Lord Brabourne) opened it in putting the Question to which that Notice was confined. This was a simple Question, and, although it was a subject that would have to be discussed, he thought it would not be fair that there should be a general discussion on so serious a subject without due Notice to all the Members of their Lordships' House. He was deeply sensible of the gravity and importance of the matter, and he would be only too glad if he were able to give their Lordships any further information as to that painful affair the subject of the telegram; but the Colonial Office was not in possession of any. He could only say, in answer to the first part of his noble Friend's Question, that, though he had no further intelligence on the subject, he had no reason to doubt that the information in the telegram was correct. On the subject of the inquiry of his noble Friend the noble Viscount (Viscount Bury), he was sorry to say also that his answer was of the same nature. He knew nothing whatever on the subject except the information which had already appeared in the newspapers. He need scarcely say that whenever the Government received full and complete information it would be made known to the House.

NAVY—LOSS OF H.M.S. "ATALANTA"—REPORT AND EVIDENCE OF THE COMMITTEE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he will lay on the Table the evidence taken before the Committee appointed to inquire into the loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta," together with the report based upon that evidence? In doing so, the noble Viscount said, that there was an impression abroad that the evidence cast aspersions upon some distinguished naval officers, and those officers very naturally thought that full information upon the subject should be afforded, seeing that they looked upon them as hasty and unjustifiable.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK, in reply, said, that the Papers had been placed upon the Table last Thursday.

House adjourned at Six o'clock,
to Thursday next,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 11*th January*, 1881.

QUESTIONS.

IRELAND—THE PORT OF DUBLIN—DUES ON ROUGH TIMBER.

Mr. BROADHURST asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to the heavy dues imposed on rough timber entering the port of Dublin, and to the hindrances those dues are to the Dublin trades; and, if so, whether the Government is prepared to adopt measures with a view to the abolition of the said dues?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, no representation has been made to the Government on the subject. The Board is authorized by Act of Parliament to levy such rates, and the rates charged are within the discretion of the Port and Docks Board. It is not, therefore, in the power of the Government to interfere in the matter.

IRELAND—PRESENTMENT SESSIONS.

Colonel COLTHURST asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Lord Lieutenant has still the power to convene extraordinary Presentment Sessions; and, if not, whether he will introduce a Bill to obtain such power?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, the power given to the Lord Lieutenant in this respect expired on the 31st December last. There is, however, still power under the 13th and 14th sections of the Relief of Distress Amendment Act to convene such sessions to enable any barony to give a guarantee in favour of a railway or other public company. For the information of hon. Members, I may add that in the month of December just passed, the Lord Lieutenant authorized the convening of such sessions in 45 baronies, in 12 Irish counties, and I do not think it is necessary or advisable to introduce any further measures on the subject this Session.

HIGHWAYS ACTS—ACCOUNTS OF SURVEYORS OF HIGHWAYS.

Mr. STANHOPE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he intends to take any steps to amend the inconvenient forms of accounts at present required to be filled up by surveyors of highways in country districts?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, in framing these accounts, the Board endeavoured to do so in as simple a form as possible consistently with the requirements of the Highway Acts, which are very minute, and were previously much disregarded. The forms had to be adapted to large as well as small parishes, and careful provision had to be made for separating the expenditure on main roads from that on ordinary highways for the protection of the county authorities. The auditors have now had nearly a year's experience of the working of the new forms, and the Board are now in communication with some of them in the hope of being able to dispense with some of the forms.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE ORANGE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. BELLINGHAM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to a series of resolutions drawn up by the Orange Association, and duly published in the Irish papers, in one of which the members of the Association were instructed to arm, and what steps Her Majesty's Government intend to take in the matter?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I cannot say that the resolutions in question have come under my official knowledge; but I am aware that both the members of Orange Associations and other persons in Ireland have, I am sorry to say, been requested by different parties to secure arms. I can only regret that such is the case. The Government intend to introduce a Bill, of which I have given Notice, to amend the law relating to the carrying and possession of arms. We do not intend to take any other steps in the matter.

THE FRENCH MARRIAGE LAW.

Mr. LEWIS FRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in accordance with the intimation made to the House on the 24th of August last by the late Under Secretary, he has considered whether any means can be devised for making the provisions of the French Marriage Law more widely known in this Country, and thus to some extent preventing the recurrence of the evils which have arisen from ignorance of such provisions on the part of British subjects?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes, Sir, in consultation with the Lord Chancellor, a Paper has been drawn up on this subject, and has been sent to the President of the Local Government Board with the view of its being submitted to the Registrar General.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS—DULWICH COLLEGE.

MR. CHARLES ROUNDELL asked the Vice President of the Council, What explanation can be given by the Chief Charity Commissioner of the delay in preparing a fresh Scheme for Dulwich College, the previous Scheme having been disallowed by an Order in Council in the year 1876?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, I am informed that the delay in preparing a fresh Scheme for Dulwich College is to be greatly attributed to the death, in July last, of Mr. Hammond, the Assistant Commissioner, who had charge of the case, in consequence of which it became necessary to place the case in fresh hands, with the result that the entire Scheme had to be re-discussed with the Assistant Commissioner. I am informed that the Scheme has now been minutely revised throughout, and will be sent to the Governors in a few days in anticipation of its submission to the Committee of Council on Education.

LAW AND POLICE—CASE OF THOMAS TITLEY.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to the evidence given by the police in the trial of Thomas Titley at the Central Criminal Court on the 16th December 1880; and, whether it is the intention of the Crown to prosecute Inspector O'Callaghan and Sergeant Stroud for conspiring to incite Titley to commit an indictable offence?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, the Question is a very serious one, and if I am to answer it at all, I must ask the indulgence of the House while I go into some detail in the case, because anything that affects the character and conduct of the police is a matter which seriously concerns society. In the first place, I think, I ought to state the information of which the police were in possession before they practised the artifice by which the conviction was obtained against Titley. In July last the police were informed by Mr. Taylor, a medical assistant at the Provident Dispensary, who called voluntarily at Bow Street, that Titley was in the habit of procuring abortion, and that he had supplied a quantity of materials for that purpose. Mr. Taylor also said that Titley was a man of depraved character. Mr. Taylor was asked by the police to procure evidence to lead to the conviction of Titley. In October he brought with him a Mr. Morgan, who had been assistant to Titley, and who deposed to having found the dead body of an infant in chloride of lime in Titley's cellar. The police used every method to obtain such evidence as would lead to a conviction, but failed. In November last, having absolute knowledge that Titley was committing these crimes, but being unable to obtain evidence sufficient, they determined to have recourse to the artifice of which mention has been made. I will not detain the House by referring in detail to the plan they adopted. All I will say is, that the evidence left no doubt in the minds of the police that Titley had been in the habit of practising these crimes on an extensive scale for a long time past. I regret that the police should have decided upon the course to which they resorted without advising the Home Office on the subject. I only became acquainted with it on the eve of the trial. Like other people, I was startled when I was informed of it, and I asked for a report on the matter. The police then stated that the course which they had pursued was founded on a case almost identical in circumstances, and which had received the sanction of the Home Office. The case alluded to occurred in 1871, and it was a prosecution of two persons named De Baddeley. It was tried at the Central Criminal Court before the then Common Serjeant, the very Judge before whom Titley's Case came.

During the proceedings an objection similar to that in Titley's case was raised. Before giving judgment the Common Serjeant took the precaution of consulting the late Chief Justice Bovill and Baron Channell, and, in the result, the objection was overruled. Thus, the police in Titley's case acted upon a precedent which received the sanction of the Judges and the Home Office; and I, therefore, answer the first Question of the hon. Member by saying that, under the circumstances, it certainly would be impossible for me to direct a prosecution of the police. The House will be more interested in learning what is to be done in this class of cases for the future. They are amongst the most painful and difficult cases that can exercise the discretion of those who are responsible for the prevention of crime. There are dangers on both sides. In the first place, there is the danger that while the police may be in possession of information that crimes most mischievous to society are being committed, these crimes may be difficult, if not impossible, of detection by ordinary means. As the Judge who tried this very case said, it was often exceedingly difficult to get evidence, because persons who committed crime were persons who concealed crime. The other day the police had information that another man had been carrying on practices similar to those of Titley, but they had insufficient evidence to prosecute. Subsequently, both the woman and the child died, and a prosecution will now follow; but that is a prosecution which will have cost two lives, the loss of which might have been prevented if the prosecution could have been undertaken at any earlier date. Then there is the other danger, that the confidence of the public may be shaken in the good faith of the police; and of all the evils that could occur that would be the greatest. I have no hesitation in stating my opinion that the cases in which it is necessary or justifiable for the police to resort to artifice of the description practised in this case must be rare indeed. As a rule, the police ought not to set traps for people; but if there is to be a departure from this rule under extraordinary circumstances, the matter is one of such difficulty that the discretion ought not to rest with the police authorities. I have accordingly directed that no such methods shall be resorted to for the future without direct communication or authority from the Home Office, the responsibility being one which, in my opinion, the Secretary of State ought not, in the interest of the public, to shrink from.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will take steps to ensure to this House an opportunity of discussing the Order in Council, abolishing the offices of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Chief Baron, recently laid upon the Table of the House, before that order shall become law?

Mr. GLADSTONE, in reply, said, that this was a grave question, which had a claim on their consideration when it became necessary to deal with it. The Order had been on the Table only four days, and as 25 days had had yet to elapse before it became law, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be so kind as to communicate with him so that the subject might be discussed at a time that might be convenient.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—PARSONSTOWN MODEL SCHOOL.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any complaint has been made to him by Mr. Thomas Fitzpatrick, late Head Master of the Parsonstown Model School, with reference to the examination of the pupils of that school December 1878; whether Mr. Fitzpatrick has made any request for inquiry into the circumstances under which the joint report of the Head and District Inspectors thereon was made to the Board of National Education; whether it is true that Mr. Head Inspector John Molloy conducted the oral examination of the senior classes of the boys' department while confined by illness to his bed-room, and attended by a doctor; and, whether this circumstance was communicated to the Commissioners of National Education by Messrs. Molloy and Dugan in their joint report above referred to?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: This case has been brought under my notice, and Mr. Fitzpatrick has, I understand, requested that a Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into it. It is true that the Inspector did conduct the examination whilst he was confined by illness to his room, and the fact was duly reported by the Inspector himself to the Board of Education at the time of occurrence.

TREATY OF WASHINGTON—THE HALIFAX FISHERY COMMISSION.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can give the House any information with respect to the allegations lately made in the House of Representatives at Washington as to the alleged fraudulent testimony brought before the Halifax Commission; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have reasons to believe that there is the slightest foundation for these allegations?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The allegations in question are, no doubt, the same as those which my right hon. Friend will remember were made to the late Government some time ago, and were found by them to be undeserving of serious attention.

STATE OF IRELAND—IMPRISONMENT OF LAND LEAGUERS IN TRALEE GAOL.

MR. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the visiting committee of Tralee Gaol have assembled since the arrest and imprisonment of several members of the Tralee Land League; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with the rules for local prisons in Ireland, sub-section 1, rule 22, the committee have permitted these prisoners to occupy a separate room or cell specially fitted for such prisoners, and furnished with suitable bedding and other articles in addition to or different from those furnished for ordinary cells; whether they have been permitted to exercise with each other in accordance with sub-section 2, rule 22, which provides that untried prisoners shall be permitted to exercise with selected untried prisoners; whether they have been permitted to have at their own cost, in accordance with sub-section 3, rule 22, the use of private furniture and utensils suitable to their ordinary habits; whether, in accordance with sub-section 4, rule 22, they have been relieved from the performance of any unaccustomed tasks or offices; whether, in accordance with rule 23, the visiting committee have permitted the governor to modify the routine of the prison in regard to these prisoners, so as to dispense with practices which are clearly unnecessary in their cases; whether, in accordance with rule 24, the visiting committee have permitted these prisoners to have supplied to them books, newspapers, or other means of occupation other than those furnished by the prison, and whether such books and newspapers have been supplied; and, whether, in accordance with rule 25, these prisoners have been permitted to supply their own food?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that Notice of these Questions was only given yesterday, and he then stated to the hon. Member that it would be impossible for him to answer the Questions in detail till time had been given to the authorities in Dublin to obtain information. He might observe, however, that as the authorities had communicated to him that the prisoners complained that they were not properly accommodated a telegram was despatched early this morning to Dublin directing that instructions should be at once given to the Prisons Board that their personal requirements should be attended to as far as possible.

MR. PARNELL said, perhaps he might be allowed to explain the reason why he put the Questions. ["Order!"] He knew that, as a rule, giving short Notice of Questions was a very undesirable thing to do; but, by experience, he had found in similar cases of arrests of political prisoners in Ireland——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is going beyond the limits of an explanation.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not wish to go beyond the limits of an explanation, and he did not wish to conclude with a Motion. He should, therefore, accept the ruling of the Chair. At the same time, he begged to give Notice that he should put the Questions tomorrow, as he thought the matter should be attended to at once.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, it would not be possible for him to answer them to-morrow. The hon. Member might repeat the Questions on Thursday. The hon. Member was aware that Tralee was some distance from Dublin, and they were not Questions on which incomplete answers could be given.

MR. PARNELL asked, Whether the right hon. Gentleman would have any objection to issue a Circular to the prison authorities pointing out how their duties were to be performed?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, the Government were anxious that there should be no interference with the comfort of prisoners who were waiting for trial beyond what was necessary for their safe custody, and if he found that such a Circular should be issued it would be issued.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

MR. M'COAN asked the Postmaster General, If he has received from the Telegraphic Staff of the Irish Post Office a memorial complaining of the inadequacy of their pay and the conditions affecting their promotion; and if he is prepared to grant any, and what, redress for the grievances of the memorialists?

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, I think the Memorial to which the hon. Member refers is one which has been addressed to me by the telegraphists in the Dublin Post Office, and I may say that I have received similar Memorials from all the important Provincial towns in England and Scotland. These Memorials complain of the position of the officers in those towns both in regard to promotion and pay. I had an opportunity of publicly stating last week that these Memorials are now engaging my most careful consideration, and I now repeat what I said then. I can assure the hon. Member and the House that no effort will be spared by me to arrive at a just conclusion on the matter.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—THE ORANGE FREE STATE.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the telegram in a morning paper that the Boers had entered Zeerust, to the west of the Transvaal, is correct; and whether he can give any information on the subject of another telegram respecting the attitude of the Boers in the Orange Free State?

MR. GRANT DUFF: In reply to my hon. and learned Friend's first Question, I have to say that there would appear to be, as might be expected, some disturbances in the district to which he alludes. In reply to his second Question, I have to say that the telegram from the President of the Orange Free State, which has appeared in the papers of to-day, is quite authentic.

IRELAND—THE STATE TRIALS IN DUBLIN.

MR. BIGGAR begged to ask the First Lord of the Treasury a Question of which he had given him Notice—namely, How much longer he intends to allow the evidence of police constables to be tendered on the trials now going on in Dublin, each one examined having so far acknowledged themselves incompetent to take a correct report?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am obliged to the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) for giving me Notice of his Question; but, at the same time, I hope that the House will not give encouragement to the practice of putting Questions in regard to proceedings actually going on in Courts of Law, and I am not sure whether the matter is made better or worse by the fact that the hon. Member himself has a special interest in those proceedings. I will, however, this time, with the permission of the House, answer the Question. ["No!"] I think if I left the Question to be reported without the answer, I might do more harm than by answering it. I must begin by stating that I entirely demur to the assumption involved in the Question that hitherto the policemen examined so far have acknowledged themselves incompetent to make a correct report. Now, so far as my information goes, which I have every reason to believe is accurate, not one of the policemen so examined has acknowledged himself so to be incompetent. And not only with regard to the witnesses, but as far as respects the Government who are responsible for producing them, there is not one of them as to whom we make that admission. On the contrary, I believe that one or two attempts were made to disparage those witnesses by showing their incompetency, and those attempts proved so unsatisfactory in their issue that they were entirely abandoned by those who at first made them. This really is a question intended to act indirectly on the effect of the testimony given at the trial; and I cannot sit down without saying that as this, I believe, is the first time, so I hope it will be the last, when Questions of this kind are put in this House.

MR. BIGGAR (who was received with cries of "Oh!" and "Order!") said, he intended to conclude with a Motion, that he might have an opportunity of stating what he knew personally of this matter, and of showing that the Prime Minister had evidently been misinformed as to the facts.

MR. PEASE appealed to the Speaker whether it was in Order for any hon. Member to refer to trials now proceeding in which he was personally concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: I leave it to the discretion of the hon. Member to take what course he thinks proper. At the same time, I am bound to say that animadversions on proceedings in the Courts of Law in matters now pending seem to me very improper. I ought to point out an irregularity which has occurred on the part of the hon. Member, because he brought up the Question, which he has now put, yesterday, and was informed by the Clerk at the Table that such a Question would be irregular; and I am surprised that, after an intimation of that kind, the hon. Member should have thought it right to put his Question in the House.

MR. BIGGAR said, he was always anxious to conform to any suggestions made by the Speaker, and, in deference to the suggestion that had been made, he should accordingly pursue the subject no further. He begged leave to say, however, that the right hon. Gentleman was completely misinformed as to the facts of the case. He also gave Notice that when the Estimates with reference to these trials came on he should bring up the whole question.

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT—ORDER OF BUSINESS.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I beg to move the Motion of which I have given Notice—namely,

"That the Notices of Motion be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty."

I think it right, in making that Motion, to say that there is, I apprehend, nothing in the nature of a Resolution or Standing Order of this House on the subject. At the same time, there is, as far as I am aware, a pretty constant and unbroken usage. I remember three conspicuous cases of this kind; one in 1830, within my own experience; one in 1833, when there was a debate of four days not having reference to any matter that was of urgency for the moment, because the Bill relating to Ireland was not brought into the House of Commons, but into the House of Lords, and, therefore, there was not any urgency for debating the Address, yet the debate was carried on from day to day; one in 1835, when there was an Amendment to the Address, and the debate was carried on three days consecutively; and, lastly, in 1841, when there was an Amendment to the Address, and there, again, the debate was carried on consecutively for four days. Although there is no Rule on the subject, there certainly is a practice, and I think that practice is obviously dictated by a certain sense of propriety that always governs this House in its proceedings. When we are about to convey an assurance to the foot of the Throne at the commencement of the Session — not an assurance pledging ourselves to adopt any particular course upon any matter that may come before us, but an assurance merely pledging us to give a serious and respectful attention to whatever matters Her Majesty may propose for our consideration—there is a feeling that that is Business of a nature that ought to be despatched before we proceed to deal with the general Business of the country. I therefore now make the Motion which stands on the Paper in my name.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not intend to oppose the Motion, because he recognized the importance of the debate in which they had been engaged for some days past being proceeded with as far as possible uninterruptedly. He and his hon. Friends claimed for themselves nothing more than the right of putting their case before the House, and, through that means, before the public of England. They recognized that the

Prime Minister had not up to the present time shown any disposition to prevent their having that opportunity. They trusted that, in return for the concessions they made to the right hon. Gentleman in surrendering a private Members' night, he would continue to give them a full opportunity for a fair discussion of that question. They were convinced, from the antecedents of the right hon. Gentleman, that he would not refuse them that right.

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Notices of Motions be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty.—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, eight months had elapsed since the hearts of all hon. Members sitting on that side of the House, and of a great many on the other side, as well, he thought, as the hearts of all the people of the Kingdom who loved the liberty of their fellow-subjects, were moved and gratified by the announcement in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of this Parliament that Her Majesty's Government did not consider it necessary to renew the measure of coercion under which the Irish people had previously been labouring. The terms in which the gracious announcement was made had not been referred to during that debate; and, as they were rather peculiar and significant, he would, with the permission of the House, read the sentence which referred to the Peace Preservation Act. In the Queen's Speech which was delivered eight months ago Her Majesty said—

> "The Peace Preservation Act for Ireland expires on the 1st of June. You will not be asked to renew it. My desire to avoid the evil of exceptional legislation in abridgement of liberty would not induce me to forego in any degree the performance of the first duty of every Government in providing for the security of life and property. But while determined to fulfil this sacred obligation, I am persuaded that the loyalty and good sense of my Irish subjects will justify me in relying on the provisions of the ordinary law, firmly administered, for the maintenance of peace and order."

The case of the Government now was that the Irish people had not responded to that appeal; that the ordinary law had not sufficed to preserve the peace of that portion of Her Majesty's Dominions. On the contrary, they had the sad and, he would say, the humiliating statement brought before them by the Executive Government that agrarian crimes had multiplied in Ireland far beyond the experience of previous years; that the administration of justice had been frustrated by the impossibility of procuring evidence; and that an extended system of terror had been established in various parts of the country, which paralyzed the exercise of almost all private rights, and the performance of civil duties. He was not one of those who could find it in his conscience to stand there and palliate in the slightest degree what had taken place in Ireland during the past eight months. It was impossible, he thought, for any man who valued truth above everything else to deny that in various parts of the country a reign of terror had been established which abrogated all the ordinary rights of private individuals. He was not curious to inquire how many reported agrarian outrages had been found, on inquiry, to be absolute outrages. He was quite aware that in newspapers, particularly in the present day, sensational paragraphs commended themselves to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. He was also aware that there might be malignant persons who invented outrages for the purpose of bringing discredit upon their fellow-countrymen; but, setting aside with a most liberal hand all these sensational statements, he could not for his life deny that in Ireland at this moment a reign of terror did exist, That reign of terror was not confined simply to those in a superior position in life, but extended in many places to the payers of rent, to the occupiers of land, to the shopkeepers, and others. But, in making that admission, he thought he was entitled to ask whether the promise of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech of the 20th of May had been kept; whether the ordinary law had been administered firmly for the maintenance of the peace? He was also entitled to ask whether the course which was now proposed to them by Her Majesty's Government was that which was most likely to restore order? He could not help answering both those questions in the negative. He believed Her Majesty's Government had administered the law in Ireland in a weak and faltering spirit. He believed, moreover, that the amount of ignorance of the provisions of the present law that had been displayed in the administration of it in Ireland was something astounding. He was not going to make an indictment against Her Majesty's Government, because he was quite willing to make this admission in their favour. He did not think there was ever a Government came into Office which was more inclined to do ample justice to the Irish people than the Government of which the right hon. Gentleman was at the head; but he would go further and say there never was a Government that sat upon either side of the House that was so badly used when it did come into Office. What happened? The Irish people, through their Representatives, having had ample experience of what Tory government meant during six years, determined at the General Election to sink all their peculiar questions, to merge everything in the one object of returning a Liberal Government to power. [Mr. PARNELL: No, no!] For that purpose the great organization called the Home Rule Confederation issued its directions for the management of elections in England to this effect—that no question respecting Home Rule and their peculiar test as to providing for inquiry into the nature of the demands of the Irish people for Home Rule should be put, and they recommended that everything should be done to return a Liberal Government. That also was the desire of the Irish people, and it was founded on the experience which they had undergone for six years past; but the moment the Government was framed, there opened on that side of the House batteries of obstruction and of misrepresentation such as he thought any generous-hearted man could not have commanded. It appeared to him that everything that the Government desired to do was misrepresented, everything they could possibly do was declined, and that the one object of hon. Gentlemen opposite was to discredit the Liberal Administration which they had just returned, and to prevent them from getting an opportunity of fulfilling any one of their promises. So strongly did he feel this, that in the month of July he ventured to write to the great journal of Ireland, *The Freeman's Journal*, a letter in which he stated before the Irish people that it appeared to him that the object of a number of gentlemen was to worry the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government to death. Within a fortnight of that time the right hon. Gentleman was struck down with the illness which filled the whole nation with grief, and which was occasioned by the strain put upon him by the conduct to which he was subjected by those who professed to be his friends. He was free to admit that the Government made great mistakes at that time. He thought that the Chief Secretary for Ireland made a mistake, for which he ought not readily to be forgiven, in again giving a subsidy to the Irish landlords. If only a portion of that additional £750,000 of Irish money had been lent to the Irish tenants to assist in developing their holdings, he believed an impression would have been made on Ireland most beneficial to the order and security of the nation. Then, again, in another instance the Government made a gigantic blunder when they issued their Land Commission, and did not place upon it tenant farmers in whose interest Land Reform was required. They refused to make the smallest concession in this matter. They constituted their Commission without the first element which ought to have been in it. It was the play of *Hamlet* with Hamlet left out. The late Government, in constituting its Commission, took care to put tenant farmers of all the three countries upon it; but it was reserved for a Liberal Government to refuse the request made to them by those who had been inclined to put the best construction upon their motives and actions. The question next arose, had the laws been enforced with firmness and vigour, and, at the same time, moderately? The right hon. Gentleman, the other night, appeared to desire to vindicate his administration of justice in Ireland, especially with regard to the police. He told them especially that some suggestions which were made to him as to the employment of mounted police or soldiers for patrol duty in rural districts were, as he thought, quite absurd. If he did not actually use the word absurd, he left that impression upon those who communicated with him upon the point. What was going on in Ireland at that time? There was an agitation amongst tenants to make them discontented with the bountiful harvest which Providence placed in their hands, and for which their hearts were full of gratitude, and to make them feel that the Government and Parliament had no desire to redress their wrongs. The administration of the law was so much relaxed in Ireland that he could only liken what took place in the country to a barring out in a public school. It seemed to him that the people thoroughly enjoyed at the time the opportunity of putting the law at defiance. They were never interfered with in any of their night meetings which were held in various parts of the country. They were never interfered with or warned against accumulating rifles and guns and revolvers, and firing them off to the fright of Her Majesty's subjects. All that was done was this—the police in Ireland continued their ordinary duties, and protection was given to individuals who applied for it, and who were willing to be guarded by policemen walking by their side night and morning with loaded revolvers. The ordinary duties of the Irish police were to patrol the roads in day time and take up wandering pigs and cows. Most of the summonses that were adjudicated on at the police petty sessions were of that trivial character. The object of the Government should have been to have prevented the people getting the habit of assembling at night for secret and unlawful purposes. It was not that they should have endeavoured to detect them at the time, but to prevent the habit of assembling by employing horse patrols at night. He felt convinced that in the South and West many men would thus have been prevented falling into unhappy courses, and by secret meetings at night bringing themselves, in all probability, very nearly within reach of the law. The most extraordinary exhibition of the administration of law in Ireland was, he thought, that great expedition to relieve Captain Boycott in Mayo. It was almost incredible that Her Majesty's Government should have sent down a large army composed of all branches of Her Majesty's troops to reap a few turnips and crops and take care of a few head of cattle belonging to a gentleman who had been treated most unjustly by his neighbours. That system of putting individuals into a state of excommunication was hateful and abominable. There was nothing, he verily believed, that so intensified the feelings of the people of this country as the system which was called by the hateful name of Boycotting, and which signalized the reign of the Land League in Ireland. There was something so repulsive, so mean, in urging on individuals not so well educated as hon. Gentlemen who had been urging on that system of Boycotting, to render miserable the lives of individuals to whom they had an objection. But he wanted to know where was the Government's knowledge of the Trades' Unions Act during all this time? How was it that they were now putting in operation the Trades' Union Act, and, he would venture to say, not without success? The truth was that the Irish Executive had not been accustomed to look to the ordinary law for the enforcement of order in Ireland. They always looked to some special enactment, and the moment the Peace Preservation Act was permitted to expire the whole Castle officials appeared to be at their wits' end, and did not know how to keep order in the country. He would read a section of the Trades' Union Act. The Act was an Act to prevent conspiracy and to afford protection to property, and was passed in 1875. [The hon. Member then read a section of the Act, which brought within its penalties any person compelling another person to abstain from doing what he might lawfully do, or to do that from which he might lawfully abstain, and any person who used threats or intimidation, or followed another from place to place, or kept watch over him in his house or his place of business for such purposes.]

If that Act had been put in operation in a vigorous manner it would have entirely put an end to this system of Boycotting. The Act was specially applicable to Ireland, and the peculiar Courts existing in that country were armed with a special jurisdiction for carrying the Act into effect. Before, therefore, being called upon to put fresh power in the hands of the Government for the repression of outrage, he thought they were entitled to ask, Had that Act been tried in Ireland? If not, why not? If it had been tried, when did it commence to be tried, and when did the Government learn that it existed? He was not going to criticize the conduct of the Government in a hostile spirit, but with the wish and hope of rousing them to a knowledge of the real situation of affairs. He was going, if they would permit him, to give them his advice as to the course they should pursue in this instance. He thought the Government knew as well as any man possibly could what was the cause of all this outrage in Ireland. They knew that it was the miserable condition of the great mass of the people; they knew the starvation of the South and West; they knew the insecurity of the Irish tenants with regard to the enjoyment of the fruits of their toil. Her Majesty's Government, when they called together that House, should not, it appeared to him, have made that vague and unsatisfactory reference to the Land Act of 1870; but the Government should have come forward and stated—"We adopt the principles that were laid down in the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster at Birmingham, and we pledge ourselves to carry out these principles in the reform of the Land Laws." Had the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government made such a declaration, and appealed to the Irish people to save him, to save the Liberal Party, to save them all from the shame and disgrace of resorting to coercive legislation after a period only of eight months' liberty, he believed that that appeal would have been attended with success. He believed that the Irish people would have responded to a generous appeal of that kind. If, however, an appeal of that character had failed, the right hon. Gentleman might then have appealed to the House for fresh powers. Now, however, the Government were going to put fetters upon the people, without recognizing the cause of the disease. Surely it did not require anything more than a conversation with the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy to make the Cabinet know what was really the matter with the Irish people. He (Mr. Mitchell Henry) was one of those who had refused to join the Land League, because he refused to tell the Irish people, as they had been told during the past year, that Parliament would not redress their wrongs. On the contrary, in refusing the invitations to attend land meetings, he had invariably, in the most open and candid manner, not made excuses, such as that he was engaged, or that he was about to take a journey, or something of that kind, as a good many other people had done, but he told them that he felt he ought not to attend those meetings, saying that he believed the Government would redress their wrongs. There was a Government now in power, he said, which contained within it those who had always proved themselves the best friends of the Irish people; and he pledged himself, as he would pledge himself for a particular matter in his own person, that they would right their wrongs. What, however, distressed him more than anything else had been the incredulity with which that statement had been received. He had found everywhere among the peasants of Ireland a firm belief that the House of Commons did not wish to do them justice. They believed that the object of the English Government was, in truth, to drive them into the sea. He could not disguise the fact that that was the prevailing impression amongst the Irish tenants. However he might condemn it, however absurd he knew it to be, yet they would never overcome that impression until the House of Commons rose to the occasion, and by Acts of Parliament and by deeds proved to them that it was false. They had often read in the papers during the past few months a wish that a certain gentleman who was called Chinese Gordon, who had been celebrated for pacifying the centre of Africa, should be sent to Ireland for the purpose of administering the law there. Well, Chinese Gordon went to Ireland, and the man who was sent to curse remained to bless. The man that was sent there with the idea that he would see nothing but a disorderly crowd of savages wrote a letter to *The Times*, in which he stated that in all his wanderings he had never seen people so wretched, so ill-clothed, so ill-housed, so ill-fed as many of the Irish peasants. He (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had himself told the House how, for months and months in every year, a large portion of their fellow-subjects depended for their sustenance upon boiled seaweed, sprinkled with raw Indian meal. That was not the case in periods of famine alone. It was habitual, and they hardly knew a better diet. What were they going to do with these people? Were they going, because through bad influence and advice they had committed outrages in very considerable numbers—["No, no!"]—he would not dispute the question with his hon. Friends opposite; but he confessed that he thought the number of outrages committed was considerable. It was an undoubted fact that for the purpose of intimidation things had been done which were entirely foreign to the Irish character. It was, also, an undoubted fact that in a great number of parishes in Ireland there was a secret organization under the auspices of the Land League. ["No, no!"] [Mr. PARNELL: The organization of the Land League is not secret.] He (Mr. Mitchell Henry) was glad to hear that the organization was not secret; but he would tell hon. Members what he meant by secret. He knew several instances in which influence was exercised upon tenants in the same manner as upon the tenants of Colonel King-Harman the other day. He knew instances of tenants who had gone to pay their rents, but who had been met by someone deputed by the Land League who advised them not to pay. Such were the proceedings to which he applied the term secrecy. He believed that in most parishes in Ireland the people had been told, not as had been publicly stated to pay Griffith's valuation, but not to pay any rent at all. He knew himself that the tenants believed that that was what they should do, and he knew also that at that moment there were families of landlords in Ireland as well educated and respectable as any person sitting in that House, who hardly knew where to look for their daily bread. The banks, as had been stated, might well be overflowing with deposits, when, according to the hon. Member (Mr. Parnell), £5,000,000 were kept from certain persons who, in common honesty, ought to get at least some of it. That was done under the advice of responsible Members of that House. Anyone who listened to the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), who was at the head of this association, and contrasted it with advice which he had been giving to the people of Ireland day after day, would have believed that they were not listening to the same person. When he saw the hon. Member coming into the House, and when he knew what he had said out of it, he felt inclined to say to him—"Bless thee, Bottom, bless thee, thou art translated." The hon. Member had been advising the unfortunate people that if they stuck fast, not only to the land, but to the bountiful harvest which Almighty God had given them, they would eventually achieve for themselves the possession of that property which at present, at any rate, was shared with somebody else. He had not the slightest objection. On the contrary, he wished that the Irish people should become in much larger numbers owners of their holdings. He wished the evils of land tenure to be put an end to; but what he complained of was that those things which the late Isaac Butt and his Colleagues as well as the Bishops and priests of Ireland recommended for the achievement of Land Reform were being frustrated by the conduct of hon. Members of the House. He had seen himself the change that had taken place in the feelings of the English and Scotch people towards Ireland within the past six or eight months; that change was the substitution of a very bitter feeling for the benevolent sentiments prevalent eight months ago. But he appealed to hon. Members not to permit the Irish people to be judged by the words of those who had recently been their mouthpieces. The Irish people were not ungrateful; and he believed that if the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government would rise to the height of the occasion, and would produce for the Irish people a charter of their liberties, in the shape of giving them fixity of tenure in their homes, this present agitation would at once subside. He did not believe in the power even of hon. Members opposite or of the Land League to make the Irish people dishonest. He believed they would rise in the future, as they had in the past, to the conception that there was something higher than the daily bread which they ate. They would remember that they had to account not only to their fellow-man, but to God who created them. The greatest boast of the Irish people during ages of persecution had been a firm belief in a happier future and a happier home hereafter than they had been permitted to enjoy here. The Government was about to deprive them of that hope, because they would deprive them of their self-respect, and when they deprived them of their self-respect they deprived them of that alone which made misery endurable. Before he concluded he was anxious to read to the House a letter which he had received that morning, because it was, perhaps, well that they should see themselves as others saw them. It was from a distinguished man who lived in this country for a great many years, who followed the course of events with unfailing interest; and perhaps the House would be interested in his words when he mentioned that he fought at the battle of Leipsic. This was what he said—

> "I was very sorry to read the account of the rebellion of the Boers in your South African Colonies, which, together with the very precarious state of Ireland, will embarrass your statesmen not a little, particularly when America begins to meddle in Irish affairs; and should Oriental matters again provoke a conflict, England would be condemned to resignment, and allow Russia to regain the mastership, not only in Europe, but in Asia. I am, therefore, of opinion that under the present circumstances it would be better that your Ministers in power would rather think of appeasing the Irish people than of crushing them, which will be hard work, particularly if the United States should assist the Irish, whilst no European State would sympathize with England, and Russia would rejoice at her powerless condition. The whole of the civilized world is of opinion that the deplorable state of Ireland is the fruit of English misgovernment, from the first beginning of the subjugation of Ireland, and it is no easy matter to resist public opinion, particularly when nothing more than the interests of power and individual advantages are at stake."

He invited the House to take these words to heart and to inquire as to their truth. At the present moment Ireland was in a state of almost unparalleled excitement, and was the weakness of the Empire. It was not the power of hon. Members who wished to separate the two countries—and there were such Members—it was not their power that brought the country to its present condition; but it was the rooted belief of the Irish people that Parliament cared not for them. He appealed to the House not to pass Coercion Acts hastily; but rather to insist that the Ministry should bring forward its project of Land Reform, should make the homes of the Irish people worth living in, should make the lives of the Irish people less miserable than they had been hitherto, and should endeavour by one supreme effort to knit together all those who looked for the fruition of their hopes to the Constitutional action of that House.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) said, that the hon. Member who had just sat down had presented to the House a formidable indictment against the Government, and had also given them some lessons in law and agriculture, which the Government would certainly lay to heart—but only, he feared, for the purpose of avoiding them. The hon. Member was of opinion that the Government had committed a gigantic blunder in voting a fresh subsidy to the Irish landlords; but, as the House knew, the Government in this matter had merely fulfilled an honourable engagement entered into by their Predecessors. The next count in the hon. Member's indictment was that the Land Commission was a great blunder. Was it, he asked, quite respectful on the part of the hon. Member to disparage the result of the labours of the Commission before the appearance of its Report? When the Report appeared they would be in a condition to consider whether the Commission was a competent one; but surely not till then.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY complained that the hon. and learned Member imputed to him words which he never used. What he said was that it was a great blunder not to add a tenant farmer to the Commission.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) replied that the question whether the omission of a tenant farmer amounted to a blunder could not well be decided before the publication of the Report. The hon. Member also blamed the Government for not having sufficiently supported the Constabulary in the difficult performance of their duties; but the hon. Member had not given, and could not give, a single instance of the kind, and, indeed, the contrary was the fact. The report of the officer at the head of the Constabulary showed that immediately upon the expiration of the Peace Preservation Act the Constabulary was recruited to its full strength. Shortly afterwards the officer to whom he had referred went to the county represented by the hon. Member —Galway—and increased the mounted force, whose duty it was to patrol by night, by 21 additional men; and he increased also the force of the foot police to, he believed, 309, and that was for the purpose of enabling the force to patrol the country by night as well as by day. This they did with so much energy and zeal that the men suffered considerably from their labours. The hon. Gentleman had said that the police were at fault because they did not suppress night meetings; but he (the Solicitor General for Ireland) had never heard of those night meetings until that evening. He wished to know if they had arrived at a state of government in which the Constabulary could walk into every house without any authority because they imagined night meetings were going on? He was a firm supporter of law and order; but he would be the last man to ask the police to do that which neither law nor order called for. It had also been said by the hon. Member for Galway that the police had allowed the people to procure arms; and on that question he could only say that the police had simply permitted the people to do that which they were clearly entitled to do under the law. The duties of the police were to preserve peace and order; and when they did that to the best of their ability they discharged their duty. He did not think that several of the lessons which had been propounded by the hon. Member would be much appreciated in the present position of the case; nor was he of opinion that the House would see the force of the hon. Member's observation that in Galway, or on the border of it, near to which Mr. Boycott's farm was situate, "turnips were reaped with Cavalry sabres." In the first place, turnips were not "reaped," either in Galway or elsewhere, and certainly Cavalry sabres were not known as implements of husbandry. In the last count of his indictment the hon. Member for Galway made a good-humoured, but, at the same time, severe attack upon the Office with which he (the Solicitor General for Ireland) was connected—namely, that which had charge of the administration of the law, on the ground that they did not seem to know that there was such an Act as the Trades' Union Act. All he could say was that the Act, so far as he was cognizant, was known to every Irish Member, and especially to such as happened to be in the Commission of the Peace—a position which, he supposed, was occupied by the hon. Member for Galway. The text-book of the Irish magistracy (*Humphrey's Justice of the Peace*), a volume which was easily and cheaply obtainable, clearly and accurately analyzed the Act, and set forth directions for its enforcement, so that if there had been any default in such enforcement in the neighbourhood of Kylemore, it lay at the door of the magistrates for the county of Galway. Having disposed of the charges which had been made against the Government by the hon. Member, he wished to invite the attention of the House, after the somewhat discursive debate which had taken place, to the very serious question now before the Parliament and the country. He had on the previous night listened with great attention to the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill); but, in saying that, he must also express his regret that the noble Lord should have treated a great question, involving the destinies of Ireland, with the levity which he displayed. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), with the ability which had marked him out, in Homeric phrase, as a leader of men, an ability which had been frequently recognized in Parliament, had asked the House to consider an Amendment to the Gracious Speech from the Throne affirming that—

> "We humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."

That Amendment assumed that peace and tranquillity at present existed in Ireland, and it was on this point that he must join issue with the hon. Member. The passage in the Queen's Speech upon which the Amendment was moved was in the following words:—

> "Proposals will be immediately submitted to you for intrusting me with additional powers necessary, in my judgment, not only for the vindication of order and public law, but likewise to secure on behalf of my subjects protection for life and property and personal liberty of action."

The hon. Member for the City of Cork translated these words into an intention to suspend the Constitutional rights of the Irish people; but he had yet to learn that if peace and tranquillity did not prevail in Ireland it could be any suspension of the Constitutional rights of the people to secure to them "protection for life and property and personal liberty of action." As it appeared to him, it was useless to cry "peace" when there was no peace, or to beg the question. It might, indeed, be enough for him to know that Ireland was deeply agitated, without inquiring as to the particular body or association of men to which such agitation was due: to quote the words of an eloquent English Judge, "when bitter waters are flowing it is not necessary to look for the sources from which they spring." But it was necessary in this case to go to the bottom of the movement. The movement to which he referred had as its object the disintegration of Her Majesty's Empire; and he would refer to facts in support of this position, instead of being content with loose and general statements. In January, 1879, there appeared in a Dublin paper a remarkable letter, which produced a great sensation at the time, from a person named John Devoy, whose boast it was that he had pleaded guilty to a charge of treason-felony in 1867, had been sentenced to penal servitude, and, after serving part of his time, was discharged and went to America. The letter was dated from New York, and was headed "Manifesto of the Council of the I. R. B." Those cabalistic words, as was well known in Ireland, meant the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Of course, at that time the Irish National Land League had no existence whatever under that name. [Mr. PARNELL: What is the date of the letter?] It was dated the 11th of December, 1878, and was published in *The Nation* on the 4th of January, 1879, with the announcement that it had been addressed to *The Freeman's Journal.* At the outset of that document, Mr. Devoy wrote—

> "The question whether the Advanced Irish National Party—the Party of separation—should continue the policy of isolation from the public life of the country which was inaugurated some 20 years ago by James Stephens and his associates, or return to older methods—methods as old, at least, as the days of the United Irishmen—is agitating the minds of Irish Nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic just now. The object aimed at by the Advanced National Party—the recovery of Ireland's national independence, and the severance of all political connection with England—is one that would require the utmost efforts and the greatest sacrifices on the part of the whole Irish people."

Mr. Devoy then went on to show how and why the Repealers and Nationalists had failed, and went on to write—

> "As the battle of Irish freedom must be fought outside Parliament, and as Home Rulers, Repealers, and Nationalists all call the form of autonomy they desire self-government, there should be nothing to prevent them agreeing on a common platform."

Now, what was Mr. Devoy's idea of this common platform? He proceeded—

> "No Party or combination of Parties in Ireland can ever hope to win the support of the majority of the people except it honestly proposes a radical reform of the land system. No matter what may be said in favour of individual landlords, the whole system was founded on robbery and fraud, and has been perpetuated by cruelty, injustice, extortion, and hatred of the people."

He prayed the attention of the House to the following passage, as he intended to show the similarity of the language with that of speeches subsequently delivered:—

> "Let the Irish landlords be given a last chance of settling the Irish Land Question amicably in this manner, or wait for a solution in which they shall have no part."

At the time this letter was published the Conservative Government was in the plenitude of its power, and must have been perfectly aware of the letter, which created great excitement in Ireland; but no notice was taken of it. That letter was followed by a meeting held at Irishtown, near Claremorris, in the county of Mayo, in April, 1879, which was celebrated in the annals of the Land League, because there that body originated, although not under that name. *The Nation* of the 3rd of May, describing the meeting, stated that—

"One of the greatest demonstrations ever witnessed in the West of Ireland took place on Sunday last. The object of the meeting was to advocate the protection of the small tenant farmers against the iniquitous extortions of some landlords in that and other localities, and to demand an abatement of the present rent in proportion to the great reduction that has taken place in the value of produce, stock, &c., within the last few years, and which has placed several thousand tenant farmers indebted to a degree that they cannot till their lands, pay their rents, or support their families. Since the days of O'Connell a larger public demonstration has not been witnessed. About 1 o'clock the monster procession started from Claremorris, headed by several thousand men on foot—the men of each district wearing a laurel leaf or green ribbon in hat or coat to distinguish the several contingents. At 11 o'clock a monster contingent of tenant farmers on horseback drew up in front of Hughes's Hotel, showing discipline and order that a Cavalry regiment might feel proud of. They were led on in sections, each having a marshal, who kept his troops well in hand."

The preamble to the resolution passed at that meeting was in the following terms:—

"Whereas the social condition of the Irish people having been reduced, through their subjection to England and its coercive legislation, to a state below that of any civilized country in the world, and whereas the mouthpiece of English public opinion, when speaking of Constitutional misgovernment in late years, having declared that 'Government should be for the good of the governed, and that, whatever rules wilfully and persistently postpone the good of their subjects, either in the interests of foreign States, or to assist theories of religion or politics, such rules have thereby forfeited all claim to allegiance'—be it therefore resolved," &c.

Again the House would recognize the features of Mr. Devoy's letter. Well, a speaker at that meeting made this statement—

"I believe it is not on the floor of the English House of Commons, but on the Irish soil, that the real struggle for Irish independence must be fought."

And another speaker, who was very influential with the people of Ireland, said—

"The people are the power. Government, law, and order are but the slaves of the people, for it is from the people as a whole or as a majority they derive their power."

These things took place when the late Government were in Office, and showed the way in which the public mind was being prepared for what soon afterwards took place. Another meeting was held about the same time at Westport, at which it was said that "green banners bearing such mottoes as 'The Land for the People,' 'Down with the Land Robbers,' and 'Ireland for the Irish,' were scattered here and there above the people's heads, and the wearing of green ribbons and rosettes was very general." The hon. Member for the City of Cork spoke at the meeting; and the hon. Gentleman, as he always did, used measured words and deliberate language, and openly and frankly stated what he intended. He said—

"Now, what must we do in order to induce the landlords to see the position? You must show the landlords that you intend to hold a firm grip of your homesteads and lands."

The meaning of that exhortation was explained by the sentence which followed—

"You must not allow yourselves to be dispossessed, as you were dispossessed in 1847. You must not allow your small holdings to be turned into large ones."

That sentence, uttered to a sympathetic and excitable audience, might be imagined to have created no inconsiderable effect. Now, at that time the public Press had taken up the movement, which was spreading, probably with the view of calling the attention of the Government to it. In *The Nation*, published in the month of June, he found this passage—

"The agitation for a reduction of rents was marked on Sunday last by a meeting in Westport, which has created widespread attention. As will be seen from a report which we publish in another column, it was very largely attended, the resolutions passed at it were 'strong,' and the speeches were more than usually outspoken. Mr. Parnell's address, especially, seems to have caused considerable excitement in landlord circles, his advice to the tenants to keep a grip of their holdings being deemed to mean something dreadful."

The meetings went on cheerily and merrily, and gathered strength as they went, and in the following month this was the state of affairs and the view that was taken of it in Ireland; and yet he failed to find any action adopted by the then Government. In *The Nation* of the 25th of June, 1879, he found this passage—

"Somewhat of a 'sensation' has been created throughout the country by the startling language which has been used at the recent meetings of tenant farmers in the West of Ireland. It certainly is something new to find large numbers of that class pledging themselves in open meeting to make common cause and stand together as one man in resistance to any attempted evictions for non-payment of an impossible rent."

That was subsequently defined as being any rent which the tenant did not find it convenient to pay. In that state of things, following Mr. Devoy's outline and filling it in, the seed having been sown and the soil congenial, the crop had grown, and now was the time for the land agitation to be turned into the Land League. He would pass over the meetings which were held during the intervening months; but in the month of October, 1879, the hon. Member for the City of Cork issued a Circular convening a meeting in Dublin—

> "To form a central body in connection with the present land agitation," and "for the union on a common platform of the different sections of the people of Ireland,"

for the purpose of the disintegration of the Empire.

MR. PARNELL: There was nothing in the Circular about the disintegration of the Empire.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) replied, that the hon. Member was certainly right in saying that there was nothing in the Circular about the disintegration of the Empire. That was the meaning of the words used by Mr. Devoy, whose original plan had been adopted. The land agitation was to consolidate the Party and to disintegrate the Queen's Empire. Well, the Association took a new title, and was thus spoken of on the occasion by the Press—

> "No better work for Ireland has been done for a considerable time than was accomplished in Dublin on Tuesday last, when 'The Irish National Land League' was founded. An organized central body was needed to give sustainment to the present land movement. That system is a vile oppression, a blight, and a curse to these countries; but it is in Ireland especially that its evil effects are felt. It plunders, enslaves, and tortures the masses of the people, and is incompatible with their peace and their prosperity. It tends to degrade their very souls. Let them steadily, resolutely, and liberally support the operations of the Irish National Land League, and the day of their emancipation from a hateful and ruinous tyranny is not far distant."

Up to that time the late Government never awoke to the situation, and the agitation was still carried on. On the 15th of the same month—October—a meeting was held, which was thus spoken of in *The Nation*—

> "Last Sunday the West again spoke out on the Land Question. Meetings in furtherance of the land agitation were held in Corofin, county Galway, and in Kilmaine, county Mayo. In the former place the Rev. Father M'Donagh, P.P., and Mr. Davitt were the principal speakers; in the latter Mr. Daly, of Castlebar, and Mr. Louden, of Westport. We need not indicate the character of the speeches or resolutions; sufficient to say that they echoed the cry which has now been ringing throughout the land for the last six months. It is needless to say that the patriotic feeling of the people found expression also in the display of national emblems and of banners bearing patriotic mottoes,"

—he thought he heard hon. Members opposite, in the course of the debate, suggest that the Land League was not born until after the present Government took Office. The article went on—

> "While pikemen and horsemen, now invariable features of Western demonstrations, occupied conspicuous positions."

A Government reporter attended that meeting. The Government at last appeared not to be asleep. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock reproached the present Government for being so absolutely tradesmanlike as to send reporters to meetings; and yet they were only doing what the great Party which at that time guided the destinies of the nation had done in this respect. Then he found this passage—

> "At Corofin the Government were represented, as usual, by a detective reporter, who was the occasion of a rather humorous incident at the close of the proceedings. We refer to the fact that the Rev. Father M'Donagh, Mr. Davitt, and another gentleman mystified him considerably by addressing the assembled thousands in Irish."

At length the Government took action, and their successors were reproached with abandoning their prosecutions. But the fact was that there never could have been any real intention on the part of the late Government to carry them on. *The Nation* thus spoke of the prosecutions—

> "After stealthily watching the progress of the land movement for some months, after having had their spies in every crowd and their reporters on every platform, noting every look and every word of the men who took a leading part in the proceedings, the Government have made their spring, and on whom?"

The hon. Member for Cork City never had a greater triumph. He had set the Government at defiance, he had organized the agitation, and they swooped down on some obscure individuals.

> "Not on Mr. Parnell, the central figure of the whole movement; not on any of the brave-hearted priests who spoke out on those occasions in the interest of their imperilled flocks. Oh, no; the courage of our rulers was not equal to such a strain; a collision with these gentlemen they would not venture on. They have made a capture of men supposed to be somewhat less formidable. The land meetings, we trust, will go on. Now, more than ever, is there need of them."

Such was the effect of the prosecutions; and the land meetings went on accordingly. But before he referred further to those prosecutions he would draw the attention of the House to another point. The present Government had been charged with inaction, although they had done what the late Government did not attempt to do. He would not say that the charge had now been made by the Members of the late Government who had spoken in the debate, for he must recognize the generosity of the speeches which had been made, and particularly that of the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin the late Attorney General for Ireland; but the charge had been made by some Members of the Party. The late Government did not attempt to interfere with the remarkable Mayo Abbey meeting. It was convened by placards for a fortnight; its object was to denounce individuals; the numbers convened were perilous to the public safety, and yet it was allowed to take place. *The Irish Times* said—

> "The above meeting, which had been placarded all over the county Mayo for the past fortnight, was held yesterday at Mayo Abbey, which is situate about three-and-a-half miles from Balla. The primary object of the meeting, as the placards concerning it declared, was 'to open the eyes of Irishmen to the rascally and traitorous conduct of two self-seeking creatures who, contrary to the unanimously expressed wish of the Irish nation, have grabbed at two farms that have been thrown up to the landlady on her refusal to give a reduction.' The particulars of the case, as far as could be ascertained, are these:—Mr. P. King, Claremorris, who is one of the most extensive farmers in Mayo, rented the above-mentioned two farms from a lady named Mrs. Rutledge Fair. Last November Mr. King, being refused any reduction in the rent he had been paying for them, threw them up. Not more than a week had elapsed after Mr. King's resignation of the farms when they were taken by new tenants, at, it is said, a much higher price than Mr. King had been paying for them. To express disapproval of the conduct of these two men was the object of yesterday's meeting."

The way in which it was done was this—

The Solicitor General for Ireland

> "Preparatory to the commencement of the speechmaking all the people, horsemen, and footmen, that were present at the meeting, entered one of the fields of one of the farms above referred to, and made a circuit of it, the footmen marching four abreast, and the horsemen two deep. During all this time the air was rent with groaning and hissing for 'the men who took the lands.' The Government reporter, Mr. Stringer, was present, and was a spectator of all the manœvring. These preliminaries over, the men left the field, and the meeting proper commenced."

The resolution passed was as follows:—

> "'Whereas, a rack-rent being an unjust tax upon the industry of the tenant farmer, its imposition should be opposed as being tantamount to a legalized robbery on the part of whoever attempts to inflict it; and whereas rack-renting has its principal inducement and chief support in the competition for holdings on the part of the tenant farmers, and the facility with which landlords can dispose of the land of evicted tenants, be it resolved that any person offering a higher rent for land or holdings than paid by previous occupiers, or any party renting or occupying a farm from which another has been evicted for non-payment of excessive rent, or which has been surrendered on grounds of unfair rent, should be looked upon as an enemy to the best interests and social well-being of the people of Ireland, and considered and shunned as a moral leper with whom no tenant farmer or lover of his country's welfare should deal, associate, or hold communication.' (Loud and prolonged applause)."

Did the speaker know what a leper was? If he had travelled in the East he would have known that the most loathsome animal that crawled had a better existence than the outcast leper. The Government took no action, and he was not now censuring them; but he blamed their Party for looking on at all that was going forward before the present Government came into Office, and then charging the present Government with inaction on their part. *The Nation* of the 7th of February said—

> "The Land League is rapidly extending its ramifications through the country. We report to-day the formation of four or five new branches in various parts of the West and South. That there is ample work to be done for all such bodies goes without saying. They are among the best agencies for the distribution of relief; and acts of landlord injustice and oppression, which they are the most competent to expose and denounce, are everywhere abundant. Above all, they can do excellent service in collecting statistics of rack-renting."

And the same paper of the 14th of February announced the formation of 20 branches of the League. Now, reverting to the prosecutions instituted by the late

Government, and which had been treated by the Press so contemptuously as he had stated, there could not have been any real intention of following them up. They were commenced in the ordinary way by arresting the defendants, and taking them before a magistrate and swearing informations. A distinguished Government official was sent down to proceed against them, and then the proceedings became a screaming farce in a Court of Justice. When at length the prisoners were committed for trial application was made to remove the indictment to the Court of Queen's Bench. There was nothing to have prevented that being done forthwith; but although the indictment was found on the 11th of December, it was not returned to the Court of Queen's Bench until the 9th of January, a delay of nearly a month. The next step was to issue process to appear, which was issued on the 12th of January; the defendants appeared on the 16th of January, but the usual rule to plead was not served on them till the 31st of that month. At that time there were not two more able lawyers than the then Attorney General and Solicitor General for Ireland, and if they had had instructions to proceed it could hardly have been expected that they would not have moved more rapidly than they had done in the matter. On the 3rd of February the traversers moved for a copy of the indictment, which might in courtesy have been given to them with the rule to plead, and, as they could not be asked to plead before they knew the charges against them, the time for them to plead was extended until they were furnished with copies of the indictment; that was not done until the 21st, and on the 27th they pleaded Not Guilty, and there the record ended. Delay at every step—and in the face of such proceedings he would ask whether there could have been any *bonâ fide* intention on the part of the Government to prosecute? If there had been, Mr. Parnell must have been included; but the indictment was so framed as to exclude him, and, instead of that, the engine of a State prosecution had been put into operation against obscure individuals. When that was the heritage to which the present Government succeeded, was it to be wondered at that they were advised that these proceedings were not calculated to vindicate the law, or to induce the Irish people to think there was much force in such an administration of justice? Now as to meetings. Did the House know how many meetings had been held before the present Government succeeded to power? Two hundred and three of such meetings had taken place, and the Irish newspapers had announced that nothing could extinguish the land agitation. Taking that state of things into account, what could the present Government do? Were they to attempt to gag free speech; to attempt to put down the right of free discussion? The great Liberal Party had written too many chapters of freedom in the history of the world to permit the Government to do such a thing. The present Government felt bound to take a distinction which the previous Government did not take. They found it necessary to interfere when violence or terror was the object or effect of the meeting; but they did not think it necessary where there was no violence and no terror. Where there was nothing but discussion, even although it might be unlawful, they did not interfere to stop the meeting. A meeting might be unlawful, and every person who attended and took part in it might be liable to be prosecuted and punished, and yet the Government of the day could not interfere to stop it; but a meeting might also, under certain conditions, be an unlawful assembly, so that the moment it was so it would be the duty of the Government to interfere. If they knew beforehand that it involved in any way the elements of violence or terror — if they were reasonably satisfied of that—and a prudent Administration would always take care to have the highest sanction for their action—then it would be the duty of the Government to prohibit it, and cases of that kind had occurred. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) last night made a good-humoured attack on the Government in reference to a Circular which he read, dated the 21st of September, 1880, and really complained that the police did their duty, and nothing more than their duty, and that the Government did not put forward the police where it was unnecessary, either to overawe a meeting or invite collision. He could not see what great objection there could be in the police, who were the servants, not the masters, of the public, not being brought into a position where they might be forced into unnecessary collision. The noble Lord referred with some degree of ridicule to the directions in this Circular. The first instruction was that—

> "If the meeting is held in the neighbourhood of a police barrack the men are to be confined therein, and no armed men are to be permitted to appear during the time the meeting is being held, except in case of actual necessity."

He failed to see in what respect that was an erroneous direction to be given to the police, who were the servants of the public. The noble Lord seemed to imply that directions had been issued from Dublin Castle that the police should provoke a collision with the mob.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I said nothing of the kind.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): The noble Lord was reported to have said—he read from *The Times;* but the report in *The Times* might be incorrect. The noble Lord said—

> "The Government having directed the police not to come into collision with the mob had proceeded to censure them in the Circular of December for not having come into collision with the mob."

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: That is correct.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): The noble Lord said he had left the Circular at home in which the police were so censured; he undertook to produce it in half-an-hour; but it was not produced. The noble Lord inferred that the police were directed to come into collision with the mob, because, he said, they were censured for not doing so.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: The Circular was dated the 21st of December, and the police were told that the fact of their allowing armed bodies of men to go about the country at night, uninterfered with by the police, caused much discredit to attach to the force.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): The noble Lord was now referring to the supposed inaction of the police in not patrolling the district. That subject very early attracted the attention of the Government, and it appeared from official Returns that some of the police were in hospital from overwork, owing to the difficulty of penetrating into districts all but impassable by day, and hardly practicable by night. The sum of the instructions to the police were to protect the persons and property of Her Majesty's subjects, and not to interfere with peaceable meetings. The hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. C. Russell) had made some charges against the Government, on which he would say a very few words. The hon. and learned Member charged the Government with acting on information derived from understrappers. The hon. and learned Member appeared to have some peculiar means of information, for he undertook to discuss the details of the Land Act and the forthcoming Bill for the better protection of life and property, with the outline of which the House was ignorant. From what source he derived that knowledge he did not know. The Government had not acted on the information of understrappers, but on information of the highest character—on sworn information of credible persons — and when there was time care was taken to verify it also by personal inquiries. He would ask, could the Government do more than that? The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) asked a Question yesterday, which he should have thought an hon. and learned Member would not have repeated, with reference to proceedings pending before the magistrates. But the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk did so, and questioned the accuracy of the reply he had given. The magistrates, he said, had refused bail by the authority of the Chief Secretary. The fact was that the magistrates had not refused bail, nor was the Chief Secretary in Ireland at the time. He had left Ireland when the transaction occurred. The magistrates had not arrived at the point when the question of bail could be considered. The case was at hearing. The accused were not yet committed for trial. If that event occurred the question of bail would arise; and he (the Solicitor General for Ireland) had said the matter might be referred to a Judge of the Queen's Bench. The hon. and learned Member for Dundalk also read a letter of the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, saying it condemned what he called coercion; but he could not see that his proposition was established by that letter, which did not appear to mention the matter at all. The hon. Member for the City of Cork contended that what Her Majesty in Her Gracious Speech declared necessary for the vindication of law and order and the protection of life and property was not necessary on two grounds —the one was that the outrages had been manufactured, and the second that the Land League had other objects in view. The hon. Member went on to state that the report in *The Times* was not correct.

MR. PARNELL: The report was not correct as regards that particular. In other respects the report in *The Times* is perfectly accurate.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): The hon. Member for the City of Cork said the Land League, which took its present shape some 14 or 15 months ago, had in view three objects—(1) to prevent rack-renting; (2) to enable tenants to become owners of their farms by paying a fair rent for a limited number of years; and (3) to facilitate the working of the "Bright Clauses" of the Land Act. Such being the objects of the Land League, as printed and announced in the House of Commons, see how they were carried out in practice. In May, 1880, there was a meeting held at Irishtown to commemorate the anniversary of the meeting held at the same place in April, 1879. It was what was called a peaceable meeting. There were two banners on the platform, on one was emblazoned a round tower and a wolf dog, with the words, "Defend your Birthrights." The other banner had a pike-head, with the words, "Down with Land Robbers." At that meeting was proclaimed what had been called the new gospel for Ireland. One member of the League said—

"In the past you have been the weaker party. The landlords had the Government with them. Now you have triumphed both over the landlords and the Government, and by your action you have made the landlords the weaker party. Then, in the name of reason, in the name of justice, and of common sense, let the landlords go to the wall."

And the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell), after referring to the poverty and want of the winter of 1879, said—

"If, under these circumstances, with this dark prospect before you, you had the courage and determination to follow our advice and stand by your rights, surely you will now, when the goal is almost in sight, be as brave as you were 12 months ago. Surely you will renew the pledge you made 12 months ago on these historic plains—that you will keep a firm grip of your holdings, that you will refuse to pay any unjust rent, and that you will stand by this struggle until the lands have passed into the possession of the people. The Irish National Land League was then a struggling institution; our people were then starving. To-day the National Land League is known all over the world."

Such was the state of things in Ireland when the present Government succeeded to Office. From the way in which the case had been presented to that House and elsewhere, it would appear as if this was a new agitation which sprang into existence immediately when the present Government came into Office. He thought he had shown, at all events, what was the heritage transmitted to the present Government. It was alleged that no effort was made by them to interfere with the movement, or to preserve life and property. But it should be remembered that the Government had to deal with the state of things which they found existing on taking Office; and were they to blame for what they had done? If the Government had not trenched on the rights of free discussion, was that a matter for censure of a Liberal Government? If they had protected life and property, under circumstances in which violence was apprehended, were they to be blamed for taking that care? If they had not followed the course they had taken, at their doors would have lain the consequences. He would now quote a little more of the new gospel from the same source to show the teaching of the movement. Speaking at a meeting in Cork, on the 3rd of October, 1880, another speaker said—

"It is our part to teach the people of Ireland what their natural rights are with respect to the land of Ireland. We will have no tampering with landlordism. That institution, created for the purpose of maintaining English rule in Ireland, and in the interests of the few against the many, will have to fall."

In the same month of October this was the language used—

"What you have to do to put down eviction is this—to show the landlords that eviction won't pay, because the farm from which the tenant has been once evicted shall henceforth be left to the crows, for no man shall touch it."

In the same month of October the last speaker informed his audience what he considered was the duty of an honest man to society—

> "I next call upon you to provide, first of all, for your wives and your children, as being those towards whom your first duty is due. When you have provided for them you can give back what you got from those men—those traders who, when you were in distress, furnished you with that which you required; and when you have done that—when you have secured that which is properly and justly your own—then you may think of the rents and the landlords. (Boos.) I tell you, if you can afford to pay the valuation, and no more, you ought to tender it. If you cannot pay sufficient to satisfy the landlord, after you have kept sufficient to secure you in your holdings, then I advise you to stick to your money. It is probable that if you pay what will not satisfy him, you will lose both money and land. Remember what I have already told you. Keep a firm grip of the land; and if you should be evicted, don't go away to America—stop in the neighbourhood of your own homes, watching the first opportunity of regaining possession."

What was the meaning to the mind of an excited audience of such language as—"Keep your money, stick to your lands, and if you are evicted stop near your farms and take possession again as soon as you can?" That meant, in language known to the law, "Take forcible possession." At a meeting in Galway this was the language used—

> "I would not have taken off my coat and have gone to this work if I had not known that we were laying the foundation by this movement for the restoration of our national independence."

And the speaker went on to say that each tenant farmer, when he kept a grip of his holding, should feel that he was doing good to his neighbours at large, and that he was helping to break down British domination in Ireland. What did that mean? It meant dismemberment of the Empire. It was not enough to have a new gospel; that gospel had a glossary, and while the glossary and practice were taught to the people at the meetings the text was read to the House of Commons. The Land League did not confine its teaching to prose; it had also published some stirring ballads called *Lays of the Land League*, and when the excitement had passed away they might, like the Jacobite songs of old, form part of the literature of the time; but in the meantime they were dangerous. He would quote one stanza from one of the ballads—

"No! we shall leave untilled, unsown,
  The lands, however fair,
From which an honest man was thrown
  Upon the roadside bare;
As if a curse was on the spot
  That saw such hateful deeds,
We'll leave the empty house to rot,
  The fields to choke with weeds.
"These are the things that shall be done,
  So swears our banded host—
    In the name of the Father,
    And of the Son,
    And of the Holy Ghost."

Such was the teaching which the Land League scattered through Ireland. Now with regard to the results of this agitation. In the whole of Ireland, up to the 3rd of November, 1880, from the 1st of January of the same year, there were 73 cases only of every description of indictable agrarian crime in which the offenders had been convicted. He was not comparing now cases in which there had been convictions with cases in which there had been acquittals; 117 represented the entire of the tried agrarian cases in the whole of Ireland for 11 months in which there was no conviction. Out of 1,718 agrarian crimes 1,481 could never be traced to any individual. [Mr. BIGGAR: Hear, hear!] The catalogue of those crimes began with murder, and there were eight murders. ["Hear, hear!"] Eight murders, and some hon. Member cried "Hear, hear!" Was life so cheap in Ireland that they were able to arrive at the belief that killing was no murder? [*Cries of* "What about England?"] He was speaking of Ireland, not of England. In England murder was detected, and not 30 per cent of the crimes committed in England were undetected, while in Ireland the proportion of detected crimes was not 5 per cent.

MR. PARNELL asked whether the hon. and learned Member referred solely to agrarian crime?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) said, certainly, and that the statistics were in the hands of the hon. Member. Next he might mention the cases of incendiary fires and arson, which, as the right hon. and learned Gentleman the senior Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) had said, especially affected the homes of the poor, who were afraid to apply for compensation from the county under the Grand Jury law for loss by incendiary fires, for well they knew their own houses were nearly always thatched. He then passed to threatening letters and intimidating notices, of which there were 851. Hon. Members would observe the phrase he had used, by which he did not mean letters that might be written by any idiot and sent through the post; but in those figures were comprised such notices as a man might find upon his mutilated cattle, or upon the door of his homestead, notices slipped into his hand as he left the fair by some cloaked figure that could not be traced, or pushed under the door when his house was empty, or such a notice as the rude drawing of a coffin that would be left behind in a house after it had been stormed by a party of armed men. If such crime was not alarming, he did not know what actions could be so described. Under the head of intimidation he included such acts of violence as the forcible entry of a man's house in the middle of the night, and the compulsory administration of an oath to prevent the tenant from paying his rent, or threat to prevent him from doing so. And that was only one kind of intimidation. Mr. Justice Barry, a most genial and popular Judge, and one not likely to exaggerate the facts, was obliged to postpone a trial for murder at the City of Waterford Winter Assizes, because he was satisfied by affidavits that, owing to the influence of the Land League, jurors could not be found who could give the case a fair and impartial trial. In the next Province, Mr. Justice Fitzgerald had used expressions with reference to the Land League for which he had been much attacked in that House. That being so, he begged to defend the character of the Irish Bench. On that Bench were men distinguished for learning and integrity, and distinguished among them all was Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, both now on the Bench and formerly at the Bar. Now, when that learned Judge, under the sanction of his oath as Judge, and sitting alone to administer the law of the country, made a statement, the result of his own judicial experience, and referred to facts that had been brought to his own judicial notice, it was rather too much for any hon. Member to say that he did not believe him. The hon. Member for the City of Cork had appealed to him (the Solicitor General for Ireland) as to the integrity of Cork juries. He had for years practised before them, and their reputation in Ireland was that a City of Cork common jury was as good as a special jury in other parts of the country; but there stood the fact that, in the instance on which Mr. Justice Fitzgerald had commented, external influences had been too strong even for such a jury. And not only the juries, but the witnesses also, were intimidated. Over and over again it had been found impossible to induce witnesses to come to the table; and a most signal proof of intimidation was that they had denied in Court their statements in their previously sworn informations. He might fairly ask what was this agency that favoured the perpetration of crimes and shielded the offenders? At the end of last September, a wife was waiting for her husband, and children were watching for their father. They did not know that the cloaked shadow was standing before them, that Lord Mountmorres was lying murdered by the roadside. [*A laugh from below the Gangway.*] It might be an object of ridicule to some hon. Member; but he did not envy the feelings of those who ridiculed the widow and the orphans. One week after that murder, the following language was used at a Land League meeting in Galway:—

> "On this day week I had the great honour of attending a meeting at Clonbur. Well, when I arrived in Clonbur I had the pleasure of hearing that some great land robber was murdered or had shot himself. The Government of England were mourning because Mountmorres was shot. I do not approve murdering anyone; but I say the Government of England did not go into mourning when the people were starving."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The speech was not by a Member of the House.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Certainly not; and the hon. Member for the City of Galway was, he was sure, one of the last to countenance such language. He would like, however, to hear the opinion of hon. Gentlemen on a speech made by an hon. Member of the House, in which the following passage occurred:—

> "We do not believe it is at all necessary to shoot a landlord, and we do not encourage it—on the contrary, we deprecate it; but, as I have said before, we are not bound to go watching every poor fellow in the country that is driven to desperation. We are not going to watch and preach sermons to them. Let the men that drive other men to desperation take care of themselves. I must protest against the Archbishop saddling us with the responsibility of every assassination that takes place in the country. He has no more right to do it than anyone else has a right to do it. They speak of this country because one poor fellow named Mountmorres was shot the other day. (Groans.)

> Well, I would not like to be the man that shot Lord Mountmorres at all. What we have and what the Land League has to try is to show you another road besides shooting these men, because they are not worth shooting."

It was not that it was criminal to take life, it was not the Gospel which our old-fashioned fathers and mothers taught. It was the new gospel—"Don't shoot the man;" and why? "Because he is not worth shooting!" In another part of the same speech he found a similar doctrine preached with reference to the landlords—

> "In France, up to a few years ago, until the year 1793, they had the landlords there. Well, I suppose, a great many of you have heard of the French Revolution. The French people were a sensitive people, and they took a method of getting rid of their landlords that, unfortunately, we cannot take. No, my friends, we are not able at present to take that method. I wish we were. (Cheers.) I wish we were, and it is not here I would be to-day."

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN rose to Order. He wanted to know whether it was in Order to repeat here the speeches which had been made at the prosecution of traversers in the Four Courts at Dublin? Listening to the hon. and learned Gentleman, he could hardly believe he was sitting in Parliament at all. It was merely a repetition of the accusations brought forward by the Attorney General at the trial, and the case ought not to be tried twice over.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson) said, the speech he was referring to was not that of any of the traversers in the prosecution. He had endeavoured to avoid that, as far as possible, in every case except the one in which he declined to disclose the name to the hon. Member for Galway. This debate had been brought on by the traversers in the prosecution. Still he had avoided, as far as he could, mentioning the traversers, and had not mentioned names. As, however, this debate had been brought about by the traversers, they must take the consequences of it. This was the way in which the French peasantry treated their landlords, according to another speaker on another occasion and the teaching of the new gospel—

> "The French peasantry offered their feudal landlords a fair compensation for the land. They did not accept it, and then the peasantry of France gave them the compensation they so richly deserved—a ropes-end at every crossing."

In the face of that, could the hon. Member for the City of Cork ask the House to believe that, because he had read out in that House what were called innocent resolutions, therefore this state of things was all imaginary and crime did not exist in Ireland? And was the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell) so ignorant of the current literature and events of the day as to be able to assure the House that these meetings were perfectly innocent, perfectly legal, and perfectly harmless? He would ask hon. Members to draw the inference for themselves. There were at this moment in almost every part of Ireland, assemblies which went through all the forms of a Court. He had had in his hands one of the summonses, and he would give it to the House. It was addressed to a lady, and it ran as follows:—

> "You are hereby informed that complaint has been made against you respecting the treatment of your tenant at . . . and you are required to attend the meeting of the branch of the Land League to be held at . . . on [such a day], where you will receive an impartial hearing. If you fail or neglect to attend, the rules of the Land League will be put in force against you with the utmost rigour."

It was signed by the hon. secretary, and endorsed with the names of the president, the vice president, and the members of the committee who constituted the Court. Unfortunately, this summons was not brought to the notice of the authorities in time to enable them to take any effectual measures. [Mr. Parnell: Where was this?] He must be excused from mentioning the place. The lady had fled from her property. In cases of this kind it was, of course, impossible to disclose names, places, and dates, but he had them all in his possession; and he asked the House to take the statements from him, as he dared not, and would not, allow the names and other particulars to be disclosed. He would now read the sentence of one of these Courts, in the case of a man who had a small farm, and who carried on a little business. He had been brought up in the old-fashioned notion that it was his duty to fulfil his obligations, and he had the audacity to pay his rent. Yes, in the month of December he had the dishonesty to pay the September rent, because he could afford to do it, and because his landlord could not do without it. He was summoned to the local Court, his offence tried, and here was the result. The offence with which he was charged was "paying his rent"—three words, nothing more. He was called in, and the sentence read to him. He was fined; but although he would not mention the amount, as it would disclose the circumstances, he might say that the man paid the money on the spot. He was, however, informed by a member of the Court that he had got off very easily, as he ought to have been fined in a much larger sum, and his business ought to have been suspended for a limited time. With these things going on all over the country, were they to be told that there was no intimidation crushing out all the energy and honesty of the country? He agreed with the hon. Member for the City of Cork that these were not the published resolutions of the Land League. If the resolutions of the Land League were carried out in their integrity as the hon. Member put them on paper, he would not pronounce judgment on them. On the contrary, he believed the liberties of this country had been won by free discussion; and if the members of the Land League confined themselves to discussion within the law the Government would forget its duty to the public and to the Crown if it ventured to interfere with them. The greatest Minister that ever held the reins of power, in vindicating the liberty of the subject with reference to general warrants, said that though a peasant lived in a straw-thatched cabin, which was entered by the elements from heaven, yet even the King himself—and that King was George III.—dared not cross its threshold except under the authority of the law; and certainly no Government would attempt to strain the law and to stifle public discussion. It was terrible, however, that in a Christian land, that under the Constitution of which they boasted, life should be rendered so insufferable as they found it in Ireland—that this man was to be cast out as a loathsome leper, that that man was every moment to carry his life in his hand; 153 persons in Ireland so held their lives at present. And then, again, there were 29 cases of mutilation of animals last month.

MR. PARNELL asked how many cases there were altogether?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR remarked that, taking the total, there were not more than 70 cases.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Good Heavens! Had we come to this—that 70 cases of mutilation of animals constituted no crime? The dumb animals were mutilated because the behests of the Land League had not been obeyed, and because their owners had been honest enough to pay their rent.

MR. PARNELL: How many cases have there been in England?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) asked what had that to do with crime in Ireland? In England the cases were detected, and witnesses were not afraid to come forward and bear testimony. In England there were citizens who even arrested, and assisted in arresting, criminals, and who did not wait for the police, but who came forward of their own accord. He wished with all his heart he could support the Amendment, and believe that these outrages were a myth; but when he knew that what was called peace was but the prostration of fear, when he knew that what was called tranquillity was only the paralysis of terror, he felt it was time to ask some remedy for so terrible a state of things. He agreed with the hon. Member for Cork City that a policy of coercion was to be deprecated; but it was a policy of coercion and terrorism that was now ruling Ireland. Here was a specimen of the Land League teaching—

> "Now, what are you to do to a tenant who bids for a farm from which his neighbour has been evicted? ('Kill him,' and 'Shoot him,' were uttered by the crowd.) I think I heard somebody say, 'Shoot him.' But I wish to point out to you a very much better way, a more Christian and a more charitable way, which will give the lost sinner an opportunity of repenting. When a man takes a farm from which another has been evicted, you must show him on the roadside when you meet him"—

"Shun" was suggested; but the reporter said the word was "show;" and it was indeed a much stronger word than "shun"—

> "You must show him in the streets of the town, you must show him at the shop-counter, you must show him in the fair and in the market-place, and even in the house of worship, by leaving him severely alone, by putting him into

a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his kind as if he was a leper of old—you must show him your detestation of the crime he has committed; and you may depend upon it if the population of a county in Ireland carry out this doctrine that there will be no man so full of avarice, so lost to shame, as to dare the public opinion of all right-thinking men within the county, and to transgress your 'unwritten code of laws.'"

The "unwritten code of laws" of the Land League! Not their published resolutions—not the innocent statements put forward in that House—but their common law code of terror and coercion, of murder and mutilation, of threatening notices and nightly outrage. That was the code they governed by. It was to relieve the country from this frightful incubus, stifling everything that was good within it, and encouraging that which was evil and bad, that the Government measure would be directed. There was no coercion, as he understood it, in a law for protecting life and property against the wrong-doer. There was no coercion in a law which reserved to Her Majesty's subjects the right of free action within the limits of the law. As he understood it, a law merely to repress the wicked and the wrong-doer, and to enable the upright and the loyal and the law-abiding man to live in peace and quietness, was not coercion. They were not to imagine from the gloominess of the statements he had made that things were past remedy. He was old enough to recollect times as bad almost as these, when Ireland had suffered almost every misfortune from heaven and from man that was ever recorded in any book of imagination. She had been scourged by famine, stung by want, and maddened by despair; she had been the prey of adventurers; she had been betrayed by the sons whom she trusted; she had been pierced by the reed on which she had leant; and she had come out of it all. She had had times of peace and happiness, and emerged from disaster and trouble, when that which was good had been evoked by righteous laws, and that which was bad had been reproved and coerced by righteous laws—if that could be called coercion. In the midst of her present troubles it was not, he believed, beyond the power of that honourable House to—

"Minister to a mind diseas'd:
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;
Raze out the written troubles of the brain."

But, to do that, they must first—

"Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart."

Ireland called upon this honourable House to protect life and property, to restrain violence and injury, to enable honest men to act honestly, and to prevent dishonest men from acting dishonestly. On the other hand, she called upon this honourable House to amend this land law system, which had caused so much heartburning, and which they on both sides of the House wished for ever to set at rest by just and proper legislation. It was a great and noble Party on this side of the House—[*Derisive cheers from the Opposition*]—aye, he was not ashamed of his Party; it was a great and noble Party. Tell him of a chapter of freedom that was written in the history of the country, and he would tell them that in that chapter the Liberal Party had borne the principal part. On the other side of the House was a great and noble Party too. They inherited great traditions, and they had impressed their principles on great events. Then let them all take heart and act together, and, if they possibly could, let them bring peace to a distracted country, and let none hereafter be able to say that the Queen's writ did not run in Munster, and that an honest man could not live in Ireland.

Mr. M'COAN said, the House was indebted to the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland for diversifying, if not enlivening, the debate, by the speech he had just delivered—a speech which, if it had not been prepared for the Law Courts of Dublin, was from first to last more calculated to influence the jury now sitting before the tribunal in Dublin than the calm and deliberate judgment of the House of Commons. As a forensic effort, he considered it creditable; but it had altogether failed, as had previous speeches in the debate, to convince him that the coercive policy which Her Majesty's Government was about to recommend was founded upon justice, truth, and reason. The Prime Minister did not, of course, address himself to the justification of coercion, but rather to a defence of the general policy foreshadowed in Her Majesty's Speech. The Chief Secretary for Ireland did more directly address himself to the subject-matter of the Amendment; and whilst he did his best he, at all events, failed to convince him (Mr. M'Coan). The hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry), he ventured to think, had taken a farewell of his constituents in the extraordinary speech he had addressed to the House—a speech which he should never have expected from one who had identified himself with Irish politics. He was pleased, however, to think that the hon. Member for Galway, though a nominal Home Ruler, was not an Irishman. He had listened to the speeches of the right hon. and learned Gentlemen the Members for the University of Dublin with a genuine feeling of admiration for their brilliancy and intellectual strength, but, at the same time, with a feeling also of sorrow and shame. He could not help deploring that two such distinguished Irishmen should, he would not say have prostituted, but have misused, their splendid faculties in order to traduce and vilify their native country. He had felt amused at the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill); but then his Lordship was a chartered libertine, who, with characteristic audacity, shrank from attacking no one. He was, however, more than amused when he heard that noble Lord speak so authoritatively on the state of affairs in Ireland in corroboration of what had been stated by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin, for the noble Lord's personal observation in Ireland had been a very limited one, extending only to a short visit which he made to a friend in the county of Kildare during the Recess; so that all he saw of the country was the view he was able to obtain out of the window of a railway carriage in his journey from Dublin to Athy. Of agrarian crime he could have seen none, for Kildare was as free as Middlesex from offences of that character. He was, however, more than compensated when he listened to the speech of the hon. Member for County Cork (Mr. Shaw), who had spoken with earnestness, knowledge, sound sense, and a thorough regard for truth, when he stated that the accounts of Irish crime which had been blazoned forth in the newspapers had been grossly exaggerated. From his own observation during a visit of two months spent in Wexford, Carlow, and Wicklow, he could confirm all that had been said by his hon. Friend, and he did so with the greatest assurance, inasmuch as having attended the quarter sessions in those counties he had heard the assistant barrister compliment the grand juries upon the peaceful conditions of those counties. The hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell) had borne similar testimony of equal value and authority. Listening to this debate, he (Mr. M'Coan) could not help feeling that the Government had entirely failed to prove the necessity for coercion, or, that if coercion were necessary, that the Bill they proposed to bring in was adequate to deal with it. The people of Ireland were bitterly disappointed at the announcement in Her Majesty's Speech that it was intended to ask Parliament for arbitrary powers. He had understood that an agreement had been entered into between the Government and the Irish Members last Session to the effect that if the latter would do their best to preserve peace and tranquillity in Ireland during the Recess, the former would not resort to coercion, but would bring in a large and comprehensive measure of justice to the Irish people. The Irish Members had performed their part of the contract; but the Government, urged on by the panic which prevailed among the Conservative Party, had instituted the State prosecutions now going on. These were a mistake and a blunder, which were sure to result in ignominious miscarriage; and he gathered from the speech of Mr. Shaw Lefevre at Reading, early in December, that even then Her Majesty's Government foresaw the defeat which awaits them in the Four Courts, and had made up their mind to have recourse to coercive legislation. He contended that the ordinary law of Ireland was amply sufficient to meet the state of things in that country. A Return of crimes up to the 1st January had been presented to the House, and there were no offences there recorded which were not fully covered by the Chief Secretary's first Circular to the Irish magistrates. If that were so, there could be no necessity for further legislation. But, even assuming that outrages were being committed, that only showed that the law was not being properly applied, either through the ignorance of the magistrates or the inefficiency of the police. The Returns for 11 months showed that there had been a total of 1,718 so-called agrarian offences in Ireland. Of that total of 1,718, eight, unhappily, were murders; but he ventured to remind the House that of those not more than two, or at most three, could be described as agrarian crimes, while the murders committed in England and Scotland during the same period could be counted by the dozen. He would be the last man in the world to speak without abhorrence of the spilling of the blood of any person, still more if the crime were committed in cold blood for any social purpose whatever. During the Recess he had occasion to address some public meetings in Ireland, and from first to last he had preached abstinence from crime of every sort. He had expressed his confidence that justice would be done to Ireland by Her Majesty's Government, and urged on his audiences that the worst course in their own interest the people could adopt would be to commit crime of any kind. In 11 months there had been assaults, not very aggravated, upon the police. There had also been assaults upon bailiffs and process-servers—incidents which had always been as common as rain showers in Ireland, and probably would be as common to the end. Of these 1,718 offences, some were for illegally cutting off the wool of sheep. That was put down as an agrarian "outrage," one of the grounds, forsooth, on which Her Majesty's Government asked Parliament to give them extra-Constitutional powers. But of the whole 1,718, more than half—namely, 851—consisted of what? Of those miserable threatening letters of which they had heard so much. He was not aware that a single outrage had resulted from the delivery of such letters. Written by cowards to frighten cowards, they broke no bones and drew no blood. He contended that they supplied no ground for putting every man's liberty at the discretion of the police; and that Irish Members would be justified in offering, by every means they could employ, the most strenuous opposition to any measure for suspending the Constitition of Ireland. Nothing that he could say in opposition to the principle of coercion would, he knew, have any effect on the House; but he could appeal to an authority who commanded the respect of every Member of the House. He found that so far back as 1866 a very eminent Member of that House, now sitting on the Treasury Bench, spoke on the subject of coercive legislation. He said that—

> "Sixty-five years ago this country attempted to govern Ireland, and that the English and Irish people were told that if we once got rid of the Irish Parliament we should be stronger. Now, during those 65 years only three considerable measures were passed for Ireland. One was Catholic Emancipation; but that measure, so just, was only passed because the Chief Minister of the day, a great soldier, dreaded the danger of a civil war. Twice in his Parliamentary life measures for the suspension of the civil rights of the Irish people had been brought into Parliament and passed with extreme and unusual rapidity."

Yet the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright), who, 14 years ago made that speech, was a party to the present application for exceptional powers to coerce Ireland. The fact was an enigma which he could not pretend to solve—how the eminent public man, who, in 1866, spoke so strongly against coercive legislation, could reconcile it to his feelings and his conscience to assent now to what he then so vehemently condemned. In conclusion, he would earnestly appeal to the Prime Minister even now to consider the unhappy decision at which he had arrived, and, instead of bullets and buckshot, to give a just and a generous land reform to the Irish people, who would repay him with a rich measure of gratitude for conferring on them so great a boon. Dispensing with coercion, let him redress acknowledged grievances, and he would not only add another stone to the monument to his own great fame, but would promote the well-being and happiness of the Irish nation. It was because he felt that appeals made to the generous sentiments of the Prime Minister were not made in vain, that he earnestly urged on the right hon. Gentleman to make some large concession to right and justice. He might also appeal to a lower motive, and assure him that the concession would immensely facilitate the government of Ireland by his own Administration by securing the co-operation of the Irish Party in evoking out of the present disorder prosperity and obedience to the law. If, on the other hand, he unfortunately proceeded to carry out these coercive threats, he would do much to make Ireland ungovernable by any Administration whatever. Without at all intending to use the language of menace, he warned the right hon. Gentleman that if he persisted in suspending the liberties of the Irish people he would impose on their Representatives the very highest obligation not only to oppose his Administration, but to make Ireland ungovernable by any British Administration until justice was done. They would, indeed, sanction no approach to crime; but they would organize a passive resistance of the Irish people to English law which nothing could overcome. He entreated the Prime Minister, then, not to be carried away by the doubtful alliance now tendered to him by the Opposition, which was, in fact, the best argument against a policy of coercion, for the Party who offered him their alliance were the landlords, the very class which had brought Ireland to its present position. Let him rather conciliate the wavering loyalty of hon. Gentlemen below the Ministerial Gangway. If he did this, and met the Irish Representatives in a spirit of generous conciliation, the Irish problem might be soon and satisfactorily solved.

DR. LYONS rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

DR. LYONS, resuming, said, he rose with embarrassment to explain the vote which he was about to give. He regretted extremely that he felt compelled to part from his allegiance to Her Majesty's Ministers, and he did so with a feeling of very profound regret. He gave the Government the fullest credit for an earnest desire to deal with the affairs of Ireland in a truly generous and satisfactory manner, and during the recent Recess he stated that he did not believe there ever sat on those Benches a Government more fully desirous of doing all that was possible to remedy the grievances of Ireland. When, last Session, the Government announced that they intended to govern Ireland without exceptional legislation, he felt that at last the time had come when the Government, relying on its own strength and the integrity of its own purpose, was prepared to place Ireland on an equal footing with the rest of the Empire. That he looked upon as a bold and courageous policy, and he believed that the Government, notwithstanding all that had taken place, would have eventually justified these expectations if sufficient time had been given, and if measures suitable to the necessities of the case had been put into operation. At the close of last year, at a period when the country was passing out of a state of things which, if not so bad as actual famine, was at least one of great pressure and extreme distress in many parts of the country, Her Majesty's Ministers devised a measure which recommended itself to the majority of that House. He did not think that that measure, an "*opus infraustum atque infelix*, was, in its essence, the one which was best suited to the condition of the country; but it was undoubtedly a great effort to meet the circumstances of the case. He must say that those who threw out that measure took upon their shoulders a great responsibility, for which they had largely to answer in the present crisis. Notwithstanding the statement of the Solicitor General for Ireland, which historically followed up the progress of the agitation that had brought about this crisis, he (Dr. Lyons) would ask the House to bear in mind that, in comparison with other periods of excitement in Ireland, it had been one of singularly rapid progress, of preternatural growth, and had galvanized into a condition of unusual excitement the people of that country. In these respects it differed from all previous agitations. But it should be clearly borne in mind that during the lengthened debates in that House the minds of the Irish people had been raised to an unusual degree of expectation; and it was natural that a proportionate feeling of widespread indignation should prevail at the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill, and that they should have found themselves driven into the movement which had had such singular success during the past four months. So far as it lay in his power, he, as an humble Member of that House, had endeavoured to bring before the House a proposal of a somewhat extended character, so as to relieve the intense pressure of the situation. Those who knew intimately the condition of Ireland at that time could not possibly conceive that £16,000,000 of rental could be wrung from the country in a single year, though that year was prosperous. It would be in the recollection of the House that he (Dr. Lyons) had, so far as the Forms of the House permitted, recommended that a loan of £2,000,000 should be advanced, under special conditions, to the tenant farmers, on the security of their holdings, to enable them to in part pay their rents, and thus meet the demands of their landlords, many of whom were themselves in necessitous circumstances. The country had been drained by the three preceding bad harvests, and therefore it became a question whether the proposal that had been made was not, in the absence of any other, the best for the purpose. He believed, however, it was greatly to be regretted that Her Majesty's Ministers did not then take some alternative measure into their consideration in order to satisfy the wants and necessities and the exalted expectations of the tenant farmers of Ireland. He was glad that the Government had adopted his suggestion in the appointment of the Land Commission; but he could have wished that the idea had been as fully carried out as he had intended. His desire had been that the Commission should go through the length and breadth of the land and make personal inquiries into the actual condition of the farmers and labourers of Ireland. To speak in the language of his own Profession, he could have wished that the duties of the Commissioners had been of a more clinical character. The Commissioners would thus have been able to ascertain the actual condition and the views and opinions of the farmers and labourers of Ireland upon the great question of the hour. It had been said that Parliament ought to have been called together two months earlier, and they had heard from the Prime Minister that as early as September 30 the Government were in a condition to consider the state of the country. If that really was the case, Parliament, he held, ought not to have been dismissed until some measure had been passed to anticipate the state of things which anyone well acquainted with Ireland could foresee, and which he (Dr. Lyons) had predicted, would surely arise. He regretted that the Prime Minister did not follow the example of Ministers in the memorable years of 1831 and 1832, at a much greater crisis than the present, and introduced measures which would be calculated to pacify Ireland. He could only tell the right hon. Gentleman that his name was still a power in Ireland; and had he come forward with large and comprehensive measures of land reform, yet far short of the confiscation demanded by some wild enthusiasts, he would have been sure to meet with a generous reception throughout Ireland, and the magic of his name, accompanied by such measures, would have been sure to satisfy the demands and aspirations of the tenant farmers of that country. He regretted that in the formation of the Ministry over which the right hon. Gentleman presided there was not more of the Irish element to guide him and the other Members of the Cabinet in their decisions with regard to that country. In 1846, a year which was marked in history, there were no less than eight distinguished Irishmen in the Government, three of them being in the Cabinet. Allusion had been made on the Front Treasury Bench to those who were obliged to seek the protection of the constabulary. Well, no doubt, there were many people of excellent character who had found it necessary to have recourse to that protection; but among those who had sought it were many rash and inconsiderate men. Some gentlemen had the most extraordinary ideas of their rights with regard to property. For instance, in one of the distressed districts a gentleman thought fit to apply for his rents 12 days after they were due. Persons who acted on their rights in such a harsh manner could not expect to be very popular. In a disturbed district, which had been recently graphically described by a right hon. Gentleman opposite, rents had, to his knowledge, been cheerfully paid in two cases, and the persons to whom they were paid were the only ones who carried no arms and were in no way protected. These persons knew full well that, after all that had happened in the last three years, it would be impossible to wring from their unfortunate tenants the whole amount due to them, and, like sensible men, they accepted what their tenants could give, which was a large and generous share of what they had to give. These were the only two persons who had received rents in the district in question, and were the only individuals who could go about at night and go amongst the people unarmed and unaffected. They never shut the shutters of their windows, and lived in the affections of their people. The county of Limerick had been referred to as being in a lawless state. What was the condition of things? It had been his fortune during Christmas Vacation to be in the very centre of that county, and he would venture to say that a more peaceable law-abiding people than those he came in contact with did not exist anywhere. He would not undertake to say that there was any community in which there were no sinners; but what he did affirm was, that the majority of these people were living in a condition of peace and contentment in that county, to which so bad a name had been affixed, but which was so secure, that, with a courage worthy of gallant Irishwomen, ladies could go about their districts and pay visits, and enjoy themselves, and go amongst the people, being everywhere regarded with feelings of the greatest amity and affection. Coming to the question of coercion, he desired to express his belief that both the late Government and the present one had relied too much upon the statements of gentlemen placed in circumstances which did not permit of their forming perfectly free and unbiassed opinions. Among such gentlemen were the resident magistrates, for a large number of whom he entertained the highest respect and personal regard. What, he asked, would be the position of a resident magistrate who should take upon himself the responsibility of saying that his district was in such a condition that it could be spared coercive measures, and where an outbreak, however insignificant, subsequently took place? The Irish Executive relied too exclusively on the opinions of the stipendiary magistrates; but he found the Duke of Wellington warning the House of Lords of his time against relying on opinions and reports from that body, and for this reason, that they were partizans. Their reports were undoubtedly of great value; but it was to shift the responsibility from themselves for any Government, Liberal or Conservative, to leave to the stipendiary magistrates the decision of a question of such high State policy as that of coercion. There was one body on whose advice the Irish Government might confidently rely, if it were reformed, extended, and brought into harmony with the convictions of the country. He alluded to the Irish Privy Council. That body, however, as now constituted, was recruited chiefly from the ranks of lawyers, able and distinguished men no doubt, but of all classes they were the one which took the most timid views of affairs. The Government, he hoped, would not overlook the fact that the Lord Mayor and Corporation of Dublin had petitioned the House in favour of a reform of the Land Laws of Ireland; and he might state that the Lord Mayor of Dublin belonged to the consistently extreme Conservative and Protestant party in Ireland, and yet he had been unanimously chosen for the high office which he held. Then, again, there was another important body in Ireland whose opinion ought to be taken and acted on. He alluded to the unpaid magistracy. He, for one, would not assert that they belonged exclusively to the landlord class. They certainly did not, and some of his hon. Friends were not justified in stating that they did. To his own knowledge, within the last 20 years many large additions had been made to that body from persons springing out of the farming classes. He would put in opposition to the opinions of the resident magistracy those of a very considerable number of the unpaid magistracy, and they were that coercive measures were unsuited to the country, were not wanted for the country, and would, in many instances, do harm rather than good. The present condition of Ireland, although, unhappily, one of extreme tension and of a most critical kind, was one which fell far short of requiring such measures as the Government contemplated applying to the country, and was in no manner, he affirmed, so extreme as it had often been. The Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, compared the number of outrages which occurred in 1828 and in each subsequent year up to and including 1833, and he showed that whereas in 1828 the number of commitments for offences amounted to 14,000, and in 1833 to 17,000, after the passing of the Coercion Bill of 1834 they rose to over 21,000, and in 1836 to 23,391.

> "Of that number (said the Duke), 7,769 were offences against the person, and of these, 843, that is about two a-day, were either cases of murder, of conspiracies to murder, or of man-

> slaughter. They were all cases in which human life was attacked or risked."

Now, he (Dr. Lyons) would be told that the Duke of Wellington had himself brought in coercive measures; but what did that illustrious Statesman himself say of such measures a little later on? He used these memorable words—

> "We called upon Parliament to grant us extraordinary powers, powers which, perhaps, Parliament ought not to have given."

He would commend those words to the Treasury Bench and to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He would cite another authority, whom the House would not fail to respect. Lord John Russell, in the debates on coercion, spoke as follows:—

> "For my own part I should be loth, under any circumstances, to join in passing a Coercion Bill for Ireland. If I saw such a Bill recommended by a majority of the Members for Ireland, on whatever side of the House they sat, I should certainly come to its consideration with feelings very different to those with which I entertain this measure, which all the Irish Members opposite oppose as tyrannical, and which most of the Members behind me denounce as futile. But, Sir, I cannot forget that this is not the first Coercion Bill which Ireland has been supposed to require which we have passed, and which have been so inefficient that there have been repeated appeals to us for novel powers."

Another great Statesman, the late Marquess of Lansdowne, speaking in July, 1837, referred to like statistics to show that coercive legislation had failed as compared with the action of the ordinary law in repressing crime and outrage. The noble Marquess said—

> "When noble Lords opposite referred to particular cases, he begged them to compare the average Returns of the last five years, when there was no suspension in the regular state of the law, with the average of the previous five years, when measures of extraordinary severity were had recourse to."

Coming to a still later period, he (Dr. Lyons) would call the attention of the House to the important admission of Lord Lincoln, in 1846, when he said—

> "He was not prepared to deny that there had been an extension of robbery of arms within the period since the passing of that Bill—the Arms Bill."

He might quote Sir Robert Peel to the same effect. But what had been the result of such legislation? They found that it had resulted, not in suppressing crime, and not in stopping the attempts to obtain arms by surreptitious means, but that it had resulted in causing the imprisonment of some few individuals who, until their incarceration, had occupied a position of comparative insignificance. The legislation of 1867 only led to the captivity of a number of, till then, unimportant men, though the country was agitated from the centre to the sea. Then, he would ask, whether it could be stated that any considerable measure of success had followed the attempts of the Government to deal with the present agitation? Quite the contrary. There had been now going on for some time in public—God alone knew how much longer it was likely to continue —a trial which was practically a melodramatic performance, and which would only enrich the lawyers; for even if the proceedings came to an end within the next six months, many legal points, and points of a technical character, would have to be reviewed before another tribunal. Why, looking at the matter as it stood up to the present time, as a contest between the Government and the hon. Member for the City of Cork, the hon. Member for the City of Cork had scored enormously by this trial. First of all, since the prosecution money had simply rained upon his head. The Defence Fund had received such support that *The Freeman's Journal* had actually said, "Don't send any more money." Only £10,000 was called for, but that sum had been more than doubled. That was not the most important result. The prosecution had had the effect of bringing into the field on behalf of the traversers persons of various classes who up to this period had never identified themselves with any movement of the kind. No fewer than 10 Irish Catholic Bishops had expressed sympathy with the hon. Member, and had sent in their subscriptions to the Defence Fund. When they came to discuss the Coercion Bill they would have to consider what amount of moral support these distinguished persons, and those who acted under them, their priests and curates, would bring to bear against the coercion policy. What was the use of a Coercion Bill if it only succeeded in imprisoning a few individuals, while the Archbishops and Bishops of the land were lending their support to the friends of the movement who were not imprisoned? Was the right hon. Gentleman prepared to imitate the great Earl of Kildare, afterwards Lord Deputy, in his contest with the then Archbishop of Cashel, when he burned down the Cathedral of Cashel, and avowed before Henry VIII. he would not have burned the Cathedral, but that he "thought my Lord Archbishop was therein?" He (Dr. Lyons) must here distinctly explain that he had not the slightest sympathy with any part of the violent action that had taken place outside the Land League; but he had the greatest possible sympathy with those hon. Members who were endeavouring, by constitutional means, to alleviate the condition of those unfortunate people who had been reduced to destitution and beggary by the action of the few unjust landlords who brought discredit on the whole order. He would not enter into any special consideration of Her Majesty's Speech further than to remark, in reference to the paragraph that dwelt with the Land Question, he very much regretted that two important subjects that might fairly have been considered were not legible in the Speech—namely, any measure connected with the waste lands of Ireland, or any measure dealing with the great corporate lands. These were two essential elements for consideration in any satisfactory Land Measure, and he regretted that they had not been referred to. At the same time, he felt it was not right to judge the proposals of the Government until they had been brought fully before them. He regretted to say that the conviction had been forced upon him that there did not now exist in the House of Commons that generous feeling and fulness of desire to meet the requirements of the case of Ireland that existed last year, and it would not be so easy for the Government, in the present temper of the House of Commons, to pass a large remedial measure as it was last Session. He felt that the hon. Member for the City of Cork had overstrained his bow, and thus materially damaged the prospects of success for an Irish Land Measure; and he could not but feel surprised at the compliments to the moderation of the hon. Gentleman paid him by the Chief Secretary, after his proposal, re-stated in that House, to take £5,000,000 from the pockets of one set of people in Ireland and transfer them to others. But he still believed in the generosity and wisdom of the House; and he, for one, ventured to think that when the land proposals came fully before them they should be able to construct out of them a measure of considerable value, and of a very extended character. He would only add, in conclusion, that he attached the utmost importance to the clause in the Royal Speech which spoke of the proposed gradual introduction of a tenant proprietary system into Ireland, and his belief was that such a project would be at once feasible and of vast permanent advantage to the country.

COLONEL DAWNAY said, he believed that all were agreed that the present condition of Ireland had become intolerable, and everyone was ready to support any effectual measure to improve that condition. The difficulty was to decide what the effectual remedy ought to be. The difficulty was greatly increased by the attitude assumed by the Home Rulers, who were playing a desperate game. They were trying to extort concessions which never would and never could be conceded by any Government, whether Conservative, Liberal, or Radical, and the sooner the fact was universally recognized the better would it be for the prosperity of Ireland. The agitation was led by bold and resolute men, and the weapons they employed were terrorism and obstruction. They had succeeded in superseding the government of Her Majesty in Ireland by an organized system of terriorism, while in Parliament they had succeeded in reducing Her Majesty's Government to a state of impotence by an organized system of obstruction. The other day, at a Home Rule meeting, it was resolved that no English or Scotch Parliamentary Business should be allowed to be proceeded with until all the arrears of Irish legislation were disposed of. The experience of last Session led him to believe that an attempt would be made to carry out that resolution, and that it would be made good unless the Government resolutely interfered. He should like to ask, Who were they who for the time had overthrown the government of Her Majesty in Ireland? If the struggle were really one between Celt and Saxon, if it were between Ireland and the rest of the United Kingdom, it would be a very serious matter; but, even then, the universal law of nature would have at length to take its course, and the weakest would have to go to the wall. He was thankful to say that this was not the case. The Gentlemen who acknowledged the hon. Member for the City of Cork as their Leader claimed to be Representatives of Ireland. He maintained they were nothing of the kind. They were Representatives only of the Home Rule Party in Ireland, which was a very different thing; and the greater part of the wealth of the education, and of the intelligence of the country was against them. They were only the Representatives of anarchy and disorder, which the Conservative feeling of England was at length compelled and fully resolved to put down. Since the Government, though late in the day, had determined to assert their authority, which had been so long in abeyance, and to deal resolutely with the state of affairs in Ireland, it was the duty of Members, wherever they sat, loyally to support them; and he believed they would be supported, except by those whose only policy was hatred of England, and whose aim and object were the dissolution of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

SIR JOHN HAY said, that as yet no Scotch Member, except the Prime Minister, had spoken in this debate, and he wished to make a few remarks on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). The speech of the Solicitor General for Ireland was wanting only in one particular. Having related all the evils that were found to exist in Ireland in 1879, and continuing at the time the present Government acceded to Office, he gavo no explanation why the Peace Preservation Act was allowed to drop in 1880; and if all the evils which the hon. and learned Gentleman described existed at the time the Government came into Office the conduct of the Government was incomprehensible, and the statements which had been made to the country by the Prime Minister and others were certainly not justified by the result. There was no doubt, as the hon. Member who has last spoken had said, that all loyal subjects should support Her Majesty's Government in any measures they might bring forward for preserving peace and protecting life and property in Ireland. Those who heard the eloquent speeches of the two right hon. and learned Members for the University of Dublin and of the Solicitor General for Ireland could have no doubt that the state of Ireland was one which required stringent measures. The action of the Government in taking those measures was so far satisfactory. They all knew that persons who ought to have means and to be able to pay their debts were now unable to carry on the ordinary transactions of life, and that a very large proportion of the lower orders were in undoubted misery, being houseless and without food or clothing. Such a condition of society was attended by the most terrible evils, and those evils were intensified by agitators, whom it was the business of Her Majesty's Government to control. But what he objected to was, that in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, as advised by her Ministers, no remedy was suggested for these intolerable evils. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) was the one single person who alluded to the only reasonable way in which this question could be dealt with, and that was by judicious emigration. Speaking as a Scotch Member, and with a knowledge of what had occurred in Scotland, he could state that within the last 100 years Scotland had been delivered from evils similar to those which existed in Ireland by judicious emigration. In spite of the arguments of the late John Stuart Mill, he did not understand how Ireland could support a larger population. He should be delighted to see money granted for the reclamation of waste lands; but such reclamation would take some years before the lands could be made productive for the sustenance of the people of Ireland. The emigration suggested by the hon. Member for Mayo was from one part of Ireland to another, from bad to better land; but such a system would not pay. Hon. Members from the other side of the Tweed would agree with him that it was by a similar system that Scotland was at this moment flooded by Irish emigrants. If Members would look to the Returns of the Board of Supervision, they would find that in proportion as the counties of Scotland were nearest to Ireland, so had the paupers in those counties been increasing. In Wigtown, which was nearest to Ireland, they had a state of pauperism, entirely induced by the Irish element, of 1 in 28, and in Kirkcudbright, which was next, of 1 in 30 of the population, and in Ayrshire a similar state of Irish pauperism prevailed. The condition of Scotland and Ireland might be very fairly compared. He would not detain the House long in making the comparison, which struck him as being forcible. The area of both was almost identical, that of Scotland being 30,685 square miles, and that of Ireland 31,874. The tilled or cultivated land of Scotland was 4,640,803 acres, that of Ireland 5,203,705. The population of Scotland was 3,593,299, that of Ireland 5,351,060. Separating the urban from the rural population, they found in seven large towns in Scotland a population of 1,188,000, and in seven large towns of Ireland 651,000; so that there were 2,404,000 more of a rural population in Ireland than in Scotland. In addition, the products of the land in Scotland, as measured by the rental, were £18,500,000, while that of Ireland, according to the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons), the product of the land was £16,000,000; and though he found it given in *Doomsday Book* as £13,500,000, he would not contest the accuracy of the hon. Gentleman's figures. Be that as it might, the acreage under tillage in Ireland, which was larger than in Scotland, in any case was less in the product than the acreage of Scotland. Was it not, therefore, evident that until a larger amount of land was under cultivation, or until the cultivation in Ireland improved, it was quite impossible that the 2,000,000 who were starving in Ireland could continue to live in that country except by the charity of others? He wished to put those matters before the House for its consideration, because he believed in a case of that sort, when Ireland had no mining industry, and, except in the North, very little manufactures, little to give in exchange for the food of its people, and that the soil under cultivation only represented about the same amount as that under cultivation in Scotland, emigration was the remedy to be resorted to. In Canada and elsewhere they had great tracts of country where Irish families might be sent, where the Great Pacific Railway was being made; and in the State of Manitoba also there was room for 80,000,000 persons. Therefore, was it not reasonable that a Government which was anxious to govern Ireland rightly, should take care that at least 2,000,000 of the Irish people should go to the Queen's own Dominions, the Dominion of Canada, where, with intelligent industry, they could maintain themselves and their families? When the West Indian Slavery was put an end to, the House did not hesitate to grant £20,000,000 for that purpose; and if the same sum of money was granted for the purpose of conveying to and establishing 2,000,000 Irish emigrants in our own Dominion of Canada, where they could become an industrious population, that money would be well bestowed; and, after all, £20,000,000 was not ½*d.* on the Income Tax. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen might laugh, but it was a fact—£20,000,000 represented interest at 3 per cent of £600,000 a-year, and the ½*d.* Income Tax produced nearly £1,000,000. A larger sum was given for the abolition of Purchase in the Army; that cost nearly £40,000,000. And here they had a starving population in Ireland, when, for half the sum, they could be sent to a country where they could maintain their families, and do good service to the country.

MR. GILL begged to call attention to the exaggerations and misrepresentations of which the English Press had been guilty with respect to the state of Ireland. A large section of the English Press had, he believed, entered into a conspiracy to exasperate the minds of the English people against Ireland. In that, the English papers had most ignoble colleagues in the Irish Press, a portion of which ought to be known by a name which had been applied to a part of the Press in Germany—namely, "the Reptile Press." That Press had done its utmost to assist the English Press in its calumnies against the Irish people; and it was a curious coincidence, if it was a coincidence, that the correspondents of allmost all the English newspapers that kept regular correspondents in Dublin belonged to the staff of Conservative newspapers in Dublin. Why did they do this? Because they knew they would pick up every story about crime and outrage in Ireland, whether true or not, and send it to the London papers. These correspondents never sent over the contradictions of those stories. If the English papers had correspondents who were connected with the popular journals in Ireland, such as *The Freeman's Journal*, they would receive the contradiction of those calumnies. By such means this country had been thoroughly exasperated against Ireland, as in the year 1848, when the most exaggerated ideas about Ireland were prevalent. At that time he remembered that an Irish gentleman, who had received a generous but unneeded offer of an asylum in the house of an English friend, had replied that nothing unusual was going on—a remark that was, to a great extent, true at the present day. It was to be remembered that while millions of persons read the accounts of outrages, hardly one in a thousand saw the denial of them. And yet most of them were purely imaginary. For example, a gentleman in the West of Ireland was reported to have been shot at; but he was seen in Dublin on the same day, and immediately wrote to the papers denying all the rumours that had been circulated about him. Equally false was a story from County Clare respecting the destruction of hay on the land of a man who had taken a farm contrary to the orders of the local Land League. Those were good and typical instances of imaginary outrages. As for the proposed Coercion Bills, it was generally thought that the imaginary nature of the outrages against which they were directed would render them all but useless. He believed that threatening letters were either written as a joke, or were sent to frighten cowards. He had himself received a threatening letter, which he afterwards discovered to have come from an intimate friend. The offences against cattle, bad as they were, were comparatively few, and in point of number could not compare with those returned monthly by the officers of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Coercive laws would not prevent "Boycotting;" nor would they be effective in making juries return verdicts, for, generally speaking, the evidence adduced before them was such as in England they would not hang a dog upon. The House was asked the other evening what chance there was of a conviction by juries as they were now constituted. He asked what chance there was up to a few years ago of an acquittal as the juries were then constituted? Up to that time the juries were packed; and perhaps one reason that it was now difficult to get the juries to convict was that the class of persons now serving on juries were so long kept off them, that they had not yet learned to judge of the evidence brought before them. There might be cases in Ireland where crimes were committed and evidence was not brought before the juries; but this was caused by the fidelity of the people to one another that was displayed in all countries where bad and tyrannical laws had been in operation for centuries. But did anyone tell him that when the poor peasantry refused to be tempted by the large rewards offered by the Government that they could, by coercive laws, be compelled to give evidence against criminals? In his opinion, coercion would not have the effect of preventing a single crime or outrage in Ireland. With regard to the refusal to pay rack-rents, which the people were determined to do at present, was he to be told that coercion laws would remedy that? The only way to remedy this was by wise and liberal legislation upon the Land Question; and if hon. Members now opposed to reform helped to promote this legislation, they would be securing to their friends the payment of at least a fair rent. The Prime Minister, rather unfairly, the other night, stated that the majority of those engaged in the land agitation had no connection with land. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman that every man in Ireland had connection with the land, direct or indirect. Land was the only thing on which all classes had to depend since they had been deprived of their manufactures by unjust laws, and when the agricultural classes were depressed all classes were depressed. It was not, therefore, to be wondered at that men not directly connected with land should be engaged in the present agitation. The country would never be made free by Coercion Acts, and never would be made prosperous by partial legislation. The only way to put the country in a healthy and prosperous condition was for the Government to go to work in a thorough and radical manner. They ought not to try to tinker up the Land Act of 1870, for however much it was tinkered there would be holes left in it which a future Parliament would have to tinker up again, and in the interval a period of discontent would exist in Ireland. If at the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act, the Government then in power had made it a wide and comprehensive measure, there would have been no necessity afterwards of patching up the holes they had left in order to admit to Office a Catholic Lord Chancellor and others who were excluded because of their religion. The peace of Ireland was at all times like the peace of a volcano, which might at any moment burst forth; and if the Government left Ireland in the condition in which she had existed for centuries, no one could tell the moment the country might burst into flame again.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, he had been much and sorrowfully struck by the picture drawn in this debate by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) and other hon. Members, of the disorders, crimes, and cruelties which were practised to some extent in certain parts of Ireland. Now, it was well known that, apart from agrarian offences, the Irish were probably one of the least criminal populations in Europe; and, therefore, a picture of that sort must be regarded as the measure of the injustice which the Irish people had suffered for generations past, and the deeper the colours they were enabled to give to that picture the more it was evident that if this House did its duty it would at once proceed to enact a large measure of justice. There were, it appeared to him, three sections of opinion in the House in regard to the policy which this country ought to or might pursue towards Ireland. There were those who believed that a great remedial measure should be at once proceeded with, and that such a measure would, in the quickest and most satisfactory way, restore order to Ireland; and those, therefore, who had that belief looked with feelings almost of dismay at the recurrence of repressive measures previous to bringing in any Land Act as was proposed by the Government. How large or small that Party might be at this stage of the proceedings they did not know. Secondly, there were those who, represented by the Government, believed that they should proceed at once to enact repressive measures, and that afterwards they should pass a Land Act for Ireland; and, lastly, there was the Party opposite, the Tory Party, which, so far as he understood it, looked for repressive measures, and repressive measures alone. ["No, no!"] Considering the speeches which had been delivered out of the House, and by the most responsible men of the Conservative Party in it, he came to that conclusion. There was for instance, the speech of the Leader of the Party, the right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. He (Mr. Jacob Bright) listened to it attentively, and it did not seem to him to make the slightest admission that there was any grievance or injustice in Ireland. The only reference he made to a remedy was a sneer. Then there was the speech by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), an Irishman, and a man of ability and experience. He told them that this movement in favour of security to the tenant farmer for his industry was spreading throughout Ireland; that it was no longer a Catholic movement, but that Catholics and Protestants were joining in it. Ulster, instead of turning her back on the sister Provinces, was united with them in demanding a great measure of reform from this House; and yet the late Attorney General for Ireland spoke as if there was not a grievance in the country, and, of course, not believing in any grievance, did not say a single word with regard to any remedy. The noble Lord the Member for Woodcock—[*Laughter*]—well, he might probably have made a more inaccurate mistake; but he should have said the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), who was also a Leader in that House, who spoke at great length, as he generally did, and amused the House by his speech, said nothing of any remedy for Ireland. He did not offer any assistance to the Government in carrying a remedy through the House, not even a Land Bill; but he did offer very earnest assistance in the proposal to carry anything like repression. The Conservative Party, as he (Mr. Jacob Bright) understood them, believed that the Irish territorial system was just what it ought to be. Why, the territorial system of Ireland would not and ought not to be tolerated in any country in the world similarly circumstanced. They might tell him, if they liked, that it was to a great extent the system which we had in England; but the English system would have been changed long ago but for the manufacturing and commercial development of this country, which enabled the energy of the people to find employment otherwise than by agricultural pursuits. But when he was told that the English and Irish systems were the same, he must ask the House one question—Did they know of farmers who created their own farms in England, who made the land from the first, cultivated it from being in a state of waste, put up the buildings, and, in fact, who furnished the farm? Did they know of any such case in England in which rents were suddenly and constantly raised, and where the tenant was liable in an hour of misfortune to be evicted in case he did not submit? Practically, therefore, there was a very great and significant difference between the systems of the two countries. He agreed with those who said that in a country where the great majority of the people lived by agriculture, where the land was monopolized by a few hands, that the landowner had no more right to receive the rent which a fierce and hungry competition would give him than a railway company, unfettered by Acts of Parliament, would have a right to charge any price it liked to the travelling public for fares. Now a word as to the policy of the Government. The Government asked to take up the whole time of the House in order, as he understood, that it might pass certain repressive measures, and then they were to proceed with a Land Bill. He wished it had been possible for the Government to ask for the whole time of the House, in the first instance, for the purpose of passing a Land Bill. They would then have seen what the effect of Irish opinion would have been in such a case, and they would only have then to proceed to repression when that great remedy had failed in its effects. But what was the prospect before them? They were about to send repressive measures up to the House of Lords, and when they got there, they would be passed without delay; or, if there were delay, it would be delay in order to intensify the character of the measures. When they sent the Land Bill to the House of Lords, what would the effect be? The Lords would seek to mutilate and impair any such Act which the House of Commons might send to them. Repressive measures would possibly do something to produce outward quiet in Ireland. But if they sent up a Land Bill to the House of Lords, that House would make the fact of this seeming quiet a reason for damaging still more that Land Bill. Repressive measures sometimes really and sometimes only in appearance accomplished the purpose which the Government who proposed them hoped to see accomplished. But sometimes such measures failed, and not only failed, but even produced a prejudicial effect. There was not a man on the Liberal side of the House, there was not an Irish Member of the House, who did not know that a great measure of justice in regard to the land in Ireland would at once produce a marked effect, would diminish the influence of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), and would attract a large portion of the population to the side of law and order. If he might imagine such an unfortunate thing as the possibility of their having two Irelands upon their hands, if in one case repressive measures were tried, and in the other influences were brought to bear in a large measure of justice, he was certain the country which had justice given to it would be the more easily governed and would be restored to order first. He knew that in advocating these views, which were not generally accepted, he had the misfortune to come from a great and populous county which was not saturated by the wisdom of the London Press, and which was a long way removed from the influence of London society. But the people of Manchester acted upon such lights as they had, and it was his firm conviction that if the Government on this occasion had taken a different course, at least so far as the Liberal Party was concerned, and had proceeded first with a Land Bill, they would not only have carried the public opinion of his county with them, but would have aroused in their favour throught the country a generous enthusiasm, which was now out of the question. The Prime Minister, in telling the House how it was that repressive measures had not sooner been resorted to, told them, among other things, that the Government had waited for the results of the trials in a certain event in order to see their effect on Ireland. Well, it was a reasonable thing to wait for these results, to see whether Ireland would be in any degree affected by them. But he thought it would have been a far more reasonable and far more desirable thing to wait for the results of a good Land Law before proposing coercive measures. Everybody knew that the results would have been tenfold better than any results that could possibly come from the State trials. The Land Bill of the Government had been severely criticized by anticipation; but he was not going to criticize a Bill which was not before them, and whose provisions they did not know. He was, however, bound to say that in the part of the House where he sat there had been much disappointment in regard to the Bill. He, himself, however, for one, had confidence in the Government that they would bring a Bill before the House which most reasonable men would think worthy of being accepted. Consider the position of the Ministers who sat upon that Bench. They were about to ask for coercive measures. They told them, and nobody doubted their word, that that was one of the most painful acts of their lives. Having then a great opportunity of passing a measure which might do away hereafter with all necessity for coercive legislation for Ireland, was it possible the Government might not be found equal to the occasion? The right hon. and gallant Gentleman who a little while ago addressed the House, the Member for the Wigton Burghs (Sir John Hay), referred to the question of the poor population of the West of Ireland. He (Mr. Jacob Bright) believed that was the most difficult part of the whole Irish question. So far the Government had given them no light as to what they meant to do there. They knew that the poor people in the West of Ireland were living on plots of land which would not keep them if they paid no rent at all. They knew that these people must be removed and put in better circumstances. The question might be whether they should be removed across the ocean, or should be removed to other parts of their own land. It might be a more economical thing from a money point of view to send them to Canada than to find them plots in Ireland; but this was not merely an economical question. There were other and higher considerations in the matter; and he believed a Government scheme for the reclamation of waste lands in Ireland would produce a great moral as well as a more powerful and immediate effect. He had, in regard to this Irish question, unbounded faith in justice; but he must confess he looked with feelings of distress, which he could not attempt to describe, at the prospect of passing he did not know how many weeks in angry debates in order to obtain repressive measures, for during that time justice would be delayed.

MR. CHAPLIN said, the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Jacob Bright) said, among other things, that in his view the Tory Party looked to coercion, and coercion alone, as the remedy for the evils of unhappy Ireland. But in his opinion of the views of the Tory Party the hon. Member misunderstood, even if he did not malign, that considerable section of the House and the country. They might differ as to the necessity for measures of repression; but he (Mr. Chaplin) took leave to say that there was no Member of any Party in that House who did not alike approach the question with greater feelings of sorrow and dismay. He (Mr. Chaplin) differed from the views expressed by the hon. Member; but he hoped that at least, before he sat down, he should be able to convince him that he had done less than justice to the Tory Party. He wished to preface his remarks with a few observations in reply to what had been said in reference to the evils of the Land Question. The hon. Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Shaw), and several other Members who had spoken, seemed to look chiefly to some alteration in the Land Laws for the remedy which they desired. He would not yield to any hon. Member in his sympathy for the sad and suffering people whose miseries had been so fittingly and so eloquently described; but he could not altogether bring himself to agree to the measures which those hon. Members had suggested. On the contrary, he was convinced that it was to the circumstances and the peculiar conditions of the country, rather than to the Land Laws, that the chronic misery and discontent of Ireland were owing. The laws which governed the relations between landlords and tenants in Ireland were more favourable to the tenants than those prevailing in either England or Scotland at the present time. He had the high authority of the Prime Minister for this statement, who in March, 1870, used these words—

"\. . . . a Bill which offers to the farmers and the cottiers of Ireland privileges of occupation such as have never yet been enjoyed in two countries that are admitted to be, as respects the condition of the cultivators of the soil, at the very least among the foremost in the world."—[3 *Hansard*, cxcix. 1851.]

The more he considered the matter the more he must, with all respect, demur to the proposition of those who held that the discontent and suffering of the Irish people were due to the evils and inhumanity of the Land Laws. The hon. Member for the County of Cork dwelt upon the hardship of the rent being arbitrarily raised; and he (Mr. Chaplin) must say that on that point he went with the hon. Member a very considerable way when it actually occurred. He, however, wished to point out to the House that the arbitrary raising of the rent was the exception, and not the rule, in the vast majority of cases in Ireland. ["No, no!"] The hon. Member for the County of Cork had certainly put a case in support of his views in which the rent had been arbitrarily raised upon improvements effected by the tenant. He (Mr. Chaplin) was not there to-night in any way to palliate or to excuse such an act. But supposing that in such a case the very worst had happened, and the tenant had refused to pay the rent so arbitrarily raised, what would have been his position? As the hon. Member had reminded the House in another portion of his speech—which, perhaps, fell rather short of that consistency which might have been looked for —under the shelter of those splendid measures, as he called them, passed 10 years ago, the position of the tenant would have been this. He would, in the first place, receive full compensation and repayment for every penny of the £300 which the hon. Member had described him as having laid out upon his farm, and, having received that, if his farm were a small one, he would be entitled in addition, over and above the compensation for improvements, to one-third of the value of the fee simple as compensation for disturbance. He therefore maintained that, hard as the case might be, it was not really anything like so hard as it otherwise might appear to the uninitiated; and, under those circumstances, hon. Members should speak on the subject without unduly exaggerating the hardship which the tenant would undergo. It might, however, be said, and, indeed, it had often been said in the course of this debate, that if the tenant were turned out of or left his farm, he had nowhere else to go to, and that the people had nothing else to look to but the land for a livelihood. That was a remark that was perfectly true, and it was that fact which occasioned the unhappiness and the misery of the position of the Irish peasant. That unhappiness and that misery, however, were not owing to unjust laws, but to the peculiar condition of the country. In Ireland, at the present time, the land was the sole resource, and it was that which he meant when he referred to the peculiar condition of the country. If right hon. Gentlemen who sat upon the opposite Bench were really sincere in their desire, as he had no doubt they were, and if hon. Members for Irish constituencies were sincerely desirous permanently to better the condition of that unfortunate country, they must find some other means of livelihood for the people besides that derived from the land. They must encourage and, if necessary, assist the establishment of manufacturing industries in Ireland, and the re-establishment of those which more than 150 years ago were crushed altogether by the selfish commercial policy of England. Something more than that, however, would have to be done. The overcrowding of people upon small and wretched plots of land must be prevented. In many parts of Ireland, if the freehold of his holding were given to the tenant to-morrow, it would not be sufficient to afford him the means of obtaining a decent livelihood even in good years, and in bad seasons it would reduce him to starvation. They must, therefore, find some means to lessen as much as possible that fierce competition for land which had often been described as the curse of Ireland, and which every person who had thought over and had studied this question recognized as the source and root and the very pith and marrow of all the miseries of that unhappy country. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) the other night had denounced all proposals for emigration; but, for his own part, he (Mr Chaplin) was convinced that in the provisions of any measure for the permanent improvement of the country emigration must always play a prominent part. He, however, saw no reason why the scheme for the migration of some of the population from overcrowded districts to waste or to semi-waste lands should not result in advantage equally to the district they left and that to which they went. Although hon. Members who sat near him had been taunted with indifference to the sufferings of the people of Ireland, they could tell the hon. Member for Mayo that it was not always those who talked the most who were ready to do the most for the Irish people. As far as he was personally concerned, he could assure the hon. Member that whenever any practical proposal of the nature he had indicated was brought forward it would receive his most earnest support. But the hon. Members for Ireland did not like the Land Bill of the Government. They said it was not what they wanted. Were they, however, quite sure they knew what that Bill was to be? The hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright), he must say, appeared to have smelt a rat; and he (Mr. Chaplin) was not quite sure that the hon. Member was not right. For his own part, he must say that he thought the Prime Minister ought to have told the House of Commons a great deal more than he did in reference to that Bill, or he should have said nothing at all about it. What the right hon. Gentleman did say seemed to him to be so vague that, as the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) had said the other night, it might mean anything, or everything, or absolutely nothing at all. He must say that for a man in the position of the Prime Minister, in a crisis like the present, it was too bad that he should be throwing flies in this way to see in what direction the stream ran. What was the case with regard to the Coercion Bill, which they thought the Government had got in their pockets? They had heard a startling announcement upon that point that night. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson), at an early period of the evening, appeared to frame an elaborate indictment against the present Leaders of the Opposition because they did not interfere with meetings of the Land League during the time that they were in Office. That he did, as he (Mr. Chaplin) understood him, to defend the conduct of the Government to which he belonged. In the course of his remarkable—and as long as it was remarkable—speech, he used these most significant words when speaking of the Coercion Bill, "of the outline of which I am myself ignorant." What was the meaning of that observation? It was one of the most serious and startling announcements ever made to an astonished House ["Oh, oh!"] Were they really to understand that, after the announcements in the Queen's Speech, after all they had heard, after Parliament had been summoned, the Government were still fishing for a Coercion Bill as well as for a Land Bill? Such a thing would be the most daring attempt to practise upon the common sense of the House that he had ever known. The hon. Member for the County of Cork asked for the introduction of what he called regulated rents. Did the hon. Member wish for a system of regulated tenant right as well, and if not, why not? He would recommend the hon. Member to read the speeches of the Prime Minister during the passage of the Land Bill on the subject of regulated rents. He would there find five columns of unanswered argument against any such proposition. He did not say unanswerable arguments, because he declined to commit himself to any opinion upon a Land Bill which was not before him. He would make no further observation upon that point, except to express the sincere regret he felt at finding that there was to be, according to the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), an agitation at Manchester, Birmingham, and elsewhere in the country, for the purpose of putting pressure upon men such as the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) and his right hon. and learned Friend the Home Secretary, he supposed, and others who, with rather scant respect, the hon. Member had described as antediluvian Whigs. He rejoiced that at last they were face to face with that Parliament, from summoning which Ministers had, until last week, shrank as from something they feared to meet. It was small wonder that they did so as they pondered over the outcome of their short Recess and the present condition of Ireland. Having made these observations, he should like to turn his attention for a moment to the Address in answer to the Gracious Speech from the Throne. That Speech was a document of considerable length. He thought it was simply a confession of failure by a Ministry of impotence and errors. ["Oh, oh!"] He wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster remembered the counsel he gave some time ago, that Ireland should be dealt with with a more desperate determination. Did he think at the time of the danger of his words, of the conflagration which they might raise? What they saw in Ireland to-day was not only crime, violence, and outrage; they had to grapple with rebellion against all law and all order in the country—a rebellion which had, undoubtedly, become most formidable in its aspects and dimensions solely through the sufferance and the supine—not to say criminal—inaction of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister complained the other night that the charges made against him were not precise and sufficiently distinct. He asked what it was that the Government ought to have done, and when ought they to have done it? He (Mr. Chaplin) would answer that question. They ought, undoubtedly, to have renewed the Peace Preservation Act; and, failing that, it was their duty, at the very earliest opportunity, to have done exactly what they said at the end of last Session it would be the duty of the Government to do, and to have done it exactly at the time they said they would do it. First, let him say a word with regard to the non-renewal of the Peace Preservation Act. They knew from his speech in Mid Lothian that the Prime Minister did not think it would be necessary to renew that Act; and it was, no doubt, very natural that he should have entertained that opinion. The right hon. Gentleman had brought all the resources of his intellect and his great powers to the solution of the Irish problem. He had introduced great measures in the interest of Ireland; he had carried them to a triumphant issue; and most certainly he had made demands on Parliament such as no Minister had ever made before. Was he not the Minister who had disestablished the Irish Church? Was he not the Minister who had made such concessions with regard to land that he transferred at one swoop, as was estimated at the time by some persons, one-third of the property of one class to another? And was it possible that all these immense sacrifices had failed to restore prosperity to Ireland? He (Mr. Chaplin) could understand and sympathize with the reluctance of the man who had made these great and tremendous efforts in the hope—the false hope, as it had, unhappily, turned out—to admit that those unparalleled concessions had not given peace and contentment to that country. But with him, as with so many other men, the wish had been father to the thought. That was not the opinion of his Colleagues, or that of, perhaps, the most experienced, and, it might be said without offence to the rest, the most eminent among them. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham had spoken, as it happened, shortly before the General Election on that subject; and he drew a picture of the state of Ireland as startling and alarming as it subsequently proved to have been absolutely true. And so struck were many of them on that (the Opposition) side of the House by his statements, that he (Mr. Chaplin) took on himself, at the earliest opportunity, to rise in the debate on the Address in answer to the Gracious Speech from the Throne, and called the attention of the Prime Minister and that of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant to the statements of their Colleague; and he said that they wished to know, and the country had a right to know, on what ground, in the face of those announcements, the Government thought it right to dispense with that which, under the circumstances, could only be regarded as an indispensable safeguard of society in Ireland? To that appeal no reply whatever was made; and he must confess that, knowing, as he did, the invariable courtesy which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland showed to every Member, he was at a loss to account for his silence on that occasion. But he was not at any such loss now. He knew now—they had it on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman's Predecessor (Mr. J. Lowther)—that there was only one answer which he could have made, and it was that he had done it on his own responsibility, in direct defiance of the warning and the advice of the permanent officials who were acquainted with the country, of all the magistrates who had been consulted with scarcely an exception, and of the heads of the police—in fact, of every competent authority in Ireland. Under these circumstances, he must say that he thought the non-renewal of the Peace Preservation Act was not undeserving of blame. Later in the Session there was great uneasiness felt on that (the Opposition) side of the House as to the condition of Ireland, and Questions were put to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) as to the intentions of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman answered—and again he (Mr. Chaplin) considered him wrong in doing so—

> "If we find—as we do not believe we shall find—that in the course of the autumn or winter we cannot rely on the existing law, we shall not, in that case, hesitate to call Parliament together for the purpose giving us such additional powers as may be needed to fulfil our first duty, the protection of life and property."—[3 *Hansard*, cclv. 1846.]

The Government, in saying that, declared that the moment their existing powers were found to be insufficient they would come to Parliament and ask for more. Now, he wanted to know how long the powers in the hands of the Government had been insufficient for the protection of life and property? When did the right hon. Gentleman find that they were insufficient? Were they, or were they not, insufficient at the end of October or the beginning of November, when the Cabinet began to meet? Those were questions to which he respectfully invited an answer from the Government, and until they gave one—and, for the present, he challenged the conduct of the Government on either ground—if they were sufficient in the autumn, how had they failed to secure life and property and to vindicate the law in Ireland? If they were sufficient, and they had neglected to enforce them, what must be their condemnation? If they were not sufficient, could they justify that departure from their pledge? He had not made those criticisms in a Party sense, or with the least desire to embarrass the Government. He did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would entertain that opinion himself. But they had before them that which they believed to be their duty as an Opposition. They thought it only right that the country should have the opportunity of knowing, as far as they could put it temperately before them, how it was and by what means they had been brought into their present position. The Government must themselves know that had they done their duty two or three months ago things would not now have been in that terrible plight. He would say nothing further on the point, except to assure the Government that if they were determined at the present time to do what hon. Gentlemen on his side believed to be their duty, they on his side of the House would give an earnest, candid, and careful consideration to all remedial measures which they might propose, and assist them to the utmost of their power in passing measures for the protection of life and property. The Prime Minister said the other night that he felt no mortification at the present state of Ireland; but surely there must be some considerations which must lie heavily on the mind of the right hon. Gentleman. They were met a month before the usual time of assembling Parliament, but too late to undo much of the misery which had been brought about during the last few months in Ireland. He would ask the Ministers how and when all this would end?—for that was the question which lay nearest at this moment to the heart of every Member of that House. They might—indeed, they must—make life more secure; they must give peace to the subjects of the Queen; nay, more, they might, perhaps, restore contentment and prosperity to that distracted country; but they could not undo the past. They could not give back the life that had been taken—the victims foully and savagely murdered—nor could they give relief to mutilated and tortured creatures. The task that was before them was beset with danger and difficulty, and the utmost vigilance and caution were required. If the Government acted with firmness and decision, even now, at the eleventh hour, all might yet be well, and they might count upon the loyal and unanimous support of every Member of the Party to which he (Mr. Chaplin) belonged; but what he was afraid of was, if they were to have any further indecision or timidity of counsels, they might see repeated nearer home what was occurring in South Africa, and the blood of the Irish people poured out like water on Irish soil. He prayed that God would grant that a catastrophe so dire and dread might be averted.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down began his speech with some observations, into which I do not think it necessary to follow him to-night, upon the Irish Land Question. We have, I think, matters of sufficient importance raised for our consideration by the

Amendment to the Address of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) without anticipating those discussions, which, no doubt, will be prolonged—if ever we are allowed to reach them—these discussions, I mean, of the proposals of Her Majesty's Government respecting the land in Ireland. The hon. Member was not satisfied with a discussion upon the Irish Land Question; he invited the House to follow him into a still more extensive subject—the introduction of manufactures into Ireland, the questions of emigration and migration, and many other subjects connected with the condition of that country. Sir, these topics are too large for me to attempt to follow the hon. Member into them to-night; but this I think I may say—and I think I say it with the agreement of all sides of the House — that the observations of the hon. Member on that part of the subject were marked by a kindly spirit, and gave evidence of his having bestowed some consideration, at all events, upon remedial measures for Ireland, or measures other than those of coercion; and I think it would have been well if the spirit which animated the remarks of the hon. Member upon that branch of the subject had always been shown by hon. Members who sit on his side of the House. The hon. Member made one allusion to the speech of my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Ireland which I think it is necessary to correct. The hon. Member said that my hon. and learned Friend had stated to-night that he was absolutely ignorant of the very outlines of the measures which are before the Government—which we intend to propose for the protection of life and property in Ireland. I did not hear the observations of my hon. and learned Friend; but I have his authority for saying that that was not his statement, and that—[*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]—and that as far as possible—[*Continued cries of* "Oh, oh!"]—well, if he did say it—and he does not think he did—that was not by any means the impression he intended to convey to the House. What he intended to say was that even the outlines of these measures were not before the House. [*Repeated cries of* "Oh, oh!"] I am surprised at these interruptions. The fact is that my hon. and learned Friend is intimately acquainted with every proposal which the Government intend to make on the subject; and it was his most earnest hope that by this time he might have been engaged in the exposition of them. The hon. Member then went on to make what I think is one of the most extraordinary of the many charges that have been made against Her Majesty's present Government—namely, that there had been an indisposition on our part to meet Parliament. Considering the bitter complaints that came from that (the Opposition) side of the House—and not least from the hon. Gentleman himself—about the protracted Session we forced him to undergo last autumn, and considering that it is even now about a month before the ordinary time for assembling Parliament, this should have been about the last charge that should have been urged against the Government. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] I am very well aware what the exclamations of dissent from the other side mean, and I shall come to that part of the question by-and-bye. The hon. Member then went on to pronounce one of the most solemn indictments against Her Majesty's Government which it has ever been my duty to listen to. I cannot follow him through the whole of that weighty indictment; but I must say that, guilty as I felt myself when I heard his solemn tones, and when I learnt from him that do what we could we could never wash away from our guilty hands and our guilty souls the stains of the innocent blood which had been shed through our criminal negligence, it was some consolation to me to turn from the solemn eloquence of the hon. Member, and to refer to the prosaic facts which lay before me. I find that during the year 1879, when Ireland was ruled over by a beneficent Conservative Government, there were 10 agrarian homicides or murders, and that in the year which has just elapsed there were seven. I cannot, therefore, feel the blood of these murdered men rest so heavily on my soul when I think that even the efficient Government that preceded us was not able to protect life to so great an extent as it has been in our power to do. Well, Sir, this is all the doing of the right hon. Gentleman the present Prime Minister, we are told. It is said—"This is the frightful condition of Ireland, notwithstanding the disestablishment of the Irish Church." Will any hon. Member rise at this moment and say he thinks that we should be in a better position to deal with the evils which exist in Ireland at this moment if the Established Church were still in existence? [Mr. R. N. FOWLER: Certainly.] I am afraid this debate will not terminate to-night, and I shall be interested to know on some future occasion in what way any hon. Member, in any part of the House, can imagine that the existence of the Established Church, an institution so popular in Ireland, so congenial, so consonant, and so in accord with the sentiments of the Irish people, would conduce to the preservation of the peace in that country. Well, then, Sir, we are told that we released the Fenian prisoners. Yes; we did release some of them. But that responsibility was shared with us by the late Government; we did not release them all. The late Government completed the work which was begun by the present revolutionary Prime Minister. The late Government is responsible for the release of Mr. Davitt, of whom we have heard something within the last few weeks, and who was certainly not one of the least conspicuous or least dangerous of those Fenian prisoners to whom the hon. Member has referred. The hon. Member concluded, as others who have spoken on that side of the House have done, by tendering to us—after the inevitable lecture—the promise of his most hearty support so long as the Government come up to his notions of the standard of duty. Sir, we have received these promises of support from various quarters. On the first night of the Session, after a lecture as solemn as that we have listened to from the hon. Member for Mid Lincoln, we received from the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote) a promise of his support. And although, of course, we winced under the infliction of punishment, I must acknowledge that that offer of support was given in a cordial and ungrudging spirit, and I thank the right hon. Gentleman for having given it. Last night we received the support—the valuable support—of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill). I was glad to hear that not only would that support be heartily and cordially given, but that it would be of very considerable numerical extent. Well, while we are grateful for the numerical support which the noble Lord is going to bring us, I cannot say that we feel equally grateful for the moral support which he says it is his intention to tender us. He seems to think that it will assist the present Government in the arduous task which they have before them, when that Government, acting upon what was their idea of the precedents most conformable to the spirit of our Constitution—when they have placed certain leaders of an organization which they believe and are advised is of an illegal character, seeking illegal objects by illegal means—when they have placed these men upon their trial—the noble Lord seems to think that it will assist the Government in its difficulties, and that it will assist the course of government in Ireland, if he endeavours, by every means in his power, to cast ridicule upon the legal proceedings which are at this moment pending, and if he endeavours to show this House, and, of course, the people of Ireland, that these proceedings have never been seriously taken up at all, and that they are not intended to be continued. And having made an observation as, I imagine, in a tone almost of regret, that for the first time in the history of Ireland a political trial is being conducted with a jury which has not been packed, the noble Lord proceeded to offer to the Government further moral support by suggesting that my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had cast a slur upon the Constabulary in the discharge of their duty. What, Sir, is the proof of that assertion? The only proof brought forward was the issue of that Circular, which, as the noble Lord was told the other night, was only the re-issue of a Circular sent out a few years ago by a Conservative Chief Secretary.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: It was not the same Circular.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It was explained the other night, and I am sorry to have to explain it to the noble Lord again, with the omission of a certain paragraph which referred to corporal punishment, and one other alteration——

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Read the Circular. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I recollect that the noble Lord, when he was challenged to produce the Circular, did not produce it. If the noble Lord was referring to any other Circular, and if I have misrepresented him, it is only the consequence of his not being able to explain what Circular it was he was referring to. Well, Sir, this very serious charge against my right hon. Friend was supported by another thing. The noble Lord read out at full length a Circular which appeared to afford him a great deal of amusement, but which I do not think the House found as amusing as did the noble Lord. The Circular in question contained a series of what appeared to me to be most sensible instructions issued to the Constabulary for their guidance and conduct in regard to their attendance at land meetings. The noble Lord said the present Government had been trying a series of experiments in Irish government since they came into power. These experiments all appeared to him to be extremely ludicrous; but the most ludicrous of all was what he called the experiment of trying to rule Ireland by the ordinary law. Sir, that is an experiment which Her Majesty's Government are not ashamed of having tried. It is an experiment which they hope they, or their successors, may very soon be able to repeat. Well, Sir, last night, after the noble Lord, we heard two other speeches of a very different character. We heard speeches from the hon. Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Shaw), and from the hon. and learned Member for the Borough of Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell). The House listened with great attention to those speeches. They not only listened with attention, but I think they listened with some sympathy; but it appeared to me that although those speeches were received with the attention which both the subject and the speeches demanded, they represented rather the natural antipathy and repugnance which are and must be felt by any Member representing an Irish constituency to repressive measures of any character or kind whatever, rather than solid arguments in support of the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), or against those measures which Her Majesty's Government have announced their intention to bring forward. Both of these hon. Members admitted the existence of a dangerous condition of affairs in many parts of Ireland. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] They both made a faint attempt to attribute exaggeration to the descriptions of that condition which had been given.

MR. BIGGAR: No, no! [*Cries of* "Order!"]

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I do not know what the hon. Member is attempting to contradict. I say they did attribute exaggeration. Did they, or did they not? I say that both hon. Members made an attempt to show exaggeration.

MR. BIGGAR: A "faint attempt" were the words used.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I certainly said "a faint attempt." I will omit the adjective, and say that both hon. Members made an attempt to prove that the reports which had been laid before this House as to the dangerous condition of some parts of Ireland were exaggerated. Well, Sir, on what evidence did that attempt rest? The hon. Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Shaw) stated that he had travelled over many parts of Ireland, and he had seen no signs of a disturbed condition in any district in which he had been. He had been in many districts, and had seen no sign of it himself. That I can well believe. I believe it may be perfectly possible to travel from one end of Ireland to the other, and to see no outward and visible signs of the terrorism which at present prevails. The hon. Member ought to go into the houses of the victims of this tyranny, and perhaps not even then would he be able to elicit from the inmates of those dwellings a full account of the daily annoyances and nightly terrorism to which they are subjected. But, Sir, what is the proof brought forward by the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell)? The hon. and learned Member referred to exaggerations in the newspaper reports. Why did he give the House that amusing and interesting description of the manner in which outrages are reported by the enterprizing agents of an enterprizing news agency? Does the hon. and learned Member suppose that the action which the Government propose to take, and the measures which the Government are going to submit to the House, are founded on newspaper reports, and upon the stories of outrages concocted by newspaper agents? The proposals which we shall have to make are founded on reports of hard matters of fact—upon dry reports, upon statistics furnished by officers of the Government, by magistrates, by the Constabulary, who have no conceivable motive—[*Cries of* "No!"]—yes, by men who have no conceivable motive for invention or exaggeration, to whom this state of things is certainly no credit, however much it may have been out of their power to prevent it. It is upon these reports, it is upon these facts, which have been, or will be, placed upon the Table of the House, and which will be open to be contradicted by any Member of the House, that the measures of the Government will be founded, and not upon any hearsay, or upon any stories concocted by a newspaper agent. Why, Sir, the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk suggested—and I regretted to hear him make the suggestion—that there had been exaggeration, that there had been overcolouring in the charge so frequently referred to by Judge Fitzgerald. On what evidence did the hon. and learned Member found his suggestion that that learned Judge had been biassed by the Grand Jury with whom he had been in association? I believe there is no Judge more impartial, or who is less likely to exaggerate than Mr. Justice Fitzgerald; but if this were not so, would it not have been more worthy of him and the position which the hon. Member occupies in this House to have examined the facts and figures upon which that learned Judge relied, than to have suggested that his impartial mind had been biassed by communications with the Grand Jury? Those hon. Members who have delivered the speeches to which I have referred could only attribute this state of things, the existence of which they could not deny, and which they could only suggest was exaggerated, to a widespread feeling of discontent and disaffection amongst the people, produced and justified, to a certain extent, by the distress which they suffered, and by their repugnance and resistance to bad laws, and, above all, to a bad land system. Sir, I maintain that that assertion has not been proved in any respect. The existence of crime in Ireland cannot be connected in any way whatever with the prevalence of distress, nor with the harsh action of bad Land Laws. During the distress of last winter, which we all deplore, and which the House endeavoured to the best of its ability to remedy, crime was at a very low ebb. After the harvest, which is acknowledged by all the Irish Members to have been one of the best with which Ireland was ever blessed, crime greatly increased. That does not seem to me to prove any connection between the increase of crime and the general distress. I will show by-and-bye how far it has been connected with the harsh action of the landlords. It has, undoubtedly, been connected with a widespread agitation for a change of law. Many of us do admit the necessity for some change in the law. There are some of us who approve some of the objects which the Land League set forth or desire to attain. I think we shall all admit that there is a wide distinction between crime which is the result, however much to be regretted, but, perhaps, the natural result, of resistance to unjust and oppressive laws which are pressing at the moment upon the people, between crime committed in actual resistance to the law by a people smarting under its operation, and crime which is deliberately committed for the purpose of bringing about a change in the law. But I think there is no proof, at any rate no proof has yet been given, that the people of Ireland are, as they are asserted to be, accomplices in the state of crime which is now prevailing. We maintain that there exists at this moment in Ireland a state of terrorism and intimidation which prevents the real opinions and feelings of the people being expressed. It is a libel on the people of Ireland to assert that they are the perpetrators of, or the sympathizers with, the crimes the prevalence of which cannot be denied. The hon. and learned Member for Dundalk made use of the well worn saying of Burke, "that he could not draw an indictment against a whole people;" but it would seem that it is hon. Members opposite, who take the same line of argument as the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk, who do draw an indictment against the people of Ireland, and who seek to make them responsible for the commission of crimes with which ninety-nine hundredths of them are utterly unconnected, and which are the work of, as I believe, a small band of persons—of miscreants living upon the agitation which has been excited, and upon the intimidation which undetected proceedings have hitherto enabled them to promote. Although I have been called upon to differ widely from the speeches of the hon. Member for the City of Cork and the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk, I cannot say that I wonder much at, or that I can strongly reprove, those speeches. Every Member of this House feels repugnance at being asked to become a party to any measure interfering with the Constitutional liberty of the subject, and I do not wonder that Members representing Irish constituencies should feel how ungrateful is such a task. But they do not feel as keenly as those who sit upon these Benches the immense responsibility which rests upon them, not only for the redress of acknowledged grievances, but for the assertion of the ordinary law upon which the welfare, safety, and prosperity of the whole community must depend. The hon. and learned Member asks what we should, under like circumstances, do in England? and asserts that it would be impossible, if a similar state of things existed in this country, for the Government to come down to the House and propose any repressive measures. It is impossible to say what would be done in circumstances which do not exist, and which I hope never will exist; but I think it would be safe to say that in the event of such a state of things existing in England this House would apply adequate remedies, whatever they might be. I do not believe for a moment that if such a state of things as exists in Ireland now existed in the agricultural districts of England, the great industrial and commercial interests represented so largely on this side of the House would for one moment tolerate that the law should be openly set at defiance, and that the peace of the country and public confidence should be so shaken as is at present the case in Ireland; and I believe that they would be the first to demand that an adequate remedy should be applied. Both the hon. Members to whom I have referred (Mr. Shaw and Mr. Charles Russell) agree with many of those who have spoken on that side of the House in regretting the indications which have fallen from the Government, both in the Queen's Speech and in the speech of the Prime Minister, as to their intentions with regard to the Land Question. We have heard regret expressed from all quarters of the House at what is supposed to be the intention of the Government to introduce a weak Land Bill. I am not going to discuss that measure to-night; but it is to be regretted that hon. Members should so suddenly jump to conclusions with regard to a measure of which they have certainly heard very little. I am certainly at a loss to know how they are informed that it is a weak Bill. But I must protest against the character of a great deal of the language which I have heard with regard to this legislation in the course of the debate. We are told that our Bill is weak, and also what sort of Bill is necessary. Sometimes it is described as a strong Bill, and at others as a large Bill. But, surely, there are considerations much more important as affecting the Land Bill than its size or strength. It seems to me more important to inquire whether the Bill of the Government will be conformable to the principles of justice; whether it will remove acknowledged grievances; whether it will be based on principles of sound judgment and policy, such as may lay the foundation for a permanent cure, and not a temporary mitigation of the evils which are now admitted to prevail. These seem to me to be subjects which have not been as much considered as the question, whether the Government is about to introduce something that will take Ireland by surprise, and the country, so to speak, by storm. But they are not the considerations which ought to guide the Government in framing a measure of such vast importance. There is an extraordinary inconsistency in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk. He paid a just tribute to the achievements of my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister and the legislative proposals which he has made and carried. He described the Land Act of 1870 as a magnificent measure; and yet the hon. and learned Member proceeded the next moment to repudiate, as something utterly inadequate for the present emergency, any Bill founded on its principles. Much has been urged on this question which I am not at all able to follow. Sometimes we are told that our proposals do not come up to the low-water mark of Conservative opinion in Ireland; that the noble Lord the Member for Down has declared in favour of the "three F's;" and not only so, but he has been made the medium of a partial recantation on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. I have the greatest possible respect, both for the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Lord the Member for Down; but I have not been accustomed blindly to follow those Gentlemen in political matters, and I cannot understand why hon. Gentlemen who sit behind me should urge, as perfectly conclusive against us, the opinions of the noble Lord and the recantation of the right hon. Gentleman. The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), following the lines taken by other speakers upon that side of the House, repeated the charge against the Government that they were responsible for the present state of things, in consequence chiefly of their failure last Session to renew the Peace Preservation Act and their delay in summoning Parliament. I will not go at length into these charges; but, whether too late or not, the time has come when some measures for the preservation of order are required. I admit that the charges made against us have been urged with moderation and good temper; and I will say that if there be responsibility, blame, or failure in renewing, or, as it has been in our case, to re-enacting, the Peace Preservation Act, that responsibility must be to a very great extent divided between those who sit on this side of the House and those who sit on the other. We have been told of the information which we found in the archives of the Irish Office when we acceded to Office; but, if I am not mistaken, that information had been in the possession of the late Government from December twelve months, and, therefore, during the three months of the first Session of last year they might have renewed the Bill. They did not, however, think proper to do do so. And if it was difficult for them it would have been absolutely impossible for us. Sir, I do not deny that we did indulge the hope that our intention and desire, openly and boldly expressed, that we might safely trust to the ordinary law to preserve order in Ireland, would have produced a good effect and conduced to its own fulfilment. At all events, we believed that to begin the proceedings of a new Parliament, pledged deeply to do justice, and perhaps something more than justice, to Ireland by a discussion which must be long and irritating, would be the one thing to ruin the chance of doing in this Parliament any good for Ireland. We believed that the feeling produced by the renewal of these discussions would infinitely outweigh the advantages of passing an Act not altogether suitable to present circumstances. We knew we might be disappointed in the hopes we formed; but we were determined that, if we were obliged to propose exceptional measures, we would, when the time came, propose those which would be effectual, and not such as, besides being ineffectual, would be of an irritating character. And, Sir, then we are told that we have grossly neglected our duty in not summoning Parliament two months ago. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) said that we had nothing to learn from the Charges of Judge Fitzgerald and Baron Dowse, and that we had all that information in our possession before. But I must remind the right hon. and learned Gentleman of what seems to be very much forgotten on that side of the House, that measures of this character have not only to be proposed by the Government, but that they have to be passed by Parliament. Parliament is jealous, and rightly jealous, of any interference with Constitutional liberty, and will not, and ought not to, sanction any interference with the forms of liberty, except upon an overwhelming cause for it, being shown and proved beyond the possibility of a doubt. And I would, therefore, point out to the right hon. Gentleman that there is a great difference between facts marshalled and presented to the House in *ex parte* statements by the Executive Government and those same facts calmly presented to the public after impartial deliberation by the Judges of the land. And I believe that the time which has been allowed to elapse has not been lost, if it enables us to present, as I believe it will, a case for the necessity of these measures in a manner which will commend itself to those on this side of the House, although there are those on the other side who will venture to dispute it. Before I sit down I must refer, for a moment, to the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) when introducing his Amendment. The tone and moderation of that speech have been referred to, and comments have, not unnaturally, been made on the extreme difference between the tone of, and the statements made in, speeches delivered by the hon. Member in this House and those delivered in Ireland. If the hon. Member would deliver the speeches which he makes in this House in Ireland, and the speeches which he makes in Ireland in this House, we should all understand each other a good deal better, and I think, perhaps, it would be better for all parties. But, notwithstanding the moderation which has been so generally observed in the speech of the hon. Member, that speech contains sufficiently startling assertions. The hon. Member stated that crime last year compared favourably with that of other years. Unfortunately, the state of Ireland for many years past has made it necessary to keep accurate and detailed accounts of crime, both of ordinary crime and especially of agrarian crime. And the House must remember that in this case we are dealing, not with ordinary, but with agrarian crime—that is, with a class of crime the motive of which can be distinctly connected with the ownership or occupation of land. Since 1844 accurate accounts have been preserved, and are before the House; and there is not a single year in which the number of agrarian outrages has come nearly up to that which, unfortunately, was reached last year. Up to that time the largest number was in 1845, when it amounted to 1,920. I know that many hon. Members attribute very little importance to threatening letters. I admit that a distinction between threatening letters and outrages should be borne in mind. But the House has been frequently reminded that threatening letters in Ireland are, too often, not the stupid and ignorant jokes which are in this country sometimes practised, but matters of real significance. I have said that in 1845 the number was 1,920; exclusive of the threatening letters to which I have just referred there were 950. Now, what was the number last year? Including threatening letters, 2,573; exclusive of them, 1,246. The number, therefore, is greatly in excess of the largest number that has ever been reached since 1844; and not only is it actually larger, but, relatively to the population, it is very much larger.

MR. O'DONNELL asked if the noble Marquess would include the 10,000 evictions among the agrarian outrages?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I will tell the hon. Member something about evictions in a moment. The largest amount of agrarian crime, in proportion to the population, took place during the year which has just elapsed. Has the state of the country, then, with regard to agrarian crime, improved? A Return is on the Table of the House, and if not in the hands of Members, shortly will be so, which shows the number of outrages for every month of every year since 1844. Up to April of last year the number was 67. It gradually rose till, in August, it amounted to 103; in September to 167; in October to 264; in November to 554; and in December to 860. If hon. Members wish to know what are the numbers, exclusive of threatening letters, they are—September, 104; October, 110; November, 217; and December, 382. It cannot be said, I think, after that statement, that agrarian outrage is decreasing; and I am at a loss to conjecture upon what facts the hon. Member for Cork City relies, when he says that the condition of Ireland, as regards agrarian crime last year, compares favourably with other periods in which it has been known to exist. We are told that agrarian outrages are the result of evictions, and caused by the resistance of the people to the harsh exercise of the rights of the landlords. But how does the case stand in that respect? In the first quarter of the year there were 554 evictions, in which there were 64 cases of re-admission as tenants, and 235 as caretakers, making a total of 255 actual evictions. In that same quarter there were 294 agrarian outrages, and 190 exclusive of threatening letters. What was the case in the last quarter? Then there were 198 evictions; but there were 46 re-admissions as tenants, and 63 as caretakers, leaving 89 actual evictions. There were 1,678 crimes, and 709 exclusive of threatening letters; and yet we are told that agrarian outrages, at the present moment, are the result of the harsh exercise of their rights by the landowners. Such a connection has existed, no doubt, in former times. In other times agrarian outrage has been the result of popular resistance to a harsh and perhaps tyrannical exercise of the landlords' rights; but the figures just stated show that it has not been so now. It is impossible to connect the two together; and I contend that, in the present case, we must look to some other cause for the increase of crime in Ireland. The hon. Member for Cork City has said that he admits that there has been a great state of excitement and agitation, and that crime always, to a certain extent, accompanies agitation. The hon. Member speaks of it, and we are glad to hear him and his Friends speak of it as an undesirable adjunct of agitation, which not only discredits, but injures the cause of agitation. I know that the hon. Member and his Friends have dissuaded from crime; but I cannot help thinking that their dissuasion has been somewhat of a mild character. I can hardly think that when the hon. Member for Cork City states, as he is reported to have done at one meeting deprecating agrarian outrage, that such outrages are unnecessary in a well-organized district, that he was passing a very sweeping condemnation of agrarian crime in the unorganized districts. But, however that may be, I am sure we are all glad to hear hon. Members disclaim any desire for the existence of agrarian outrage. I cannot agree with the hon. Member and his Friends that agrarian outrages injure, though they certainly discredit, the cause of land agitation. I think the hon. Member and his Friends do some injustice to the support they receive from those who are implicated in these crimes. What is the operation of the Land League? It comes into a district; branches are established; advice and counsel are given to the tenant farmers. They are advised not to pay any rent at all, or not to pay above a certain valuation, or not more than they find it convenient to pay. That is advice of a not unpalatable character, and the only wonder is that it should not be more universally adopted without any persuasion. But sometimes serious reflection intervenes. Many tenants reflect that they are not so badly off after all. They have a pretty good occupation, their rent is not excessive, and their landlord is not a tyrant. They have successfully passed through bad times, and they hope that better times are in store for them, and they do not like to risk their whole future for what may be a temporary and slight present advantage. They consider, perhaps, that on the whole it would be better to reject the advice, and they pay their full rents. A tenant forms this resolve, and what follows? The next morning, perhaps, his cattle are houghed, his ricks are burnt, and his property is in some way or other injured. He himself, perhaps, is visited in the night, guns are fired through his door or his window; his dwelling, perhaps, entered; he himself pulled out of bed and dragged into the road, and threatened with the most fearful penalties if he does not swear not to repeat the unpardonable offence of paying his full rent to his landlord. I need not go through the description of outrages of this kind, the existence of which cannot be denied, and the terrors of which extend far beyond the area of reported cases. But what is the effect? After one or two of these outrages have taken place in a district, what the hon. Member for Cork City calls "public opinion" among the tenant farmers is greatly strengthened, and the advice of the Land League, which might, perhaps, on further reflection have been disregarded, at all events by some of the tenant farmers, is humbly and submissively accepted. Is that no advantage to the operation of the Land League? That it discredits and disgraces the Land League and the land agitation there can be no question; but it is not quite so clear that it is of no advantage. Why, the fact is that the unwritten law of the League, of which the hon. Member has spoken, is enforced by the same means and by the same sanctions as any other law. It is enforced, in the last resort, by the strong arm. Do we say, Sir, that the law in this country is obeyed solely on account of its majesty and of the respect universally paid to the law, to Parliament, and to the Judges, that it is entirely the moral effect of the law which causes its observance? Do we ignore altogether the services of the police-constable or the gaoler? Do we think that without them the law would be respected, even in this country? So, in Ireland, the advice of the Land League would go for comparatively little; but its unwritten laws are enforced by the strong arm, by those who, I do not say do its bidding, but do its work—the perpetrators of the outrages to which I have referred. They are the instruments of the Land League; and although I have no doubt that hon. Members opposite detest those instruments, I cannot but think that they are useful in assisting to attain the objects which that League has in view. The hon. Member spoke with great moderation of the objects of the Land League. I will not discuss the question whether those objects are legal or not; I have my own opinion on the subject; but the time is late, and the question is the subject of judicial proceedings elsewhere. I understood the hon. Member for the City of Cork, however, to say that he had never counselled the farmers of Ireland to offer any but a passive resistance to the exaction of unjust rents. I have a difficulty in reconciling that with the words that fell from the hon. Member in the same speech, when he said that it was sometimes the highest duty of a citizen to oppose resistance to a law which he knows to be unjust. There are passages in our own history in which men, whom to-day we hold in the highest honour, have opposed such a resistance to the law. But it is a dangerous doctrine to propose. It approaches dangerously near to incitement to rebellion. And I would remind the hon. Member, and those who act with him, that there can be no justification for such an incitement, except not only a conviction of the justice—the absolute justice—of the cause, but also a reasonable conviction of the probability of success. Does the hon. Member feel that he is so certain to triumph over what he considers an unjust law—and his idea of an unjust law, I think, is very different to that of even the most advanced Members who sit on this side of the House—does he feel so confident in his power to overcome what he considers to be an unjust law, that he considers it his duty to incite, even in the most distant manner, his followers to practise resistance to the law? If he does, he takes a great responsibility, a tremendous responsibility, upon himself. Hon. Members opposite have wisely appealed to the attachment which this House, and all Parties in this House, feel to our Constitutional liberties, and to the forms which guard them. But, attached as we are to those forms, I trust that we are not yet altogether the slaves of form. I trust that, in respecting and vindicating as we do the forms of our Constitution, we are not indifferent to that which is a yet more precious thing — the substance. I have had before, and I fear we may have again, to point out in this House how, in the sacred names of freedom of debate and liberty of discussion, the Forms of the House have been abused until, for the great majority of hon. Members, there is little freedom of debate and no freedom of action remaining. And so it is in Ireland at this moment. Under the forms of Constitutional liberty the substance is disappearing. It is not, as it is described by some, a condition of anarchy. A law does prevail, but it is not the law of the land. For the law of the land has been substituted the law of the Land League; for the Judge and the magistrate has been substituted an irresponsible committee; for the police-constable and the sheriff's officer—for those who work in the service of the law in the full light of day—have been substituted the midnight assassin and the ruffian who invades the humble cottage, disguised, at midnight. From this tyranny there are thousands at this moment suffering, and it is for them, and not for the landlord class alone—it is for hundreds of thousands who desire to gain honestly their living, but cannot do so except in fear of their very lives, that we ask you to give us not permanent, but temporary measures, to restore the substance of liberty, though it may be by a temporary abridgement of some of its forms.

Mr. HEALY complained that the Government had put up the noble Lord to attempt to bully the Irish Members. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"] Time after time hon. Members had risen; but, no matter on which side they sat, not one of them had attempted to defend the policy of the Government except a paid official of the Crown. The Government had done well to have recourse to the noble Lord—who was the Representative of coercion in the Cabinet—to put him up at that late hour of the night to utter the well-worn menaces, to which they were so well accustomed, of coercion and intimidation against the Irish Members. The noble Lord had informed them that liberty was the portion of Englishmen; that it had been strenuously struggled for in former years; and that they would preserve the substance, and abolish the shadow of it—in other words, he meant to say that the Irish Members, who were really attempting to preserve the substance of liberty and to exclude the shadow, were to be put down at all hazards. In the struggle that was coming, whatever it might be, the Irish Members would not be afraid to face it; and then the Government could invite the Representatives of other countries and other Constitutions to come in and witness the magnificent English Thermopylæ of 500 men against 50. The noble Lord had taunted the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk with saying that the outrages reported from Ireland only came through the channel of *The Central News*, and he had said that he would give the House dry facts and hard figures in order to show the House the justice of these measures of coercion. But from what authority did he get his facts and figures? Was it from the Representatives of the Irish people in that House? Was it from that respected body of gentlemen in Ireland — the Roman Catholic and the Protestant clergy? Was it from those other well-known bodies in Ireland that might easily be found if sought for? No. The gentlemen from whom the noble Lord derived his information were the constables and the magistrates. In other words, the Irish Members and the Irish people were put upon their trial, and judgment was to be pronounced against them, when the Judges who sat upon the Bench were the complainants. Who were the magistrates of Ireland? The noble Lord, and the right hon. Gentleman who sat beside him (Mr. W. E. Forster), knew very well who they were; they were the landlords and land agents of Ireland; and they knew also that time after time complaints had been made in the House against the character of the magistracy. It had been pointed out to the House time after time that very few Catholic or trusted gentlemen sat on the Bench. He had seen the other day in the newspapers a Memorial from an important body of magistrates in Cavan calling for coercion. Doubtless, the noble Lord had it in his pocket. The very day after there came from a very distinguished gentleman in that county of Cavan, the Catholic Bishop—a gentleman who, he supposed, had the interests of law and order and public morality at heart—an offer to prove, if the Government would give him facilities, that the magistrates of Cavan had stated that which was not the fact. He would like to know what answer was returned to the Bishop, and whether they did or did not intend to grant the Commission asked for? Another statement which had been made by a Member of the Government was that the facts and figures should be put before the House in black and white. No doubt, the House would receive a report from every police-barrack in Ireland; but he would draw attention to a report which had appeared in the public Press of some remarks made by the much-esteemed Judge Fitzgerald at the Cork Assizes. They had reference to the case of an unfortunate boy who was arrested for an alleged outrage; and, in this matter, he should like to ask the Chief Secretary to produce to the House all the information bearing upon it sent up by the police to Dublin Castle, so that hon. Members could form their own opinion of the merits of the case. The boy, David Keefe, was charged with maliciously shooting at his uncle, John Keefe, with intent to wound, and the uncle at the trial stated that he was concerned in the sale of some land that had belonged to the prisoner's father; that, however, there had been no dispute about it; that he saw the prisoner on the land, and that the prisoner had discharged some sort of fire-arm at him, but that he had sustained no wound, that he had seen no smoke and smelt no powder. The Judge ridiculed the affair, and said that for aught they knew the boy might only have fired off a pop-gun. It would be interesting to know what the sub-inspector said the prisoner had fired off. The boy had been kept in gaol three months, and the jury expressed surprise that he should have been incarcerated so long upon such a charge. For three months this lad, who was only 15 or 16 years of age, was kept in confinement, and subjected to the contaminating influences of a prison, deprived of his home and what little comforts he might have had, brought to trial, and dismissed from a charge that the Judge himself described as an absurd one. He (Mr. Healy) challenged the Chief Secretary to produce his police report upon this case. He would give the noble Lord another case—not this time that of a boy, but of a woman, who was kept in confinement for three months, and immediately acquitted on being placed upon her trial. The woman was kept in gaol, notwithstanding the magistrates knew she was *enciente* when apprehended. These cases showed in some degree the character of the magistracy and of the police on whose information the noble Lord asked the House to suspend the liberties of the Irish people. He would give another instance, and he trusted that the House would forgive him for adverting to it, as it was one in which he was personally interested. He also had had the misfortune to be put in prison on an agrarian charge. He would tell the House how it was done. Two agents in a district, who were both magistrates, came together and induced the stipendiary magistrate to visit a farmer named Manning, an illiterate man, who hardly knew a word of English, and got him to swear an information against him. The poor man was threatened that if he did not swear the information he would be fined £50. Well, who were the magistrates who decided the case and sent it for trial? They were Mr. J. W. Payne, the agent of Lord Bantry; Mr. Barratt, Lord Kenmare's agent; Lord Bantry's son, a late trooper in the Guards; and another military officer. This was the character of the magistracy in Ireland, and these were the sort of men upon whose evidence the noble Lord asked the House to suspend the liberties of the Irish people. He would tell the noble Lord that if his evidence were ten thousand times better than it was, the Irish Members would be justified in resisting to the last gasp any attempt upon the lives and liberties of the Irish people. They had heard a great deal about outrages. He himself knew something about outrages—[*Laughter*]—and, as the House thought that so very funny, he would tell them all about it. He had visited Castletown, Berehaven, and had spent three days there; never, up to that time, having been in the place before. During the visit, he had been informed that a good deal of rick and hay burning was going on. Every one of the people was in sympathy with, and afterwards became members of, the League. He asked them if they had any suspicion as to who burnt their hay, and everyone answered that they had. And against whom had they suspicion? The police of Castletown. One of them told him a very strange thing. Complaint had been made in that House that no police patrols went out at night, and this man told him he informed the sub-inspector of police that every night these patrols were out a hay-rick was burnt; and since they were withdrawn there had been none burnt. And, what was more —as the right hon. Gentleman enjoyed it so much—one of the local men swore an information against the police, and the police found it necessary to demand a sworn investigation on their side. And, to-night, he found the entire state of things in this district corroborated by a Roman Catholic clergyman, who came forward and made a charge against the police. It might be said the police were not interested in outrages in Ireland. If the police were not interested their masters were very much interested. And who were their masters? The magistrates of Ireland, and the landlords, and the men at Dublin Castle, the gentlemen who were continually at the elbow of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, and who were continually dinning into his ears stories. When asked, last year, if his Under Secretary (Mr. Burke) had acted on the advice given him by the right hon. Gentleman, to deal leniently with his tenants, and to refrain from pressing hardly upon them in a bad year, he gave no satisfactory answer. These were the persons interested, and they wanted to keep up the system. Dublin Castle and its precincts was a centre of conspiracy against the mass of the Irish people, by appointing magistrates who were enemies of the people. If they looked at the gentlemen appointed by Dublin Castle, who would they find? Were they men trusted by the people? They would find some landed swell, some evicting gentleman— and he ventured to say there was not an evictor in Ireland who was not on the justice-seat. If the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster), or the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), had at heart the peace of Ireland, and wished really to probe its wound to the bottom, they would sweep away this pestiferous class who had so long fed on the vitals of the Irish people, and replace them by men who would hold the scales of justice equally between man and man. The noble Lord had complained that, although the Government Bill had not yet been seen, hon. Members had expressed mistrust and doubt as to its provisions, and as to the *boná fide* intentions of the Government. He did not think the noble Lord need go very far to find the cause of this doubt and distrust of the Ministry. He distrusted it when he found the noble Lord in it; and he distrusted the intentions of any Ministry to propose a good Land Bill for Ireland which had in it a preponderating element of landlords. Their own selfish interests forbade them to pass a good measure for Ireland; and it was the action of men like the noble Lord that created distrust in the intentions of the Government. They had been told—and a great point had been made of it—that in the past six months Ireland had been governed by the ordinary law. He denied that Ireland had been governed by the ordinary law. The House did not know, perhaps, what the ordinary law in Ireland meant. Did they think it was the law as they knew it in England? It was nothing of the sort. They were governed year by year by a series of atrocious Whiteboy Acts which had no place on the English Statute Book—and that was what was called the ordinary law. He would like to see it in force in England, and see how long the English people would stand it. And now, what did the right hon. Gentleman want? He wanted these extraordinary and bloodthirsty enactments, some of which—the one, for instance, under which he (Mr. Healy) was tried — involved a penalty of being once, twice, or thrice privately whipped. These were the statutes of a Liberal Government in Ireland; but the right hon. Gentleman was anxious to abolish flogging in the Army and Navy. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) obstructed that House an entire night, and refused to let the Army Bill go on because there was flogging in the Service; yet these were the laws of Ireland, and they were told that they were governed by the ordinary laws. Another of the ordinary laws was for the suppression of public meetings—that had become a very ordinary law lately. The noble Lord caused many of their fellow-countrymen to be bathed in blood in Phœnix Park. He was tried for it and found guilty; but the noble Lord, on some technical quibble, got out of the scrape. That was one of the ordinary laws the Irish people could not rely on when they got into scrapes. He would like to draw attention to some of the incidents of these cases. He himself attended a meeting which was not proclaimed; it was proclaimed for the following day. The meeting was proceeding in peace; there was no tumult, no attempt to disturb the peace, no incendiary language; when, suddenly, the intelligence came that a special train was coming down—from a distance of 20 or 30 miles—with a body of policemen to disperse the meeting, although there was no proclamation. This special train—which would have to be paid for by the taxpayers in Ireland—arrived, and, so hasty were the gentlemen in command, that though the policemen were fully accoutred, as they always were in Ireland, with knapsacks and blankets, and, of course, buckshot, they were at once formed into military order; they threw down their surplus accoutrements on the muddy ground, and charged upon this riotous assemblage at double-quick, with fixed bayonets and loaded rifles. These were some of the insignia of the ordinary law in Ireland. They might have been holding a meeting not to discuss the Land Question, but to discuss the Boer or the Basuto rebellion; or it might have been a temperance meeting. No question was asked; but the magistrate came up, and said—"If you do not disperse we shall fire on you." That was the ordinary law in Ireland. But it was not good enough for the noble Lord. He wanted something still more extraordinary. He wanted to have their liberties at the disposal of the meanest policeman or the meanest magistrate, the most contemptible magistrate, who might have a personal grudge against any one of them. He wanted them to allow themselves to be thrust into gaol because Policeman X had a falling out with one of them a year ago; and they were threatened with tremendous penalties if they dared to say a word in that House against this message of peace to Ireland. They told the noble Lord that he would find that they were not to be intimidated by him. They told the noble Lord they knew something about Coercion Acts in Ireland. They knew something about going to gaol in Ireland. They knew how to face it. They had lived for the last 20 or 30 years through as many Coercion Acts; and if they lived 20 or 30 years longer they could live through as many more. The House would never be at a loss for a pretext to suspend the lives and liberties of the Irish people; but he was glad to say they had taught the people of Ireland something. They had taught them that, by combining amongst themselves, they were a power which the Government, and its military, and all the forces at its disposal, could not overcome. The people of Ireland felt it; and they would go on teaching them that in that system of combination they had their only salvation.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Blennerhassett,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND.

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. PARNELL moved for a

"Select Committee to inquire into alleged outrages in Ireland, and the effect of distress, and the system of Land Tenure thereon, the present state of the law for the prevention of such outrages, and the manner in which the said law has been administered."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I must oppose the appointment of this Committee.

Mr. PARNELL: Does the right hon. Gentleman oppose?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Yes.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR moved the adjournment of the debate, so as to afford the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of giving some reason why he opposed the appointment of the Committee. He could quite understand the indisposition of the right hon. Gentleman to inquire into the alleged outrages in Ireland.

Mr. PARNELL thought the right hon. Gentleman might be able to inform the House what his reasons were for opposing the appointment of this Committee. He (Mr. Parnell) certainly could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman should desire to hide or to place a cloak over the real state of affairs in Ireland. He thought the people who lived in Ireland were best acquainted with the state of affairs, and he considered that they were entitled to

produce evidence before a Select Committee and the House, to prove the falsehood of the statements which had been made on the part of Her Majesty's Government as to the state of things now existing in Ireland. On the present occasion, when he asked that a Committee should be appointed, he thought that some more consideration should be paid to the request of the Irish Members than the cavalier treatment which he had received.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The House is well aware that the reason why we have been summoned much earlier than usual is on account of the conviction the Government have as to the state of things in Ireland, and that the outrages which have been and are being committed in Ireland require exceptional measures. All are aware that the Government are exceedingly anxious at the very earliest moment to state the grounds on which they make that appeal to the House; and they are also aware that that appeal requires a statement on the part of the Government and on the part of myself in bringing the measures forward. The facts connected with these outrages will, of necessity, have to be stated in a Committee of the Whole House, and when they are brought forward their truth will be fully inquired into. The House, I presume, will have to be convinced before they consent to pass the Bills which will be laid before them. Therefore, I can hardly suppose that the hon. Member for the City of Cork really seriously proposes that we should allow ourselves to go into an inquiry previously to hearing the statement which the Government will have to make.

Mr. O'DONNELL failed to see any ground for objecting to the appointment of the Committee.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the Motion of the hon. Member for the City of Cork was one which appeared now for the first time upon the Paper. He wished to know, therefore, whether the Standing Order fixing the half-past 12 o'clock Rule did not apply?

Mr. BIGGAR remarked, that the Question now before the House was not the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork, but the Motion for the adjournment of the debate.

MR. PARNELL wished to say a word in reference to the point of Order raised by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Courtney). He apprehended that the objection just taken by the hon. Member was taken too late. He submitted that it should have been taken at the time he (Mr. Parnell) made the Motion for the appointment of a Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: This Notice appears upon the Paper for the first time to-day.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: And I have objected to it, Sir.

MR. O'DONNELL said, that since the Motion was made the adjournment of the debate had been moved, and he presumed that that was now the Question before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: As the Motion for the appointment of a Select Committee has been objected to, it cannot, under the Standing Orders, be proceeded with now, but must be postponed.

MR. PARNELL gave Notice that he would put down the Motion for Wednesday.

Motion *postponed.*

TRADE UNION ACT (1871) AMENDMENT BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

MR. PARNELL moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Trade Union Act of 1871. He desired to say a word by way of explanation. The Bill proposed to enable the tenant farmers of Ireland to form a combination among themselves, so that they should be able to meet on the same footing as the trades unions authorized by the Act of 1871 in reference to artizans and labourers, who were enabled, in England, to unite together in trades unions. The Bill was of a very simple character. and merely defined the term trades unions, and one or two other terms, so as to include the tenant farmers of Ireland.

MR. WARTON objected to the introduction of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: As the Motion is objected to it cannot be proceeded with.

Motion *postponed.*

LANDED PROPRIETORS (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

MR. P. J. SMYTH moved for leave to bring in a Bill "to facilitate the creation of a class of small landed proprietors in Ireland."

MR. WARTON objected to the introduction of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Then it must be postponed.

Motion *postponed.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 12*th January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Public Petitions, *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Municipal Franchise (Scotland) * [57]; Elections (Closing of Public Houses) * [58].

QUESTION.

IRELAND—PROTECTION OF CAPTAIN BOYCOTT.

MR. BELLINGHAM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return of the number of forces employed in Mayo for the protection of Captain Boycott; and what was the cost of the expedition?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I must point out to the hon. Member that this Question should rightly have been asked of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War. There will, however, be no objection on the part of the Government to grant the Return asked for, as far as it can be furnished, if the hon. Member will move for it. I may state that the troops sent to Mayo were not sent solely for the protection of Captain Boycott, but mainly for that of the labourers who were engaged in performing necessary work in the district.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (SCOTLAND) BILL—[Bill 45.]

(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Sir David Wedderburn.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I venture to make an appeal to the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) and to the hon. and learned Member for Lincoln (Mr. Hinde Palmer), both of whom have down upon the Paper Bills for a second reading. Generally speaking, the Government would not make such an appeal; but they naturally supposed that the debate on the Address would be over before the first Wednesday of the Session. That, however, is not the case, and I am sure that the hon. Members to whom I refer will agree with me that it would be very much for the convenience of the House, and that it would conduce greatly to the progress of Public Business, that we should proceed with the debate on the Address with as much expedition as possible, in order that the very important measures, for the discussion of which Parliament has been summoned earlier than usual, should also be proceeded with without delay.

Mr. ANDERSON thought that it was rather hard he should be called upon to resign the very good position he occupied in reference to the measure he had brought forward. The disadvantages under which private Members laboured were very great; and when they had an opportunity of bringing forward their Bills, to ask them to give way for the Government Business was taxing their good nature very heavily. At the same time, he fully admitted that in the present case the appeal was irresistible, for the Business under the consideration of the House was far more important than any private Member's measure could be; and, therefore, he requested the leave of the House to postpone his Bill until to-morrow.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow."—(*Mr. Anderson.*)

Mr. HINDE PALMER said, that it was also a great disappointment to him not to be able to avail himself of the opportunity he had the good fortune to gain for bringing forward his measure. In the extraordinary circumstances of the case, however, he felt that it would be ungracious, if not improper, for him not to yield to the appeal of the right Gentleman; and, therefore, he also asked leave of the House to postpone the Motion for the second reading of his Bill. In doing so, he hoped the Government would assist him in getting another and an early day.

Mr. J. COWEN said, the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had taken him entirely by surprise. When he (Mr. Cowen) left the House on the previous night, he was under the impression that the ordinary Business was to be taken to-day. He did not receive his Parliamentary Papers before leaving home, and the first intimation he had that the discussion on the Address was to be resumed was from the observations of the right hon. Gentleman. He must protest against such a proceeding. There were many hon. Members in the same position as himself, who did not know the debate was going to be taken at that time, and who were now absent. To force it forward on a day set apart for private Members' Business and take a division would be most unfair. For his part, he was opposed to coercion in every form; and it was his determination to resist the measure of the Government having that object in view by every means that the Forms of the House gave him. He was aware that if Ministers determined upon having their Business taken first there was no power to prevent them. But, whatever course was taken by other hon. Members, he, at least, would strongly protest against a Bill, highly objectionable in its character, and which raised such important Constitutional issues, being taken without Notice and in proper form.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is passing beyond the limits of the Question before the House.

Mr. J. COWEN understood that the Question of renewing the adjourned debate upon the Address was involved in the Motion now before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) to name the day to which he intends to postpone the second reading of his Bill.

MR. ANDERSON: To-morrow.

MR. J. COWEN said, he had made his observations under the impression that the Question to adjourn the Orders of the Day had been put. If a division on the Address were taken that day, many hon. Members would be absent who would have desired to be present.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is, That the second reading of the Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill be postponed until to-morrow.

MR. GRAY said, he was under the impression that the majority of the Irish Members who were present last night thought that the debate was to be resumed on Thursday. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) that it would be a great inconvenience that a division should be snatched on Wednesday, when hon. Members were unprepared for it, upon a question which had been under consideration for so many nights.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD was bound to say that his impression was that the adjourned debate would be resumed that day. With regard to the Bills under discussion, he might say he had had the honour, with others, of an interview with the Lord Chancellor, who expressed a sympathetic interest in the subject; and if hon. Members acceded to the wish of the Government on the present occasion, he hoped the Government would have regard to the importance of the subject, and give facilities for the consideration of the Bills on a future occasion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he became aware that morning that the Government intended to press for the resumption of the debate that day, and he did his best to prevent their doing so, for he had intended to make a Motion calling on the House to give precedence to the most important Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), to which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had taken a technical objection. He was informed, however, that it was not within the privilege of anybody but the Leader of the House to make a Motion of precedence. He desired, however, to say that although he had due Notice, from an interview with the Clerks at the Table, of the course the Government intended to pursue, yet the House generally had no idea of that course. The House might have guessed that it was the intention of the Government to proceed with the debate *de die in diem;* but, no Notice being given from the Treasury Benches, many hon. Gentlemen might be found to agree with the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen). Apart altogether from the fact whether they received due Notice of the resumption of that discussion that day, there was a larger question, whether or not it was convenient that they should resume the debate on the Address. He had no desire to make any charge against the Government which he could not substantiate; but if he had not confidence in them he would be inclined to think that their object in now proposing to continue the debate was to stifle discussion. ["No, no!"] Stifle might not be a happy word; but what he meant was this—that it was generally understood that Wednesdays were reserved for harmless and innocuous measures, such as those placed upon the Table by the hon. Members for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) and Lincoln (Mr. Hinde Palmer) that day; and if the Government persisted in the resumption of the debate on the Address, they must know that it would take place in a comparatively empty House, and that many of the speeches made from the Home Rule Benches would not be heard by the majority of the Members of the House. That, considering the importance of the debate, should not be, for it was eminently unfair to the Irish Members. Another day would be wasted, and that feeling of listlessness and apathy would be induced which was always useful to the Government when they wanted to get rid of an unpalatable subject. He did not know whether his hon. Friends would proceed to a division on the subject; but if they did, they would be defending the rights of private Members, and asserting that it was the duty of the Government to give a full and fair opportunity of discussion upon the important questions involved in the Amendment to the Address.

MR. RYLANDS said, he had no sympathy with the attack which had been made upon the Government, for he could not admit that there had been any attempt on their part to stifle discussion upon that painful and difficult question. He wished to point out that it was not altogether unprecedented to take Business such as that proposed to be taken on a Wednesday. There were, however, a large number of hon. Members who still wished to consider the question; and later on it would, no doubt, be found inconvenient for the House to take a division on a day when a large number of hon. Members might not have anticipated that a division would take place. Everybody almost had the idea that the debate would go on, and he appealed to hon. Members opposite no longer to delay the Business of the House with the useless discussion that was now taking place. If they desired the House to come to a calm judgment on the question they must concede something to the feeling of the House.

Mr. DALY thought it an injustice to hon. Members who wished to discuss the Bill before the House that the Government should force on the continuation of the debate on the Address that day. A large part of the community were interested in the measure under notice, which would be deprived of the advantage of having a full House for its consideration.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that a full and fair Notice had not been given by the Government that they intended to continue the debate on the Address that day. It did not seem to him at all desirable that Bills affecting such a large section of the community as the ladies should be postponed in order to enable the Government to introduce, as speedily as possible, their coercion policy in Ireland. It seemed to him, however, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) was more anxious for the coercion of Ireland than for the rights and interests of the married women of Scotland, or more disposed to agree to any proposition which might be made by the Government in favour of their coercive projects, which, by-the-bye, were not to be based on any evidence which could be offered to the House. [*Cries of* "Order, order!"] Some hon. Members were shouting "Order!" Well, he would not now discuss the projects of the Government; but he would to-morrow, and probably, also, on several future occasions. Despite what the right hon. Gentleman who represented the buckshot Government of Ireland had said, he still thought the hon. Member for Glasgow ought to have proceeded with the Bill, and afforded the House an opportunity of discussing its merits.

The O'DONOGHUE said, that a great many hon. Members left the House last night with the same impression that he (the O'Donoghue) entertained—namely, that it was doubtful whether the debate was to be resumed to-day, or on Thursday. He would, therefore, suggest that the Government should give an undertaking that no division should be taken that day on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell); that they should proceed with the adjourned discussion on the Address till 4 o'clock, and then the debate should be adjourned, and the measure of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) taken up.

Mr. R. POWER said, that a great many hon. Members left the House last night under the impression that the debate would not be resumed till Thursday. ["No, no!"] An hon. Member cried "No;" he evidently did not read *The Times* that morning, for it stated that the debate was adjourned until Thursday. Even his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) was not in his place, doubtless under the belief that the debate would not be resumed to-day. Again, the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) was obliged to leave the House very soon, having made an arrangement on the understanding that the debate was adjourned till Thursday. The hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) proposed that they should go on with the debate. Well, they had not yet heard that hon. Gentleman on the Irish Question; and if he would promise to give them a couple of hours of his oratory, and if one of his English Friends would give another couple of hours, they might consider the suggestion. But it was utterly impossible for Irish Members to keep all the discussion to themselves. He had himself a few remarks to make about hon. Gentlemen who generally occupied the front Opposition Bench; but they happened to be not there just now, and it would be unfair to attack them in their absence. He, at all events, sincerely trusted that the Government would see their way to adjourning the debate till Thursday.

Major O'BEIRNE thought the proposition of the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) was very rational, and hoped the Government would take it up. Most Irish Members certainly had been taken by surprise with the attempt to renew the debate that day. He had not the slightest idea that it would be resumed.

MR. MACLIVER said, the time had arrived when plain speaking was necessary, for the House seemed to be under the control of a few hon. Members opposite. He was of opinion that there had been an ample discussion on the Address; but was sure the Government did not wish to check the fullest and freest discussion of their proposal. The great mistake the Irish Members were making was what was done, or said to have been done, when a man was sentenced before he was tried. The Government measures had not yet been fully disclosed —they had only been surmised; and, upon that surmise, certain criticisms had been made which were totally unjustifiable. He therefore thought that in the interests of the House, and of all classes of Members, the Government procedure should now go on.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY, on the contrary, considered it was to the interest of the Government not to press on the debate at a time when it was unexpected by many hon. Members. He thought the last speaker (Mr. Macliver) had entirely mistaken the nature of the discussion, for it should not be forgotten that it was raised not by the Irish Members, but by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen). He (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) was bound to say for himself that he was quite aware the discussion was to be resumed to-day; but then he remained in the House to a much later hour than many hon. Members. It was an unusual condition of things, and hon. Members naturally supposed that the debate would be adjourned till Thursday, and that the measures of private Members would be taken that day. He failed to see what loss the Government would sustain if they adopted the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue); it would only mean the difference of an hour or two; and he, therefore, strongly appealed to the Government to accept the compromise suggested by him. It was obvious that the Government could not take such an important division to-day in an almost empty House, most of whose Members did not know that any such discussion was to come on.

MR. DAWSON said, he had no objection to the discussion going on; but a division was a very different thing. If the discussion was prolonged, and a division taken, then the motive of the Government would be apparent. An hon. Member opposite (Mr. Macliver) had spoken of condemning a man first and trying him afterwards; but it appeared to him (Mr. Dawson) that the programme of the Government, in the present great crisis, was to hang them first and try them afterwards.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I cannot think that anyone can suppose the Government wish to stifle discussion; and, certainly, the desire to go on from day to day until the debate is concluded would be an extraordinary way to do so. Another remark that was made has surprised me, and that is that any of us can be supposed to be so exceedingly inexperienced—and, I may say, foolish—as to imagine that in a matter of debate it is possible to take Irish Members by surprise. The whole matter is very simple. It is not merely that we have important Business to bring before the House, for which we have summoned Parliament at great inconvenience earlier than usual; but it is also of great importance that the debate on the Address should be finished as soon as possible. The Government are not attempting to check discussion in any way; but, as the House is aware, it is contrary to custom, and to right custom, to introduce controversial matters until the debate on the Queen's Speech is concluded. With regard to the debate, my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister gave Notice distinctly that it would be resumed to-day. One or two hon. Members opposite have frankly stated their belief that the debate would be proceeded with, and I may say, further, that I remember occasions when some of the greatest divisions were taken on Wednesday; but I think hon. Members are really underrating their powers when they speak of a division being taken against their wishes, and it would be the first time that such a thing has happened, if the Irish Members, not wishing a division to be taken before 4 o'clock, did not find some means to prevent it.

MR. BELLINGHAM wished the debate to go on; but testified to the general impression among Irish Members on the previous night that it would not be resumed that day.

Dr. COMMINS said, that although he failed to hear the Notice of which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had spoken, he left the House last night under a vague impression that the debate would be continued to-day; but he saw no announcement in *The Times* to that effect, and, therefore, concluded that the Press were uncertain as to the Business to be taken. If those whose business it was to record the proceedings of the House for the public had been mistaken on that point, it was no wonder if hon. Members also had been mistaken. It was evident, too, from the emptiness of the Opposition Benches, that the hon. Gentlemen who usually occupied them were not aware of the resumption of the debate. If they were not under such an impression, he asked, why were they not in their places? Some of the most violent attacks made on the hon. Gentlemen who sat around him came from the Opposition Benches; and it would appear that if they believed the debate would be resumed they were now shrinking from hearing the replies to their attacks. He had not the slightest doubt that they would have been as ready to hear the rejoinders as they were to make the attacks. They were, however, not in their places; and he would labour under the same disadvantage as the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. R. Power), if he were to attempt to answer either of the right hon. and learned Members for the University of Dublin or the hon. Member for Mid Lincoln—they would not be in their places that day. He could not believe that the speeches of the hon. Gentlemen upon the Opposition Benches were made for the purpose of pandering to the panic abroad or crushing Irish opinion; and until he saw in what spirit they took the replies to their speeches he could not admit that such was so. The hon. Member for Mid Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) had raised a very extraordinary question—it was whether the Business of the House was to be in the hands of the Government, or in those of the Irish Members. He (Dr. Commins) wondered whether the hon. Gentleman had studied the matter so sufficiently as to see that there was a third alternative, and that was, whether the Business of the House was to be conducted according to the accepted and recognized Rules of the House, and according to the methods and forms that hon. Members in the House like to be followed. He was only a novice in that Assembly; but his impression was that one of the best recognized Rules of the House was this—that contentious Business or Business of a very important character was not usually set down for Wednesday, unless there was something in it of a very urgent nature. The urgency of a division being taken on the debate on the Address depended entirely upon the urgency of coercive measures—measures which, although they appeared to be steadfastly contemplated by the Government, were far from urgent. There was not the slightest reason for supposing that the state of things in Ireland would be any worse in February than they had been in December and January; indeed, there was reason to believe the condition of things would be better.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Member is not keeping to the Question before the House.

Dr. COMMINS said, he always bowed with the greatest submission to the Chair, for he had no desire to infringe the Rules of the House. He felt it his duty to say that, up to the present, the Government had not shown the slightest disposition to abridge the discussion, so far as the hon. Members representing Ireland were concerned. But it would certainly be most unfair to crowd all that the Irish Members had to say into two or three hours' discussion that afternoon. He appealed to the Ministry to continue that fairness which had characterized their previous proceedings, and not to continue the debate in the almost entire absence of hon. Members from Ireland, and of many hon. Members below the Gangway, who were thoroughly interested in this question.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL said, he did not rise to prolong that discussion, nor to charge the Government with any intentional unfairness; but, reference having been made to the emptiness of those (the Opposition) Benches, he must give his personal impressions, and he dared say they were those of others also, as to what was intended to be the course of Business that day. He had, yesterday, asked Mr. Speaker what would be the course of Business that day; and that high authority had told him that he thought that two private Members' Bills would take up a certain time, and probably the debate would be resumed afterwards. He believed that the House generally did not know that there would be any arrangement between the Government and the hon. Gentlemen in charge of those Bills that the Bills would not come on for discussion that day. At the same time, everyone knew perfectly well that the debate would be taken at a later hour. That sufficiently explained the absence of many of his hon. Friends at that moment; and if the discussion of those Bills had gone on an hour or two, the Benches near him would, doubtless, have become more fully occupied. There was no disposition among those who sat on his side to treat Irish questions with anything like contempt. On the contrary, when an important discussion of that kind came on, they had every desire to be in their places; and all who were interested in the question would, he was sure, take care to attend.

MR. MARUM said, the question was one of great importance to Ireland, and the Irish newspapers contained very full reports of speeches of Irish Members on Irish questions which had not been noticed by the London papers at all. It was, consequently, necessary that there should be a full House, in order that the Members might be made acquainted with their arguments. English Members never read Irish newspapers; and, unless through personal attendance in the House, they were unacquainted with the debates on Irish affairs. They had no other avenue to the English Parliamentary mind save through the presence of hon. Members in their places in the House. He, therefore, objected to debates with empty Benches.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL rose to a question of Order. He understood that the Question before the House was that the first Order of the Day should be postponed till to-morrow. He wished to ask whether it was in the power of the hon. Member to discuss subsequent Orders of the Day until the question relating to the first Order of the Day was disposed of?

MR. SPEAKER: It is, no doubt, quite irregular to discuss now the merits of the third Order of the Day. That will come on in the ordinary course. The noble Lord (Lord Eustace Cecil) has correctly stated the course that may be taken if the House thinks proper to postpone the Order of the Day now before it, and also the second Order. The House will then be engaged upon the third Order; and the remarks of the hon. Member would not, in that case, be irregular.

MR. MARUM (who resumed amid considerable interruptions) said, he repeated that unless English Members were present when Irish Members spoke they could learn little or nothing of their views. He thought it inexpedient that the discussion should go on in the absence of a fair representation of the House. The Second Party in the House were not present, and there was only one Member of the Fourth Party present. He submitted that it would be better to adjourn the debate now, and thus render unnecessary a mere repetition of the arguments which Irish Members would feel it their duty to bring forward. He put it to the sense and discretion of the House whether they would force on them the necessity of repetitions of arguments, which course would be afterwards censured as causing waste of public time.

MR. BARRY did not desire to impute unworthy motives to the Government; but a mine had been sprung upon the Irish Members. He must say that it was extremely remiss in the Government not to make it perfectly clear last night as to when the debate was adjourned to. For his part, he left with the impression that the debate would not be resumed that day, and for that reason he had left the notes of a speech he intended to make at home. He thought, however, if the suggestion of the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) was carried out, it would meet the case, and, everything considered, be a fair compromise.

MR. CALLAN thought the discussion had been most irregular — he might almost say unprecedented. He sat there till late last night, and to-day, like many other hon. Members who had private business to attend to, and he was taken by surprise by the course proposed by the Government. He did not know until 25 minutes ago that the debate was to be resumed to-day; and when he saw the Prime Minister's Notice on the Paper he naturally expected the right hon. Gentleman would be in his place to move it. Then hon. Members would have been enabled to discuss the merits of the question to which precedence was to be given; but as the right hon. Gentleman was not present and the Motion had not been moved, the course now taken was a discreditable subterfuge. Whenever any hon. Member, whatever his position, put down such an important Notice, it was due to the House that he should be in his place to move it. He was not surprised that the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) should give precedence to the Government whenever it was to inconvenience the Irish Members, or to abridge their liberties. As an Irish Member, he objected to the Motion on very simple grounds. He had intended to take part in the debate on Thursday; but, unlike his hon. Friend (Mr. Barry), he had not forgotten his notes, for he had not prepared any, and he wanted the interval to prepare and condense his observations, so as to save the time of the House. Therefore he thought that, for the very purpose of facilitating Business, this Motion should be withdrawn, and that the House should be allowed to proceed with the Order in the regular course. The Government would gain no time by attempting to steal a march on Irish matters. He sat now on the Opposition side of the House. He did not take his place there on the first day—he only went on that side when he found it authoritatively stated that coercion was to proceed.

Colonel WALROND asked if the hon. Member was in Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The observations which the hon. Member is now making are certainly out of Order. He is bound to keep to the Question before the House, which is simply that the first Order of the Day be postponed.

Mr. CALLAN said, he had invariably paid deference to the opinions of the Speaker and of the Chairman of Committees. [*Laughter.*] Perhaps those hon. Gentlemen who laughed had not paid the same respect to the ruling of the Chair as he had. As to the condition of married women in Scotland, he was surprised that every woman was not married according to the Scotch law.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the merits of the Bill before the House.

Mr. CALLAN, resuming, said, it was a great inconvenience to private Members that their rights should be taken away from them at the beginning of the Session. He entered a strong protest against it, and should oppose it as far as he was able.

Sir JOHN HAY suggested that Business would be best promoted by passing to the Orders of the Day, when, as it would be seen that the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) and the hon. and learned Member for Lincoln (Mr. Hinde Palmer) did not intend to press their Bills, the House would naturally arrive at the third Order, which would be the resumption of the debate on the Address, when the remarks then being made would be in Order. At present Public Business was being obstructed by a course which was entirely unnecessary.

Mr. PARNELL said, he understood the Question before the House was whether the first Order of the Day should be postponed in order to permit of the resumption of the debate on the Address to the Throne.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is simply that the first Order of the Day be postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. PARNELL could not help thinking that the course taken by the Government in the matter was extremely inconvenient. The House rose that morning at a very late, or rather early hour, and no announcement was made at the time of the adjournment by the responsible Ministers of the Crown that the Motion which stood in the name of the Prime Minister asking for postponing the Orders of the Day would be made. No intimation was given to the House, or to hon. Members desirous of taking part in the debate on the Address, that the Government proposed that the important debate involving considerations of a character unprecedented in the history of the century would be resumed at the Morning Sitting. This morning, when he went up to the Table for the purpose of giving in a Motion upon another matter, he accidentally heard from one of the clerks that the Notice of the Motion which they now saw on the Paper with reference to the postponement of the Orders of the Day was placed upon the Paper, and that, consequently, it was the intention of the

Government to resume this most important debate at 12 o'clock that day. He had no time to communicate the information which he then obtained to the hon. Members who acted with him in the House. The Speaker had left the Chair at the time, and it was by the merest accident that he (Mr. Parnell) became acquainted with the intention of the Government to steal a march—["No, no!"]—he repeated, to steal a march upon the House.

MR. GORST rose to Order. He wished to know whether the hon. Member for the City of Cork was in Order in discussing this question on the Motion that the Order of the Day be postponed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the third Order of the Day; but I cannot say that the observations just made by the hon. Gentleman appear to me to be out of Order.

MR. PARNELL, continuing, said, he always endeavoured to keep within Order, and to submit to the ruling of the Speaker. He had, too, always shown himself exceedingly thankful for that indulgence which the Speaker extended from time to time to hon. Members of the House, including himself. He did not propose, on the present occasion, to depart in any particular from any ruling the Speaker now laid down. He was merely speaking of the inconvenience which had resulted to his Colleagues and himself from a want of information, which might have been easily given by the Prime Minister, in reference to the resumption of the debate to-day. What were they called upon to do? Private Members were asked to give up to the Government one of the very few days which the Standing Orders of the House placed at their disposal for the purpose of initiating legislation. They knew that all the valuable legislation which had been added to the Statute Book in times past was the result of the exertions of private Members. He could cite many examples; but if he cited one conspicuous example—the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last Session, which, unhappily, did not become law for reasons to which he need not now allude—it would be quite sufficient to prove the case that he put to the House. The Compensation for Disturbance Bill was the result of a Bill introduced into the House by a private Member, and forced to a second reading by a private Member; and, notwithstanding the obstruction which the Forms and Standing Orders of the House permitted, Business of the greatest public importance and urgency only ought to be allowed to deprive private Members of their privileges, which were at present quite sufficiently limited. Measures providing for the most useful legislation were frequently brought forward on Wednesday. It was hardly proper that they should be asked to resume a debate upon a question of such enormous importance as the one which the House had been discussing that Session at a Morning Sitting, when the great majority of hon. Members had not been warned of the intentions of the Government, and when the collapse of the debate might easily have occurred through ignorance of those intentions on the part of the hon. Member who should be in attendance to resume it. He was ready to admit that the Government were entitled to every assistance from them to proceed with important debates; but, in this case, the discussion adjourned from the previous evening was not particularly pressing. For his own part, he had endeavoured to meet the Government. He and other Irish Representatives had given up Tuesday night, because it was then considered desirable that the debate should be continued. But the issue today was of an entirely different character. The House was asked to resume the debate on the Address on the most flimsy pretexts. He (Mr. Parnell) had come down to the House unprepared, to a certain extent, for the line of action the Government were taking; and he was, therefore, not exactly in a position to shape a definite policy or to decide upon any particular course of action. He understood with regret that one very reasonable proposition had been made to the Government, and contemptuously rejected—namely, that the debate be arranged to be adjourned at 4 p.m., so that other Business might be proceeded with. In connection with this, he wished to draw attention to a circumstance which had occurred. Last night, after the adjournment of the debate on the Address, he (Mr. Parnell) asked leave to bring on a Motion standing in his name on the Business Paper, having reference to the appointment of a Select Committee on the alleged commission of outrages in Ireland.

Mr. WARTON wished to know whether the remarks of the hon. Member were in Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member appears to be travelling beyond the Question before the House. At the same time, I should not feel it my duty to interpose if the hon. Member gives me an assurance that the matter to which he is now referring has any bearing on the Motion before the House.

Mr. PARNELL said, he was about to show the bearing of the transactions to which he had referred upon the present question, when he was interrupted by the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), who had recently made himself conspicuous by obstructing Irish Members on two occasions. When they heard Obstruction talked about, he hoped it would be recollected that the first obstruction this Session had been committed——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not now keeping to the Question before the House.

Mr. PARNELL, continuing, said, that his Motion with regard to crime and outrage in Ireland stood on the Paper that day, and he desired to make a proposal to the Government in connection with that Motion which might facilitate Business, and bring about a solution of the difficulty in which the House was involved. He had been frustrated in the attempt to bring his Motion forward last night by the Rule prohibiting Opposed Business after half-past 12. He now asked the Government to allow two hours after 4 o'clock for its discussion. If that were acceded to, he should withdraw his opposition to the Motion before the House. The position of the Irish Members in that House was a very peculiar one. They were a very small minority in the House; and out of the 102 or 103 Irish Members, probably only 63 represented what were called Home Rule constituencies. It consequently happened that the Home Rulers——

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound to say that I entirely fail to see the relevancy of the observations of the hon. Member to the Question before the House, which is simply whether a particular Order of the Day shall be postponed until to-morrow or not. I must call upon the hon. Member to keep himself closely to that question.

Mr. PARNELL said, that if his course of argument was not permissible he did not wish to persist in it for one moment. He, however, desired to urge most respectfully on the Government the desirability of acquiescing in the compromise he suggested—namely, that they should give him two hours for his Motion on crime and outrage in Ireland, and enable him to take the opinion of the House on the matter. He would not have another chance of bringing it forward, in the event of all the private Members' days being taken by the Government for their own Business. In the event of their refusing, he should be under the painful necessity of dividing the House not only on the present question, but on the subsequent Motion for the postponement of the other Bill which stood upon the Paper. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] He regretted exceedingly to appear to delay the debate on the Address; but there were times when hon. Members were entitled to use the Forms of the House against the progress of Business. He considered that, owing to the extraordinary action of the Government in not giving public Notice of their intention to resume the debate at 12 o'clock that afternoon, the Irish Members, who were, as he said, a very small minority in that Assembly, were entitled to use the Forms of the House for the purpose of preventing progress. He regretted that they should be compelled to do so; but that course had been forced upon them by the action of the Government, who were responsible for the entanglement into which affairs had got, and who would show a desire that this entanglement should continne by refusing the very reasonable compromise which he had proposed to them.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON thought the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) was mistaken in supposing that there was an entanglement. There was no entanglement. No one would regret it more than the Government if there were any misunderstandings as to the time of the resumption of the debate for which they could be held responsible. But nothing could have been more distinct than the intimation given by his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister the other afternoon that, in the view of the Government, although, in consequence of the extreme rarity of the precedents, there was no absolute rule on the subject, it was undoubtedly the custom that the debate on the Address to the Crown should be continued *de die in diem;* and, acting upon that principle, he (the Marquess of Hartington) had himself, when the debate was adjourned last night, named on behalf of the Government this day as the day on which the debate would be resumed. Hon. Members, he pointed out, must be supposed to pay some attention to the Business of the House; and if any hon. Member entertained the slightest doubt as to the day which had been named, nothing could have been more simple than for him to have made the matter certain by putting a Question. It was not from *The Times* or any other newspaper that hon. Members were expected to obtain their information as to the Business. Parliamentary Papers were issued for the information of Members. On the Paper that day there was a Notice of a Motion by his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister for the postponement of the Orders of the Day. It was not, hon. Members would see, necessary to make that Motion, because the Members in charge of the first Orders had expressed their willingness not to proceed with those Orders on that occasion. It would be in accordance with the usual courtesy extended to hon. Members if their wishes were acceded to. The hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) had made what he considered a very reasonable proposal to the House. But, believing, as the Government did, that the most convenient and proper practice was to continue the debate on the Address until it should be disposed of, they certainly should not take any action or assent to any course which would have the effect of bringing about a different procedure. He would also point out that there was a doubt as to the power of the Government to come to the arrangement suggested by the hon. Member, for they were not absolute masters of the Business of the House; and when the debate was resumed it would be for the House to decide how long it should continue, and the Government would not be able to put an end to it at a stated time. The hon. Member would have an opportunity of bringing his Motion forward, as an Amendment to the Motion of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Forster), on the introduction of the Bill for the Protection of Life and Property in Ireland.

MR. SEXTON (who rose amid cries of "Divide!") said, he was there till the House rose last night; but he could not ascertain what was going to be done that day. To his knowledge several Irish Members wanted to speak, and he thought as they were not present they should have an opportunity of doing so. It was important that the voices of the Irish Members should be heard there, and their votes recorded; and he protested strongly against any decision which should prevent the Irish Members from stating their views to the fullest extent. The Government had stolen a march on Irish Members; and if they persisted in that course the result would be to inflame the suspicions already prevailing in Ireland, and excite a similar and sympathetic feeling in Scotland and England. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) had said that the hon. Member for the City of Cork might bring his Motion forward when the Government introduced their land proposals; but it would then be too late. For his part, he (Mr. Sexton) challenged the accuracy of the Returns which had been produced on the subject of the hon. Member's (Mr. Parnell's) Motion.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD asked if the observations of the hon. Member were in Order? The hon. Member was discussing the Returns.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is bound to confine himself strictly to the very limited Question now before the House.

MR. SEXTON was not aware that he had exceeded the limits of the Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is travelling beyond the Question before the House. He is bound to confine himself to the Question that the first Order of the Day be postponed.

MR. SEXTON explained that he wished to show that the public interests would not be served by a postponement of his hon. Friend's (Mr. Parnell's) Motion. Once the Coercion Bill were introduced, a Committee to inquire into outrage and crime in Ireland would be too late to be of any use. If the Government persisted in refusing the proposal of the hon.

Member for the City of Cork, their conduct would be considered in Ireland unworthy of any English Government, and especially of a Liberal Government.

Mr. HEALY rose, and proceeded to address the House irrelevantly upon the Question, when——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not confining himself to the Question before the House. I must repeat to the hon. Member that the Question before the House is simply whether the first Order of the Day shall be postponed until to-morrow or not.

Mr. HEALY said, he proposed to show that by the postponement very great inconvenience would arise to certain hon. Members of that House. He contended that great inconvenience would arise if the Orders of the Day were postponed. A mine had been sprung upon Irish Members. He, for one, had not understood that the debate was to be proceeded with *de die in diem*. It was strange that the Government was represented on this occasion by what had been called the "coercive section of the Cabinet." He did not see the Prime Minister, or the Chancellor of the Duchy, or the President of the Board of Trade, on the Front Treasury Bench. On an occasion when an Address was to be voted to Her Majesty, it seemed to him that it would not be unusual for those right hon. Gentlemen to be in their places to assist in the deliberations of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must repeat to the hon. Member that he must confine himself strictly to the Question immediately before the House. His observations are quite irrelevant to that Question.

Mr. HEALY said, he was endeavouring to show the inconvenience which arose from the absence of certain right hon. Members. [*Cries of* "Order!"] He would endeavour to confine himself to the Question. The question was, whether an arrangement made very suddenly by the hon. Member for Glasgow and certain right hon. Gentlemen opposite was to be accepted without hesitation? If his hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell) should divide the House against the Motion now before it he would certainly support him.

Mr. BYRNE considered the course adopted by the Government a most inconvenient one. One of its results was to take the Irish Members by surprise. It was simply through accident that he himself was there; and he was aware that many Irish Members believed that no attempt would be made to have the debate on the Address resumed. Wednesday was the only day on which private Members could hope to forward their Bills, or to have matters discussed which to them were of the utmost importance. The provisions of the Bill of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) were of great interest to the people of Ireland, as well as to the people of Scotland. ["Order!"] He would avoid referring to the provisions of the Bill, and would only say of it that it was a Bill——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite out of Order in referring to the nature of a Bill which is not before the House. The Question is, Whether its consideration should or should not be postponed?

Mr. BYRNE said, he bowed to the ruling of the Chair, and would only say generally that the adjournment of the Business of private Members was not only inconvenient, but improper. If the hon. Member for Glasgow was willing to give up his rights, it was not right to assist in the curtailment of the privileges of other private Members. He considered that the compromise offered by his hon. Friend the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) was a fair one, and ought to be accepted. The action of the Government would not contribute to the furtherance of the Public Business, for they had already wasted two hours. Even now they ought, he thought, to meet the Irish Members half-way.

Mr. O'KELLY objected to the course taken by the Government, because he saw that the adoption of it would be the establishing of a precedent which might have the effect of seriously curtailing the rights of private Members—a precedent which would be unfair, not only to Irish Members, but to English and Scotch Members also. The Bill proposed to be set aside was a very important one, and he objected to its consideration being postponed. For his own part, he also had come down to the House by accident, not at all expecting that the adjourned debate would be resumed; and he would, therefore, vote against the Motion before the House.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY also protested against the course adopted by the Government. The proposition which they supported was, he thought, an unfortunate one. He knew he was not at liberty to allude to the subject the consideration of which they were called upon to postpone; but this he said, that they were asked to set a very bad precedent. They had been told that it was the intention of the Government, when certain other Bills came on, to attempt to postpone all other Business in their favour; and if they tamely gave up the present Wednesday, a precedent would be set which would be called in aid when the Prime Minister asked the House to postpone all other Business in favour of his Coercion Bills. But he had another reason for not wishing to proceed with the debate on the Address that day. It was said that the Government had not arrived at definite ideas of what their proposals were to be. If so, it was the duty of the Irish Members to give the Government as much time as possible for reasonable arguments to weigh on their minds; and they could not accelerate the debate on the Address without accelerating the decision of the Government on the chief subject of the Address. There was no Rule of the House that the discussion on the Address should conclude before other Business was touched. There was merely a custom, which, if it existed unbroken, seemed to have so existed merely because no attempt had been made to break it. The Irish Members had very strong reasons for the course they were taking, and he should certainly support them.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he did not complain of the action of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) as being improper. In the view of the hon. Member, he might be acting wisely for the purpose of obtaining future facilities for his Bill; but he (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) thought it would be extremely unwise, inexpedient, and impolitic if the House acceded to the proposal before it. Neither he nor any other Irish Member wished to shirk discussion of the Main Question; but they objected to a decision being snatched by a side wind, especially in the absence of so many hon. Gentlemen whose votes it was important to have recorded. He implored hon. Members not to let it go forth to the people of Ireland that in a matter of such deep importance to them as the Address the Irish Members had allowed themselves to be taken by surprise. Many other hon. Members would have been here, including men of independence and spirit, from Ireland, had they known that this question would be proceeded with. They were not now in their places; and although they were men without reproach and without fear, the Irish people would not excuse their absence through a misunderstanding if a division were now taken. He believed Ministers were averse to taking the House by surprise, and he implored the House not to allow them to do so. What would be thought of the matter in Ireland was this—Here was one of the gravest propositions made that ever occupied the mind of the House, a proposition in the discussion of which every Irish Member wished to join.

CAPTAIN AYLMER rose to Order. The hon. Member was discussing the third Order and not the first.

MR. PARNELL also rose to Order. He was in a better position to hear what fell from his hon. Friend than the hon. and gallant Member above the Gangway (Captain Aylmer); and he was able to say that the testimony borne by the hon. and gallant Member was not accurate or true testimony.

MR. SPEAKER motioned to SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA to proceed.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he was certainly in Order in protesting against any course which might seem to be an attempt to take the Irish Members by surprise. The hon. Member for Glasgow, he had no doubt, had voluntarily suggested that he should give way in order that the debate on the Address might be resumed, and it was not for the Government to refuse such an offer; but, on public grounds, he objected to the sudden unmasking of the Government battery on an army not prepared to meet their fire. He repeated that he believed there was not a single Member of the Government capable of perpetrating such a thing, or laying a trap for them. But, although he said that with all earnestness, in Ireland they would not believe it. They would believe that it was a stretch of Parliamentary courtesy, and a mere straining of politeness on his part to say so; but he believed it, and for that reason only. In conclusion, he earnestly implored right hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches not to let it go forth to Ireland that they laid a trap for the Irish Members in the matter for the purpose of denying them an opportunity of having full and free discussion of the subject. In the most patriotic spirit, and as a Member of that House, he appealed to the Government not to avail themselves of the offer of the hon. Member for Glasgow.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, no one could doubt that it would be most improper to take the House by surprise; but, so far as he and his Friends were aware, there was no surprise in the case at all. He clearly understood from the beginning of the evening yesterday, and he had no doubt that the same understanding prevailed to the end, that the debate would be resumed that day. In accordance with that understanding, he saw without any surprise that the Prime Minister had given Notice of a Motion for postponing the Orders of the Day in order to take the adjourned debate on the Address. It appeared that there was no occasion for him to make that Motion, because the hon. Gentlemen in charge of the two Bills which stood first thought it was their duty, and were entirely disposed, to take the course of postponing the discussion of them until a future day. This was a matter entirely within the discretion of any hon. Gentleman in charge of a Bill. Of course, as the stage of a Bill was an Order of the House, its postponement might be objected to; but it was a convenient practice to allow a Gentleman in charge of a Bill to postpone it, if he thought proper. All he wished to say was that it was distinctly understood throughout last evening—and he never heard any doubt expressed on the subject—that the Government would propose that the debate on the Address should be resumed to-day, and he took the usual step of asking his Friends to be down in time for the division, which might be expected on that understanding.

Mr. WILLIS wished he could believe in the sincerity of the objections which had been advanced by Irish Members against proceeding with the debate that day. As to the objection that they were taken by surprise, and were not, therefore, prepared to continue the discussion, the singular facility with which, in advocating the postponement of the debate, they glided into a discussion of the Amendment to the Address perfectly satisfied him that they were as capable of discussing the question now as they would be to-morrow. With regard to the argument that the Irish Representatives desired the presence of English Members, so that they might reach their minds and judgment, he reminded the House that the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had said that he did not desire their presence, because he did not expect to reach the minds of the English Representatives—that all he wished was to reach the English people through the Press——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. and learned Member that the Question before the House is simply that of postponing the first Order of the Day.

Mr. WILLIS hoped that the House would accede to the Motion of the hon. Member for Glasgow, as it was proper that they should at once proceed to the real Business before them.

Mr. LEAMY said, he was very sorry the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland did not see his way to accept the proposal of the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue); and he thought that by the time they had arrived at 4 o'clock the right hon. Gentleman would also be very sorry. It might have been very convenient for the hon. Member for Glasgow to make this arrangement with the Government; and he should be glad to know if, in return for his courtesy, the Government had not made any arrangement with him to give him a further day for discussion? As to the remark which had been made in the beginning of the discussion, to the effect that the whole question at issue was whether the Public Business was to be regulated by that House or by the Irish Members, he thought that that was not so, because this point was raised by an English Member. It was also quite evident that the Benches never were so empty upon the discussion of a Coercion Bill for Ireland. The reason they were so empty to-day was because hon. Members believed that the discussion would not take place that day.

Mr. GILL said, he also wished to bear testimony to the impression that prevailed in the minds of Irish Members that the debate on the Address would not be resumed until Thursday. Being a young Member of the House, he inquired of one of his more experienced Colleagues as to the probability of the debate being resumed that day, and he was informed that there was no chance of that, as it was contrary to all precedent. If such a course were pursued, it would, in the future, infringe upon the time which belonged to private Members. At the commencement of the Session the Bills which were intended to be brought in were announced, and it was left an open question at what time they would be taken up.

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is travelling very wide of the Question really before the House.

MR. GILL said, he was always ready to bow to the decision of the Chair on a point of Order. He was simply desirous of explaining the position in which the House was placed. As the Speaker had decided that he was out of Order, he would now move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member second the Motion?

Mr. LALOR said, he would beg to second the Motion, and, in doing so, he would point out that, if the conduct of the Business of the House depended upon the will and pleasure of right hon. Gentlemen who represented the Government, it would tend to a curtailment of the liberties of Members of the House, and, therefore, a curtailment of the liberties of the people of the Empire.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Gill.*)

MR. SPEAKER said, the Question now before the House was that the debate be adjourned.

MR. W. H. JAMES said, that the discussion had drifted into something in the nature of a wrangle, and he hoped he should not introduce into it any unnecessary heat or anger; but it was distinctly stated by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), and he certainly understood the Prime Minister last evening to say, that the debate on the Address would be continued *de die in diem* until it was concluded. This was also clear from the Order Book, which was the official and regular authority to which hon. Members looked for the arrangement of Business. If the authority of the Prime Minister and the Order Book of the House were not to be conclusive, he did not know how Business was to be carried on.

MR. NELSON said, he sat calmly observing the proceedings of the House, and he had refrained from wasting a moment of the time of hon. Members, which, he might be permitted to say, was very frequently wasted in talk. He had seen strategical movements, and he had seen marches stolen by experienced generals upon those whom they should have met by straightforward procedure; but the question of coercion for Ireland would not be decided by the movements of either Party in the House. Public opinion was too strong in this Island. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I must call upon the hon. Member to confine himself to the Question before the House. He is now travelling very wide from it.

MR. NELSON continuing, said, it would be seen that he was out of Order already. Order was a very curious thing. It often served to produce disorder, and much oftener it served to produce dissatisfaction in the minds of hon. Members. He ventured to suggest to right hon. Gentlemen who sat on the Benches opposite that they would conduce to the advancement of the influence of the House as a deliberative Assembly, and they would conduce to the advancement of their own power in Ireland, by avoiding anything like the appearance of management in the debate. He did not know that in the whole course of his life he felt more pained than by a word which dropped from the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) last night.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. Member to refer to debates which have already taken place in this House.

MR. NELSON said, he was there as the friend of Ireland, having no personal interests to serve, and he was not there as a "miscreant." [*Cries of* "Order!"] Though he was very much a junior as to the Forms of the House, he took it for granted that they could go on with the Bills on the Notice Paper then, and postpone the Irish Business until to-morrow, in accordance with the desire of the Irish Members. Whenever he trespassed upon Order he would bend to the House, and whenever he said an unkind word of hon. Members, he would withdraw it at once; but he would not submit to be called a miscreant.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, as an old Member, could not adopt the course suggested by the "junior" Member, as he called himself, who had just sat down (Mr. Nelson). He must appeal to the House to have some respect for its position before the world. [*Cries of* "Order!"] He was not to be put down by nonsense of that kind.

Mr. CALLAN rose to Order. He wished to know if it was regular to speak of observations made in that House as "nonsense?"

Mr. Speaker motioned to Mr. Beresford Hope to proceed.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE thought there was nothing un-Parliamentary in the use of the word. He would, however, withdraw it, and say that he would not be put down by the exquisite sense which hon. Members below the Gangway had so often shown. He must say that it was the full and complete understanding yesterday that the debate on the Address should be continued *de die in diem*, and also that it was the ancient traditionary Form of Parliament that the Answer to Her Majesty's Speech should be disposed of before other Business was proceeded with. If there was anything which would be uncommon or strange in this matter, it would be if, on the first Wednesday of a Session, the Bills of private Members were ripe for discussion.

Mr. ANDERSON said, that his object in postponing his Bill, and that of the Government in asking him to do so, had been equally misunderstood and misrepresented. They were accused of having made a private arrangement; but if that had been so, last night he might have taken his Notice off the Paper altogether, in which case there would have been no necessity to discuss the question at all. He mentioned that to show that no private arrangement had been made. Those hon. Members who had been in the House since 12 o'clock had heard the whole of the arrangement; and the fact was, the Government asked him to postpone his Bill for the convenience of the House, and he had consented with great reluctance, for he had got a splendid opportunity for proceeding with his Bill—such an opportunity as he should probably never get again. He consented, not only to oblige the Government, but, he had supposed, the Irish Members also, for he thought it would have been far more advantageous to them to proceed with the debate on the Amendment to the Address. He was exceedingly sorry that they had not entered into the spirit of an arrangement made in their interest.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, that if the representations of the case and this discussion were as stated by the hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. W. H. James), he should be very much disposed to oppose the Motion for adjournment; for on looking at the Orders of the Day, he found they were calculated to mislead the Members of the House. Usually, when the Government intended to take a substantive Order, attention was attracted to the fact by a Notice of Motion that the Orders of the Day were to be postponed in order to make way for the resumption of an adjourned debate. [*Cries of* "Look at the Paper!"] He could assure hon. Members on both sides of the House that he was in no difficulty at all. [*Laughter.*] He had not nailed his colours to the mast; and if he were to express his feeling of the matter, he would say that he should regret as much as any hon. Member of the House that a discussion of the kind should go on. There could be no doubt that the argument of the hon. Member for Gateshead was perfectly conclusive, and he could count on his (Mr. O'Connor Power's) support. But there was another matter that should be taken into account that would go to justify, if not to excuse, the action hon. Members had taken. *The Telegraph* of that morning contained an announcement that the debate that was adjourned last night would not be resumed that day, and in consequence of that a large number of Irish Members who were prepared to speak on the resumption of the debate had not come down to the House. He would also say that he regretted that some Members of the Irish Party should have come into collision with hon. Members opposite before they had come to consider the proposals to be laid before the House. He would be very anxious to avoid a collision of that kind, when serious questions were pending, upon which the opinion of the House was required to be given without fear, favour, or affection. He would, therefore, ask right hon. Gentlemen to offer some suggestion which would enable them to get out of the difficulty.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that the Motion before the House was the adjournment of the debate, the debate having arisen on the Motion for the postponement of the first Order. He did not suppose anyone expected that the Government could assent to the adjournment of the debate. They had already wasted much time, and perhaps more time would be wasted, and it was very desirable for the convenience of the country that the debate on the Address should be proceeded with from day to day until it was concluded. His right hon. Friend the Leader of the House last evening gave it as a reason for asking for last night, and he and other hon. Members thought the reason applied to all after days. Notice was given by his right hon. Friend last night that the debate would be resumed to-day; and, no doubt, at the close of the evening, the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) also gave Notice of it. Notice was put on the Paper to that effect; but there was no necessity to make the Motion for the reason that his hon. Friends the Members for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) and Lincoln (Mr. Hinde Palmer) acceded to his appeal. There was no arrangement between them and the Government whatsoever. Now, would it not be for the convenience of the House that they should proceed with the debate on the Address that day? Was it not for the convenience of the House and for the Service of the country that, as soon as that debate could be reasonably got through, the Business for which Parliament had been summoned should be brought before it? He could hardly suppose that hon. Members from Ireland wished to prevent the Government from being able to state to the House and to the country the special grounds why Parliament had been called together. Allusions had been made as if the Government wished to surprise the House into a division. No one would be surprised more than he should, even if the debate had begun at 12 o'clock, that they should have a division that day; but he thought there would be a feeling in the country that unless they were allowed to proceed with the discussion on the Address there was an attempt, he would not say to stifle discussion, but to delay discussion, on the important proposals the Government had to make. That would be the general opinion of the country; and he could not conceive that hon. Members from Ireland, even with the views they held, could consider that it would advantage their cause to give the impression—he did not say they intended it—that they wished to prevent the Government from being able to state the grounds upon which Parliament was called together. He trusted they would be allowed to go to a division upon the adjournment of the debate, and then to take a division upon the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson). As for saying that Wednesday was a day on which the debate could not be continued, he might remark that they had now in the House a very much larger number of hon. Members than was generally present in the House on important debates between 8 and 10 o'clock at night. The hon. Member for Kerry (Mr. Blennerhassett) had possession of the House when they came to the third Order, and could proceed with his speech, for he (Mr. W. E. Forster) believed he would have an attentive audience. Practical men throughout the country would see that there was absolutely no reason why they should not go on, and he trusted they would be permitted to do so.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) was one which should not be made without an immediate answer. There could not be the slightest doubt that to-morrow morning there would be a feeling in this country that the Irish Members were desirous to delay the progress of Business. ["Hear, hear!"] The expectation that the feeling would be prevalent in this country to-morrow was more than corroborated by the cheer they had heard from the Benches opposite. He should not be at all surprised that the country, which had not had an opportunity of listening to that debate, or following its course, should fall into an erroneous impression and judgment with regard to it when hon. Members, who had an opportunity of following it, had already arrived at a conclusion so unjust to the Members from Ireland. He thought, however, he would be able to prove to the satisfaction of the House and the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson), that any such feeling as had been referred to was founded altogether on a misapprehension of the facts. In the first place, he would desire to call attention to the fact that the debate was not originated by the Irish Members. The debate originated in the complaint, by his hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen), that the rights of private Members were being trampled upon by the course that was taken. It would also be found that the discussion was not exclusively continued by hon. Members from Ireland. The debate had also been joined in by some speakers representing English and Scotch constituencies. When the debate originated, there was not a single Member except one on the Front Opposition Benches. The noble Lord who represented the Conservative Opposition at the time (Lord Eustace Cecil) stood up and said that his impression was, and the impression of the Leaders of the Opposition, in whose name he spoke, and whose absence he excused, was, that the debate would not have been resumed at 12 o'clock that day. Did not that distinctly prove that the misapprehension with regard to the continuation of the debate was not confined to the Irish Members alone, but that it was shared in by English Members, and especially by the Leaders of the Conservative Party of that House? It showed that the debate was not originated by Irish Members; that it was not protracted solely by Irish Members; and that the question involved was not an Irish question; but, as had been admitted by hon. Members representing English constituencies, it was a question affecting the right of private Members of that House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now referring to a past debate. He must confine himself to the Question before the House.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he bowed to the decision of the right hon. Gentleman; but he could scarcely think that his observations were open to the construction put upon them. He did not intend to refer to past debates, and anything he had said had reference only to what occurred in the course of the present discussion and within the past hour. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland stated that a feeling would exist to-morrow in England that a day was deliberately wasted by Irish Members. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) fully admitted that; and he fully admitted also that that was the impression of English and Scotch Members of the House at the present moment. But he thought he had shown that that was an utterly erroneous impression; and if the feeling in the country to-morrow should be that the debate was originated and continued by Irish Members, and that the question involved was an exclusively Irish question, that feeling would be contrary to the facts known to the House. It would also follow that English public opinion was easily excited against Ireland, and easily led astray; and it was for the very reason that English public opinion was so fickle, treacherous, and hostile, that the Irish Members objected to its having its present supremacy over Irish affairs.

Mr. D. GRANT said, that, in his opinion, hon. Members from Ireland could hardly believe the intensity of the feeling that existed in many large English constituencies unless they were face to face with it. Most of them thought that the Business of the House was thrust altogether on one side, and certainly it was continually and systematically the practice——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must request the hon. Member to confine himself to the Question before the House.

Mr. D. GRANT, resuming, contended that hon. Members opposite had been wasting the time of the House by the course which they had taken. Why should they continue a practice that could only have that result?

Dr. COMMINS pointed out that the confusion which existed in the minds of hon. Members, in consequence of the discussion on that side issue in presence of the many Amendments to the Motion before the House, was sufficient to warrant him in appealing to hon. Members to allow the debate to be adjourned before they would forget the question before them. He considered also that it was desirable to allow the feelings which must have been aroused in the minds of hon Gentlemen by the expression "miscreant," by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) the previous night to subside, before resuming the debate on the Address.

MR. SPEAKER: the hon Member's observations are not relevant to the Question before the House.

DR. COMMINS said, his argument was, that the words used by the noble Marquess——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is referring to words used in a debate upon another question. He is not entitled to refer to them.

DR. COMMINS said, the words he referred to had been used by his hon. Friend the Member for Mayo (Mr. Nelson) in the course of the present debate and within the last half-hour. His hon. Friend made use of the word "miscreant."

MR. SPEAKER: I must again call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that these observations have no reference to the Question before the House.

DR. COMMINS said, he bowed to the right hon. Gentleman's decision, and should not refer further to the word in question; but the argument that it had aroused strong feelings in the minds of hon. Members still remained in force, and it was proper that those feelings should be allowed to subside before the debate was resumed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) referred to the exquisite common sense that characterized that portion of the House; but to some of the Members to whom that observation would apply he might have an opportunity of pointing to the exquisite grace that occasionally characterized hon. Members who sat even on the Front Opposition Benches. In conclusion, he would appeal to the House to allow the debate to be adjourned, as it was clear that many hon. Members were under the impression that it would not be continued that day.

MR. BYRNE supported the Motion before the House, and urged that the only course hon. Members could take was to allow the debate to be adjourned. He said, that as the Government had refused all reasonable offers which had been made to them by way of compromise, he hoped hon. Members would stick to the Motion for adjournment. They should do so not only in their own interest, but in the interest of every individual Member and the interest of free debate and free discussion in the House. If certain hon. Gentlemen were disposed to abdicate the rights and privileges to which the Rules of the House entitled them, the Home Rule Members were not disposed to yield one jot on that particular. If they were to do so, a Motion might be proposed some fine morning that all hon. Members sitting in any particular part of the House should be ordered out of the House altogether. Therefore, he said that so long as there was a plank of the Constitution left, so long as it was left in the House, although they might not have it elsewhere, hon. Members should be prepared, if necessary, to speak on every Motion for the protection of their rights and privileges to the letter. The Members of the Government ought to see that public order and decorum were maintained in the discussion of all Business; and he did not see how that could be done, or how they could expect to have due respect and confidence, if they began at the very opening of Parliament to make bargains with private Members, which enabled them to violate the privileges of the House.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, it was well known that there was a strong deputation gone to the Prime Minister on Irish Business, and, in the absence of those Gentlemen, he thought the debate ought not to be resumed. When they returned, however, particularly as his Friends on the Home Rule Benches were now much strengthened in numbers, he would not object to the resumption of the debate.

MR. M'COAN said, he also had been misled by a paragraph in the newspapers, and therefore had not come down until after 2 o'clock. When he heard the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland charge the Irish Members with a wish to obstruct the debate, he for one was not concerned to deprecate the charge. He was not afraid to say that he did wish to delay it by every possible means that the decorum of debate and the Rules of the House would permit. His object, of course, was to stave off the Coercion Bill, which was now in view, and therefore he wished to protract the debate on the Address.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Question before the House, which is the postponement of an Order of the Day.

MR. M'COAN said, he would, of course, bow to the ruling of the Chair, and would conclude by protesting against the proposal to go on with the debate as a direct attempt to encroach on the rights of private Members to whom Wednesday belonged.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not join with the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan) in a desire to protract the discussion either of the present Amendment, or any other Amendment to the Address. He thought he had sufficiently shown already that was not his desire by the brevity of his speech; and he thought the great majority of his hon. Friends had also shown that was not their desire by the brevity of the speeches with which they had supported his Amendment. With regard to the present matter, he wished distinctly to declare that he believed it to be quite within his right as a private Member of the House to use the Forms of the House legitimately, properly, and fairly against the resumption of the debate on the Address on the present occasion; but he wished to explain that he should not take upon himself the responsibility of initiating any such course. That morning, after the House rose, he heard accidentally from one of the clerks at the Table that it was proposed to resume the debate that day. He was very much surprised, and felt indignant, but did not decide to oppose the resumption of the debate, and did not come down to the House till a quarter past 1, when he expected to find the debate in full swing. But what had occurred in the meantime? The hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) rose, and, from the point of view of the general interests of Public Business and private Members, objected to the course which the Government proposed to take; and he having taken that step, several Irish Members supported him, and urged the desirability of stopping the debate, on account of the very great inconvenience which it would cause to the Irish Members. When he (Mr. Parnell) arrived at the House, he was hurriedly made acquainted with the position of affairs. He considered the opposition which had been got up was a just and proper one, and accordingly he proceeded to express his views on the general situation. At the same time, he would admit, to the fullest extent, that those considerations influenced his action that the Irish Members were exceedingly likely to be misrepresented and misunderstood in the country. ["Hear, hear!"] He did not mean in his own country. He had always felt it was very desirable, whenever they could, to take advantage of any opportunity of directing and informing public opinion in England with regard to the situation in Ireland; and he could not help seeing that any attempt at obstruction on the Address, or any undue prolongation of the debate, must re-act against them. He wished to give an opportunity to English public opinion to assert itself, and to inform itself on the real facts of the Irish Question. He did not wish to interfere, in the slightest degree, with the success of that process. But he did feel that the Government had acted unfairly in putting down the debate for that day. They must have known that they were affording only a very brief interval of rest to those hon. Members who remained in the House until its rising, and that the occasion would not be propitious for the resumption of debate of that kind. The Government undoubtedly knew that the majority of the Irish Members were averse to resuming the debate that day; and, whatever arrangement might have been come to between the two Front Benches, it was without the knowledge and against the desire of the Irish Members. In consequence of opposing themselves to the majority of the House, the Government had brought about the present tangled situation; but he could not help thinking that, as hon. Members had now made their protest against the course the Government had taken, they would sufficiently register the protest by taking a division, and then allowing the debate on the Amendment to the Address to proceed. The House had now filled. Many hon. Members who were absent at first were now in attendance; and the same reasons which influenced those who opposed the Government earlier in the afternoon did not influence them now. Therefore he would ask his hon. Friend (Mr. Gill) to withdraw his Motion for adjournment, and allow hon. Members to register their protests on the Books of the House by a formal division. He said, in conclusion, what he said in the beginning, and he appealed to his conduct in the House in confirmation of that statement. He did not desire to prolong the debate on the

Address; but, in saying that, it must be understood that he did not pledge himself or his hon. Friends as to their future conduct when Bills for the coercion of his country were before the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 230; Noes 33: Majority 197.—(Div. List, No. 2.)

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FIFTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. BLENNERHASSETT said, every hon. Member of the House, especially any Member who represented an Irish constituency, felt when he rose to speak on this question under a grave sense of responsibility. For his own part, he felt there never was a time when plain and honest speaking was so necessary on the part of the Irish Members as on the present occasion. He would not have ventured to intrude in this debate did he not feel that he should do so for the purpose of speaking openly and boldly, and without the slightest regard for consequences, which must be painful to himself if he did his duty to his constituents. The part of the House from which he rose to speak sufficiently indicated that he did not feel himself at liberty to act with the large body of Irish Members who sat on the other side of the House, and who, he admitted, represented a large portion of the public feeling in Ireland. He was unable to accept the principles which those hon. Members had propounded for the settlement of the great question which was now agitating public opinion in Ireland to its depths. He was unable to approve the mode those hon. Members had adopted to give effect to those principles. He was unable to recognise in the utterances which they had made in connection with this question in every corner of Ireland during the last few months any indication of that spirit of calmness by which he believed alone this great question should be approached. Nothing could be further from his intention than to make the slightest attack on hon. Members opposite. He differed from them with pain and regret, and this position had been forced upon him by an overwhelming sense of public duty. He knew well how serious it was for a public man, especially representing as he did a large agricultural constituency in Ireland, to feel himself unable to co-operate with those who were supposed to speak for the country at large. He knew that by the course which he had taken he had laid himself open to the danger of being misunderstood by many whose opinions he valued, and with whom he had long acted in common; but the opinions which on several occasions had secured his election by a large constituency still remained unchanged. He was not there to recant or recall one single word which he had ever said on the great question of the Irish Land, nor to qualify one word which he had ever spoken. He still felt that he represented the fullest desire of the Irish tenant farmers on the great question of Land Reform; and he believed that the time would come when the farmers who sent him to Parliament would acknowledge that in the course he was taking on the present occasion he was doing that which was best for their true interests. He should not have ventured to introduce personal considerations, did he not feel that the best contribution which any Irish Member could make to this debate was to speak honestly and openly that which he really believed. The crisis at which they had arrived contained lessons of the utmost value. For seven or eight years he had been in that House the constant advocate of those large and comprehensive measures of Land Reform in Ireland which he still believed to be essential to the prosperity and happiness of the country. He had been the advocate of these reforms when there were not many men to advocate them; he had been a Member of an independent Irish Party when the Members could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

He knew he had incurred the painful imputation of being willing to advocate wild impracticable schemes, because he wished to conciliate the popular feeling in Ireland, or lose his seat in that House. All that was now changed. Numbers of those gentlemen had then told him that they would gladly accept the views which he had put forward as a settlement of the question; and he had now the painful satisfaction to know that his refusal to change from those views would give him something very different from the popular favour and applause. He held that the violence of the present agitation in Ireland was due to the refusal of this country to consider the just claims of the Irish people. [Mr. BIGGAR: Hear, hear!] To the attitude with which the late Government refused to approach the consideration of a real remedy for a real grievance was in great measure due the condition in which we were now placed. But, while he was deeply anxious to remedy the present state of things—and hon. Members opposite would probably do him the justice to say that he was as anxious to see justice done to the Irish tenant farmer as they were—yet he was not willing to go beyond the principles of justice in doing so. He was not willing even by silence to appear to assent to any invasion of the just rights of any great class of the community. He had already stated before a popular assembly in Ireland that no fresh confiscation, no matter in the interest of how large a number, could be of advantage to Ireland. On the contrary, it would be ruinous to that country. There were no persons in Ireland who would suffer more deeply, who would be more permanently injured by any violation of the great principles of justice in the settlement of the Land Question, than the poorest and humblest of the population. Any settlement of this question must be carried out not only on sound economical principles, but also with just and due regard to the interest of those who, relying on the past policy of the country and the existing state of the law, had invested their fortunes in the ownership of Irish land. The case of the Irish tenants was so reasonable and just that nothing would do it greater wrong than to exceed the bounds of justice in its advocacy. He felt it might be right to take an instalment of justice when you could get nothing more; but he could not admit that, under any circumstances, it was right to ask for more than it was just to receive. To ask for more was immoral and degrading to those who did it. It was entirely inconsistent with that respect and that reverence for truth which was the highest duty of every individual and of every country. He must refuse at any cost to support demands which he believed to be unjust, or to encourage hopes that were delusive. There was another duty equally imperative, which he as an Irish Member felt at the present time he ought to discharge, and that was to point out to Her Majesty's Ministers that no imperfect or inadequate scheme of Land Law Reform would meet the necessities of the present case. He wished for a reform, and not for a revolution; but the reform, to be efficacious, must be just, complete, and full. He was not prepared to say that the measure about to be proposed by Ministers would not be a full and complete measure. He was rather inclined to think it would be of an unsatisfactory and imperfect character; and he thought it was very deeply to be regretted that the House had no more satisfactory assurance than that the measure would be necessary for the circumstances of the case. The House ought to have been assured that no just effort would be left untried to settle that great question; that no tinkering of the Land Act was intended; but a thorough and complete measure, which would for ever place the one great industry of the Irish people in a condition which would enable them to enjoy happiness and prosperity in their own country. His own belief was that there could be no greater misfortune to Ireland than to attempt, by a weak and imperfect measure, to deal with the question. Such a measure would be a great misfortune, not only to the agricultural class in Ireland, but also to the owners of property. They had been reminded, in the course of this debate, that this was not the proper occasion to discuss the details of the Land Question, and he had no intention of doing so; but this he must say—that no measure dealing with that question could be effective or satisfactory which was not based upon the great principle of fixity of tenure. They must, to use a popular phrase, root the Irish people in the soil, and until they recognized that great principle, and so long as they permitted capricious evictions, this could never be done. There was a great opportunity now for Her Majesty's Ministers for the settlement of that question. It was an opportunity which had been purchased at an enormous price, a price which Ireland would have to pay for many years to come. That opportunity had been purchased by a great disturbance of social order and by the destruction of many of those ties that kept a happily-constituted community together. In his opinion, this question might have been made ripe for settlement by other and far better means—by a legitimate use of the weapons of political power, and by appealing to the better feelings and to the higher intelligence of the Nation. But the opportunity had come, and he thought every friend of Ireland must feel that no greater misfortune could happen than the not using that opportunity. What was wanted were wisdom, determination, and courage on the part of the Government to settle this great question once for all. Therefore, he heard with pleasure a sentence in the speech of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, that the measure which would settle this question should not only be a measure in harmony with the great principles of justice, but a measure which would be a final adjustment. There was a great responsibility upon Her Majesty's Government on this question. He believed if they would not rise to the height of that responsibility, they would be severely judged in the future and in the present. He believed that if they would rise to the height of that responsibility, and if they brought forward proposals worthy of this great occasion, and of that great Party which inherited such noble traditions of services to Ireland, they would triumph and carry their measure over all obstacles. He still hoped and believed they would rise to the height of that responsibility; and for that reason he must refuse to give a vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) which, if passed, would be equivalent to a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government and prove fatal to the proposals which they intended to make. Representing, as he did, a great agricultural constituency in Ireland, he believed he should best serve the interests of those whom he represented by approaching the proposals of the Government on this question, not in any spirit of bitterness or hostility, but with an earnest and sincere desire to find in them a true, just, and adequate settlement of one of the gravest and most difficult questions which had been necessary for a Government to bring before Parliament.

MR. BELLINGHAM said, as a Member of the moderate independent Irish Party, he was anxious to see the Land Bill brought forward, and wished to say a few words with reference to the vote he intended to give. He regretted extremely the wording of Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech, because he saw coercion written in very big letters and remedial measures in very small. He said that with a sense of deep responsibility, because he firmly believed that coercion was of no avail in the present state of Ireland. He deeply deplored much that had happened, and he could not condemn in too strong terms much that had been said, and much that had been done, in Ireland. But, at the same time, he believed there had been great exaggeration in the matter. He could not understand why so many hon. Members thought that any person of moderation must necessarily support Her Majesty's Government, especially on the question of the land. They had been told repeatedly to trust to a Liberal Government on the Land Question; but, so far as he had read and seen, the Liberal Government had done nothing to settle the Land Question in Ireland, save the bringing in of a Bill in 1870, and that Bill was a complete failure. It was prophesied beforehand that it would be, and it had proved so. Not only had it done no good in the Provinces of Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, but it had unsettled everything that was previously good in Ulster. The hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) the other day, in a most amusing speech, taunted Irish Members with being very impracticable. He said they howled to the moon. He (Mr. Bellingham) must confess that to trust to the Liberals for a settlement of the Land Question, and to ask them to legislate for Ireland as her people wished, was very like howling to the moon. If he had read history to any purpose, he found that the only reasonable and fair attempts to settle the Land Question had been made by the Conservative Government, for twice they had embodied tenant right in Cabinet measures; whereas a Liberal Prime Minister had called tenant right "landlord wrong." Some years ago the Prime Minister taunted Catholics, English and Irish, with re-furbishing rusty tools. Was he not now re-furbishing the rusty tools of coercion, which were not wanted, and were perfectly useless in Ireland? Hitherto the Government had flooded the country with troops to such an extent that it was enough to incite the people to rebellion. With regard to the outrages that had been committed, he fully admitted that in some parts of Ireland there had been gross outrages, and he deplored them. But it was equally true that in other parts of Ireland there had been no outrages whatever. In his own county there had been no outrage on man, woman, child, or beast. There was one report of an outrage of so serious a kind that if it had been true it would have been terrible; but he held in his hand a contradiction. Perhaps hon. Members would remember being startled by a report that a lady had been fired at upon driving up her own avenue. He was in Ireland at the time the report was first started, and, as he was convinced it was false, he took the trouble of making inquiry and getting authentic information on the matter. When he came back to England, fully eight weeks after, he saw the same paragraph going the round of the papers. Some of the papers published a leading article upon it. He wrote a letter to several papers, contradicting the statement, but his letter was only inserted in one or two of them. The same thing had happened in connection with an outrage committed in Galway on a Protestant minister, for while the outrage was reported in every English paper, Metropolitan and Provincial, no notice was taken of the fact, to which he called attention, that immediately afterwards a meeting of the inhabitants of the district, at which 800 persons were present, was held, with the parish priest in the chair, to condemn what had taken place. In his own county there had been three meetings, or rather, he should say, only two, for the Government had suppressed one. All of them were largely attended by people who behaved quietly and orderly. *The Standard*, describing the land meeting at Drogheda, said that the Riot Act was read by one of the resident magistrates; but that for that proceeding there appeared to be no necessity, that the people dispersed quietly, and no disturbance whatever occurred. Neither was there any disturbance at the meetings at Dundalk and Ardee. In regard to his own county (Louth), he could say that it was in as peaceful a state as, for example, any county in England; and it was, therefore, intolerable that the people of that district should be deprived of their Constitutional rights, simply because of the existence of crime elsewhere. [Mr. W. E. Forster: Hear, hear!] He objected to coercion on principle, quite independently of the different state of counties in Ireland; and, in conclusion, he believed that if Ireland had been governed so as to obtain the goodwill and affection of the Irish people, and in the same spirit as a Parliament sitting in Dublin and fairly representing them would show, matters in that country most probably would not have been in the serious state in which they were at present.

Mr. MARJORIBANKS said, the impression had gone abroad, and had been fostered by certain of the public newspapers, that a large section of those who sat on the Ministerial side of the House were losing confidence in the Government. That impression he believed to be entirely unfounded. They had the utmost trust in the Government, feeling confident that their Land Bill, when brought forward, would completely and radically deal with Irish grievances; and they were content to wait until it was convenient for the Ministers to disclose to them what the provisions of the Bill might be. But they were alive to the fact that the embers of rebellion were glowing in Ireland, and were prepared to give the fullest support to the Government in their endeavours to prevent incendiary agitators from fanning those embers into a flame. What did hon. Members who sat on those Benches think they would be doing by supporting the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork? He should like to ask these hon. Gentlemen if they altogether realized what that vote would mean? It would mean a Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government. It would mean that they did not believe that the description given of the condition of Ireland was a true one — that they would set up their own private uninformed judgment against the fully informed judgment of Ministers; that they condemned the Bill of the Government without having heard its provisions. Oh, men of little faith! They were told that faith but as a grain of mustard-seed would suffice to remove mountains; and would hon. Members, he asked, not have that amount of faith in their own Leaders till, at any rate, the Government policy was fully disclosed? They had frequently in the course of the debate heard the idea that the Land League was responsible for the state of things in Ireland vehemently challenged; and efforts had been made to show that any blame that might be attached to that organization was due to the unauthorized action of its smaller and irresponsible county branches. But the cheers with which the hon. Members from Ireland greeted those portions of the eloquent speech of the late Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Plunket), in which he described cruel and outrageous acts—the story of Mr. King-Harman's tenantry, and the Land League emissary that met them—were surely alone sufficient evidence that a very large share of responsibility—he had almost said criminality—must be credited to occupants of Benches opposite. He presumed that the hon. Member for the City of Cork wished the House to believe that one branch of the conspiracy of the Press against Ireland, of which he complained in such dulcet tones the other night, was the manufacture of speeches, and the putting of those speeches into his mouth. Well, certainly, that would be some explanation of the strange inconsistency between speeches delivered by the hon. Member on Irish platforms and on the floor of the House. But if he (Mr. Marjoribanks) rightly understood the drift of much of the argument that had been advanced, it amounted to this—that at other periods there had been many more agrarian murders than there had been recently; that at those periods coercive measures were not adopted, and therefore were not to be adopted now; and, moreover, that this comparative immunity from murder was due to the action of the Land League. He quite understood the sequence of thought that had governed the policy of this Land League. With but the change of a letter or two, Cicero's reflection on Cæsar exactly expressed it—"*Hos primum mortales, deinde etiam multis modis exstingui posse cogitabam.*" Murder, naturally, was the first crude plan of getting rid of an adversary —had been since the first great criminal slew his brother—but the crime was apt to be dangerous to the murderer. Other expedients were soon discovered, and efficient means of dispensing with murder was found in making life intolerable. So the order had gone forth—"Threaten —refuse to fulfil your lawful contracts —Boycott." It might be that destruction of property and life was less now than at some other periods of disturbance. He could make hon. Members who opposed the protective measures of the Government a present of that statement to use for what it was worth. But of this there could be no doubt—there was now a state of terrorism rampant such as there never was before. Where one person was in fear for his life at any former time, 20 were in like fear now. Where the property of 100 persons was threatened with destruction before, the property of 1,000 was threatened now. Those were facts which could not be denied, and they justified—nay, demanded—the very strongest measures to suppress them. And what, he asked, could be said of the recent policy of this great Irish Party —if they really were to regard it as the policy of a great National Party, desirous to obtain a great measure of Constitutional Reform by Constitutional means? Should it not be stigmatized as at once irrational and unreasoning? Last spring a Ministry came into Office, at once strong and determined to remedy permanently Irish grievances. Amongst its very first acts it displayed its goodwill towards Ireland by suffering the Peace Preservation Acts to lapse, and thus proclaimed its conviction that the Irish people might be trusted to abide by the law, whilst the endeavour was being made to rectify what was faulty in that law. How grievously that confidence had been shown to be misplaced. It might have been imagined that the leaders of the Land League would have thrown the whole of their great influence into the scale of law and order, and so have strengthened the hands of those who desired to help them, by showing that they desired to obtain reasonable reforms in a legal and Constitutional manner. But these leaders had done nothing of the sort. The land agitation had been but the cloak for wilder and more revolutionary projects. The probability of a just and final settlement of the Irish land grievance—and a great one he admitted it to be—had only made these leaders the more anxious to use their strongest and longest lever for exciting the people while yet it remained to them. Severe strictures had been passed on the Government for not sooner applying for the protective powers they were now asking for. It seemed to him that to have done so sooner would have been a proof of the greatest weakness, of the smallest confidence in their own carefully-considered judgment, on the part of the Government. A strong Government, whose motive of policy was principle, not mere expediency, whose motto was, "*Mihi res non me rebus subjungere,*" on accession to Office, came to the deliberate conclusion that it was justice to Ireland to dispense with the Peace Preservation Acts, and relied on the Irish people to take this determination as some tangible proof of their desire to redress long-standing wrongs. Surely, then, six months' trial was not too long to give so large-hearted an experiment. Six months had elapsed, and the Government had to confess themselves deceived and disappointed. It seemed to him that instead of deserving censure, the Government had the right to demand the sympathy, to command the respect, of every subject of the Empire. The House had had the speeches of several statesmen quoted, and he, too, should ask leave to quote a few words from the speech of one of the greatest living statesmen—the late Prime Minister, who—in his speech in that House in 1844, said—

> "A starving population, an absentee aristocracy, an alien Church, and the weakest Executive in the world—that was the Irish Question."—[3 *Hansard,* lxxii. 1016.]

Let them leave out one clause, and this sentence exactly described the Irish Question now; and surely it should be some reason for confidence in the present Government that it was owing to the present Prime Minister that that one clause, "an alien Church," had been struck out of the list of reforms to be accomplished. In the same speech, Mr. Disraeli wisely foreshadowed the objects to be aimed at in the settlement of this Irish Question. He said it was the duty of a wise English Minister "to effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force." —[*Ibid.*] That was, he believed, the line of policy proposed by Her Majesty's Ministers; and he hoped there would be few indeed who would not give their sanction to those protective measures which now seemed necessary to check a revolution on the point of breaking out.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that in the course of this long debate, so far as the main opposition was concerned, the discussion came in like a wolf and promised to go out like a lamb. On the first night the Leader of the Opposition commenced the debate with a very vigorous attack on Her Majesty's Government, charging them—first, with not having renewed the Peace Preservation Act at the beginning of last Session; secondly, with not having called Parliament together in November for the purpose of passing a Coercion Bill; and, thirdly, with not having administered the law with sufficient severity during that time. The late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) renewed the attack on the second night in a powerful speech, in which he spoke of criticism, but not of arraignment; and it made one wonder what arraignment might be in his hands. After his speech the attacks against the Government had dropped, and they had heard no more of them. The right hon. and learned Member for Dublin addressed himself entirely to the subject of coercion, and promised his earnest support to the Government in passing that measure. The criticisms, therefore, to which he had alluded had now become matter of ancient history, and it was scarcely necessary to advert to them. There was one matter, however, in connection with the Peace Preservation Act which had not already been alluded to, and which he would venture to bring under the attention of the House; it was, that all previous experience showed that a mere Arms Prohibition Act had been of no avail whatever in putting an end to outrages or preventing a dangerous agitation.

He need not remind the House that Lord Stanley passed an Arms Act in 1831, and in the two years that followed there was dangerous agitation and numerous outrages; in fact, outrages were at least more than tenfold what they were in the previous year, and in 1833 the then Government of Lord Grey was compelled to introduce a coercion measure and to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act. The same thing followed in 1847-8. In 1847 there was in like manner an Arms Prohibition Act; that was not sufficient, and in the following year Lord John Russell was forced to ask for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. The same thing occurred again in 1866-7, and once more in 1870-1. He thought, from this experience, it must be clear that for Her Majesty's Government on coming into power to have caused a renewal of the Peace Preservation Act would have been useless, and, further, would only have irritated the Irish; and he need hardly say that for a new Government to propose such a measure as that at the beginning of a new Parliament would not have been a wise act. With reference, again, to the complaint that coercive measures had not been applied for earlier, his confident belief was that if the Government, two months ago, had summoned Parliament and proposed the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act at the time, there would have been found a very considerable section of Members on the Liberal side of the House who would have been opposed to such a measure. He might remind the House that it was during these two months they had had the most important evidence as to the necessity for such a measure. This was borne out by what had taken place at the Winter Assizes. Coercion and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act could only be justified when all the ordinary remedies of law had been tried and been proved to be wanting, and it was only at the Winter Assizes that there had been conclusive proof of the insufficiency of the law. He need hardly remind the House that at the Summer Assizes there was not proof sufficient of the unwillingness to convict. It was only at the Winter Assizes they had conclusive proof of that. They were commenced in the second week in December, and they were only over a few days before Christmas. They brought out very distinctly two main points—the one, that in the West and South of Ireland, notwithstanding an immense increase of agrarian crime, it was impossible to bring the offenders to trial, owing to the unwillingness of witnesses, even the injured persons, to come forward to give evidence; and, secondly, that juries were unwilling to convict in the face of the most clear and certain evidence. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald showed in his Charge in Munster that although there were only 20 agrarian cases for trial before him, the police had reported to him nearly 500 other cases of indictable offences of an agrarian character. Of these about half were the sending of threatening letters. He quite agreed with what had been said by some hon. Members that they must not attribute too much importance to these offences; but, at the same time, he would venture to point out that the sending of threatening letters at a time when other crime was undetected and unpunished, was a matter of much more serious import, and much more likely to cause terror than such a practice would do at another time. Even if they subtracted the threatening letters, there still remained nearly 250 cases of agrarian outrage, consisting of arson, maiming of cattle, injury to persons, firing into houses, and other acts of a similar criminal nature, where the facts were reported to the Judges, and where the witnesses were unwilling to come forward to prosecute. Of the 20 cases that came for trial the jury in 17 refused to convict, and there were only three most trivial cases where the juries convicted. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, in discharging the Grand Jury, pointed out that the unwillingness of the juries to convict arose from some external influence, which deterred them from doing their duty, Therefore, there was conclusive evidence that there was a system of terrorism at work. The case of Connaught was even stronger. Mr. Justice Dowse informed the Grand Jury of Galway that there were 469 cases of agrarian outrage reported to him by the police, and that in the vast majority of those cases the injured persons were unwilling to come forward to give evidence. In the case of the West Riding of Galway, the Judge reported 208 cases of agrarian outrage, and only 31 were threatening letters, leaving 177 cases of arson, maiming, and other offences, and in those cases 127 persons, who were actually injured themselves, declined to come forward and give evidence. In Mayo there were 135 cases reported of agrarian outrage, 121 of which were cases other than threatening letters, of which 29 were for arson, 24 for maiming of cattle and other serious agrarian offences, and 215 persons refused to bring cases before the Court. In the whole Province there were 469 cases, of which a certain number were threatening letters; but there remained 334 other cases of serious agrarian outrage. Only 10 of them were brought to trial. In only three was there a conviction. It appeared that in these cases the convictions were less than 1 in 100 of the agrarian outrages committed in the winter months. That produced, in his mind, the conviction that there did exist at that moment, both in the Provinces of Munster and Connaught, a system of terrorism which prevented people coming forward to give evidence, and juries from performing their duty. These facts had only become public within the last few weeks; and if Parliament had been called together at the beginning of November to consider this question they would have been altogether wanting in these facts, and, therefore, wanting in the most important link of the chain in which coercion could alone be justified or founded. Now, some hon. Members had suggested that the word "protection" should be substituted for "coercion." He should object to the change, because it would indicate a normal remedy. Coercion was not a good expression, it was a short term for the suspension of the ordinary checks which the Constitution afforded upon the action of the Executive and the arbitrary arrest of individuals; these checks secured to them trial by jury, but those Constitutional checks implied and were conditional on, or at least, only consistent with, the working of the jury system and the Courts of Law. If those did not work, if injured persons were intimidated from coming forward to make their charges, and if juries were intimidated from giving verdicts, then the groundwork of the Constitution itself failed; if crime were unpunished, the fabric of freedom itself was dissolved, and the Government, if it meant to exist and to keep society together, must be armed with power temporarily to put down terrorism, to allay panic, to restore order, and to enable the Courts of Law to resume their functions. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was to the criminal law what the suspension of the Bank Charter was to the monetary world. A crisis arose, a panic prevailed, ordinary laws were suspended. It was necessary for the State to intervene for the purpose of allaying panic, and to enable the ordinary laws to resume their calm and quiet operation. In this view, then, he believed that at the present time the emergency had arisen, and that it was necessary to arm the Government with special powers. Coercion, it had been said, was no remedy for the disease. He fully admitted it. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) had jeered at the phrase; but he would call his attention to the words of a wiser man than himself, the greatest Constitutional statesman his Party had ever produced—Sir Robert Peel—whose speech on the Coercion Bill of 1833 was eminently worthy of study. If he recollected rightly, he said—"Coercion is no remedy; I admit it; but it may still be necessary, for continued anarchy would be death to the State." Coercion, indeed, might be necessary to stay the violent symptoms, to arrest the spread of the disease, but it could not cure the disease which was the cause of the symptoms; rather would it drive the disease inwards into the body politic, and the danger was that we might be lulled again by the restoration of order into the belief that the disease was over. He thought, too, there was some reason to complain of hon. Members opposite that they had not shown the slightest sign of any attempt to probe the nature of the disease from which Ireland suffered, or the causes of the present agitation. He must, however, except the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) from this, who had shown an earnest desire to approach the question from this point of view. With this exception, the speakers opposite had contented themselves with calling loudly for coercion, with blaming the Government for not sooner resorting to coercion; but their minds were perfect blanks upon other questions, upon the causes for what they saw. They had no suggestion for the future. The right hon. and learned Member the ex-

Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) had promised to give fair consideration to any reasonable Bill that might be brought forward. That was not a very vigorous promise, and, from former experience, they might judge what that meant. He ventured to ask the House what was really the cause of the present state of things in Ireland? No person who looked into the condition of that country could doubt that its present state was due to the evils of its land system. He had no doubt that the hon and learned Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) was right in saying the promoters of the agitation had other objects in view—namely, the disintegration of the Empire—but, at the same time, they could not doubt that the disaffection was due to the evils of the land system. Unless there had been some power of that kind, these agitators would not have been able to do what they had done. He might remind the House that during the last General Election all questions of Home Rule for the moment disappeared. [" No, no ! "] Home Rule questions were, at all events, very subordinate, and the main questions discussed were questions affecting land. Who could doubt that at the root of this agitation lay the Land Question when they looked at the condition of landed property in Ireland, the vast number of small tenants having practically no security for improvements, and, on the other hand, the very small body of landholders? He would have another opportunity, and therefore he would not enter into details. He had frequently pointed out the unsafe condition of property in Ireland, and he had made that the basis of a Motion in the House on a former occasion. Independently of the actual condition of landed property in Ireland, there appeared to him many reasons for the present disaffection which existed in Ireland. He was bound to say that he thought one cause of the disaffection was due to the neglect by the late Government of all questions effecting land tenure. That neglect was not merely ordinary neglect, but a matter of policy; and he would venture to call as a witness the right hon. Gentleman the late Colonial Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who, speaking a few weeks ago at Cirencester, explained his policy when he was Irish Secretary. He said, on that occasion, that his Government had opposed a fierce resistance to any demand for changes of the Land Laws. But, not only content with opposing a negative to any proposed change in the land tenure, the right hon. Gentleman did not even carry out the existing law with efficiency, for he allowed one-half of the Irish Land Act to be obstructed by the ordinary officialism of the Departments in Dublin. It was not merely a question of carrying out any new changes; but the right hon. Gentleman did not put into effect those conditions which Parliament had passed with the view of effecting changes. He was bound to say that, in other respects, the administration of the right hon. Gentleman when Irish Secretary was just, prudent, and moderate, and one which did him credit. The right hon. Gentleman, however, was followed by Mr. Lowther, whose administration was not either a prudent or a moderate one. The right hon. Gentleman presented not only the same firm resistance to any proposal to change the Land Laws; but he went further, because he never opened his mouth upon the Land Question affecting Ireland, but he repudiated and condemned in the strongest possible terms the Irish Land Act of 1870, and denounced it as Communism and robbery. Now, he ventured to think that language of that kind was not calculated to appease the Irish community, but to aggravate the disaffection. There were other causes for the present state of affairs. It was in times of distress, as a general rule, that people began to look more closely into political questions, and that agitation such as they had seen during the last few months had its origin, and was able to lay its foundations. Therefore, in the course of the autumn of 1879, after the unexampled bad harvest, it was natural that an agitation of this kind should arise. He was bound to say that he did not think at the time that the Irish landlords were sufficiently quick in meeting the emergency which arose, by making those remissions of rent which were only to be expected in consequence of the calamitous harvest. He ventured to point out at the beginning of last Session—and he drew a contrast between Ireland and England in this respect—that when in the previous autumn there was grave agricultural distress in England, the late Prime Minister went down to Aylesbury, and pointed out to the landowners of the county the very serious nature of the crisis. He told them that the time had come when very great remissions of rent ought to be made, and that it was not a mere question of 10 or 20 per cent. Now, so far as he was aware, no responsible or official person made a like statement in Ireland, or had reminded landowners there of their duties, and yet it was only reasonable that some equally important personage should have led public opinion there. It was, therefore, left to the Land League to initiate a great movement for the remission of rent, and the movement to a great extent fell into their hands. He ventured to think that was one of the causes which had given rise to the agitation. He also thought at the time there was a considerable fear among a large number of the smaller tenants in Ireland that opportunity would be taken of the distress for the purpose of turning them out of their holdings and depopulating parts of the country. They had the recollection of what took place in 1848, and it was not unreasonable that some should be alarmed lest the same course should be pursued again. The other day he read in one of the reviews an article by an Irish landlord containing the statement that he had himself evicted numerous tenants in 1848, and he spoke of it as having signed their death-warrant, and the writer of the article recommended the same course to be taken now. That only showed the opinion of some of the Irish landlords on this question. It appeared to him that such language, used by an Irish landlord, was not unlikely to lead to serious agitation and disaffection in Ireland. He might also remind the House that when a deputation waited on the late Chief Secretary for Ireland and asked him to contribute his assistance towards the public purchase of seed for Irish tenants, he remarked that what was wanted was not seed potatoes, but grass seed. The meaning of that was that it was desirable that the land should be laid down to grass, and that many of the small tenants of Ireland should disappear. Such language was unwise, and was likely to create great disaffection. No doubt it was hoped, and possibly it was expected, that the good harvest of last year would put an end to the agitation and the disaffection; but they must bear in mind the treatment which Irish measures received last Session in "another place." He did not wish to make too much of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. He held then, and he held still, that it was a just and necessary measure. He thought the rejection of it was unwise, and still more was the rejection of those two other Bills by the House of Lords unwise. But, even more so, was the justification given by speakers in the other House and elsewhere for its rejection. It was said that the majority of this House in favour of the Disturbance Bill was composed entirely of Irish Members. Now, that appeared to him to be an argument unsound and improper, and one which was unjust to Ireland, and against the principles of government in this country. As long as the Irish Members were in this House they were bound to treat them as other Members. A majority composed of Irish Members was as good as a majority composed of any other. The use of such arguments was calculated to create great discontent in Ireland. There were many other reasons which accounted in part for the agitation. They must remember they had given democratic institutions to Ireland; and they could not be altogether surprised that, under democratic institutions, they should be dissatisfied with the constitution of their land system. They should also recollect that every year the influence of the United States was increasing; and that was a most dangerous point with regard to the future. They must remember that that influence was growing, that it was of a democratic character, and that it tended to make the Irish more and more discontented with their present land system and English institutions. Those were questions which must be considered by everybody connected with the administration of Ireland. Hon. Members opposite should bear that in mind. They might say it was only 10 years since they legislated for Ireland. It was his confident belief that if that measure had passed in its original state, and been treated in a proper way by the Irish Executive, and due effect given to that portion of it which went by the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), it would have gone a great way towards the settlement of the Irish Land Question. Unfortunately, great and unwise

Amendments had been made in the measure, and one-half of it had proved to be altogether ineffective, and had produced no result whatever, and the result was they were now called upon to legislate again for Ireland; and he feared that the settlement which would have been permanent and effective in 1870 would not now satisfy the Irish people. He hoped the Opposition would recollect that fact, that in any fresh settlement for Ireland they would do their best to enlarge its provisions rather than to restrict them. He hoped they would endeavour to deal with the question in a generous spirit—in the same way that he observed the Ulster Tory landlords were endeavouring to deal with it. The latter appeared to be conscious of the difficulty of the question, and were trying in generous rivalry with the Liberal Members to devise a plan. Therefore, he hoped the Opposition in that House would not do as they did in 1870—namely, endeavour to restrict the settlement, and thus prevent its being a permanent one. Above all, they must bear in mind that the settlement should be according to Irish ideas, and not English ones. On that point he would refer to a speech of that great statesman, Charles James Fox, who was quoted approvingly by the late Earl Russell, in the debate on the Irish Municipal Reform Bill, as follows:—

> "I would have Irish legislation regulated by Irish notions, and even by Irish prejudice, and I am convinced that the more this is the case the more Ireland will be bound to English interests."

He believed it would be wise in the matter to legislate in the sense of Irish ideas, and not English ones; and if right hon. Gentlemen opposite would take that view, and endeavour to enlarge rather than to restrict any measure which might be brought before the House, they would do more to benefit Irishmen, to bring prosperity to Ireland, and to prevent outrages and agitation such as had been lately seen, than by a hundred Coercion Bills. Although he had ventured to explain the causes of the present agitation, it must not be supposed that he approved of the agitation or of the methods by which it was carried on. Few Members on the Ministerial side of the House sympathized more deeply than he did with the Irish tenants, or more freely recognized the evils under which they suffered, and the instability of the present land system of Ireland, or were more desirous to see the system brought into harmony with Irish ideas. But, for those very reasons, he felt bound to express his opinion as to the objects of the Land League and the methods they had pursued. Last year, in the debate on the Address, he had referred to some of those objections. He pointed out that the leaders of the agitation stated in the previous autumn that their object was to depreciate the value of land with a view to its purchase by the tenant at a reduced value. He said then that the policy was a dishonest policy; he repeated it now. So far as he could understand, during the past autumn the programme had been enlarged even beyond that. The object of the Land League appeared to be not only to depreciate property, but also by a process of terrorism to expropriate all the landlords of Ireland, and to put the tenants in their place at a price to be fixed by themselves. He said that was a dishonest programme, and should not be carried out in the real interest of Ireland. It would involve the expenditure of an enormous sum of money, and what Ireland had been paying in the shape of rent to the landlords it would in future pay in the shape of interest to the fundholders in England, who would provide the money. The result would be that for very many years all the evils of absenteeism would be multiplied tenfold, while the whole rent of Ireland would have to be remitted out of Ireland for the benefit of those who lent the money, so that financially and economically, and in whatever point of view it was looked at, such a measure could not be for the interest of Ireland. Any measure for promoting and increasing ownership in Ireland must be of a slow character, and could not be carried out in the manner it appeared to him to be proposed by the Land League. He regretted very much to hear the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell) saying that he approved of the avowed objects of the Land League. He did not know whether he drew any subtle distinction between the avowed objects of the Land League and its practical working. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), for his part, could draw no such subtle distinction. He refrained from saying all he thought of the Land League, because their proceedings were now before a Criminal Court. He would not express his views as to whether what they were doing was criminal or not. He would leave that to be determined by the Criminal Court; not merely by the verdict of the jury, but by the opinions of the Judges. But whatever might be the finding of the Judges or the jury, he said, looking at it from another point of view, that their action and their programme were dishonest and immoral. Not merely did he find fault with their programme; but still more, he was sorry to say, he was bound to find fault with the methods by which they were carrying them out. He deplored most deeply, and most of all, the fact that throughout the whole of this agitation he had not been able to observe that any prominent member of the Land League had ever boldly, honestly, and vigorously denounced the outrages which had taken place through Ireland. He looked in vain for any language of that kind. He himself was not opposed to agitation. He was of opinion that no great measure had been carried in Ireland without agitation. He believed that if he were an Irishman he would be an agitator too, not, indeed, such an agitator as they had seen lately. But there were agitators and agitators. There had been agitators of the O'Connell type, who had carried out agitation boldly, no doubt, but yet honestly; and he need hardly remind the House that O'Connell frequently took the opportunity of repudiating connection with outrage, and he stated boldly, on more than occasion, that no political change he could conceive was worth one drop of blood. Well, he had looked in vain for any such language from the agitators of the present time. They had heard, indeed, some gentle language used upon the subject. They had heard, for instance, one hon. Member, a leader of the Land League, say he considered outrages were unnecessary in those parts of the country where the tenants were properly organized; but he did not say whether they were necessary or unnecessary in districts where the Land League was not organized, and where the tenants had no such organization. Language of that kind seemed to him to lead the Irish tenants to believe that outrages might be necessary in other parts of Ireland. Then they had the language which another member of the Land League, another Member of that House, had used, saying it was not part of the duty of the Land League to shoot landlords, and then he went on to say it was the duty of the Land League to take care that anybody who shot a landlord should have a fair trial. [Mr. BIGGAR: Hear, hear!] He thought that language was an attempt to mislead the Irish tenants into the belief that they might shoot Irish landlords, and then receive the protection of the Land League. Another leader, the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) himself, offered as an alternative for murder a course which was only second to death—namely, civil death. In language the most powerful in which a curse was ever uttered, more powerful, he ventured to think, than the well-known curse of Kehama, he told his audience to treat as a leper or outcast from society anyone who should venture to take a farm from which a tenant had been evicted. Even the Church was not to be a sanctuary for such an offender. Even in the House of God the offender was to be severely left alone. He could conceive no more terrible threat. He wondered the hon. Member did not go on and quote the words of Southey a little altered—

"And he shall ask death to release him in vain,
He shall live in his pain while King Parnell
shall reign."

He cared not whether these sayings were criminal or not, they were equally detestable to honest men. There were many things in this world condemnable in themselves which the Criminal Law did not reach. It was no crime to abstain from saving a drowning man when by holding out a hand he could be saved. It was no crime to abstain from interfering to save another from assassination. So it might be no crime to hold meetings in disturbed districts where agrarian outrages were numerous, and to excite the populace by violent speeches while abstaining from expressing any condemnation of crime or from any warning against it, or offering these charitable alternatives of social death. These might not be crimes, but they were acts abhorrent to any man of honour and right feeling. He regretted to have to speak thus strongly; but the language of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell) compelled him to do so. He regretted to say that he had come to the conclusion that coercive measures were necessary at this time for Ireland. There could be no doubt whatever that the ordinary Criminal Law of the country had been superseded by some other law, and that some government other than that of Her Majesty's Government prevailed in some parts of Ireland, that secret societies practically ruled to-day, and enforced their orders and pronounced their decrees. That the ordinary Criminal Courts of the country were set aside appeared to him conclusively to be shown, and that a reign of terror existed in some parts of Ireland which prevented witnesses coming forward to give evidence of outrages, even though they were the victims themselves, and prevented juries by the same means from giving their verdicts. It appeared to him an imperative necessity that the Government should interpose to allay the panic that had arisen, and to restore order; and, in his humble judgment, any Government that refrained from doing so at the present moment would cease in any real sense of the term to be a Government, and would forfeit the respect and confidence of every honest citizen.

DR. COMMINS said, he had listened with feelings of pain and admiration to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He admired some of his eloquent expressions of sympathy with the interests of the people of Ireland and the desire he expressed to do something for their grievances; but that feeling was entirely dashed by the conclusion of his address, and by other sentiments to which he gave utterance. However he might have studied the case of Ireland, whatever remedies he might propose for the ills of Ireland, it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman had not gone the right way to understand what was wrong in Ireland, or the right way to redress it. It seemed to him when he concluded his address with an indictment against the Irish people that he should have supported it with something stronger than he had introduced. He had told them he had only repeated what had been stated *ad nauseam* from both sides of the House—that the ordinary law was suspended in Ireland. He need hardly remind the House that in no country in the world could the ordinary law be suspended until that law was found to be directly hostile to the welfare of the people. In the histories of all countries they knew that the people did not set themselves in antagonism to the law unless that law was, in the first instance, in direct antagonism to themselves. When such charges as these were made against the people of Ireland they should expect that some reliable facts would be advanced in support of them—something to show that these charges were not the product of the imagination of the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen that gave utterance to them. They had been told yesterday by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India that he would produce statistics on a subsequent occasion; but statistics were still wanting to show some grounds for the attempt to take away the Constitutional liberty of the Irish people that was involved in the proposals of the Government. What had the Government condescended to show them with regard to the statistics they had acted upon? Nothing whatever. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down went so far as to say that the legislation for Ireland should be in accordance with the feeling of the people of Ireland. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman if, before agreeing to the proposals for coercion in Ireland projected by the Government, he consulted in the slightest degree the opinions of the Irish people, or of those they had sent to represent them in that House? The Ministry had not consulted the feelings or wishes of the Representatives of the great majority of the Irish people, nor had they shown them their confidence in the faintest degree. The Government had to undergo the humiliation of receiving promises of support from the Tory Members of that House to any measure of coercion they might bring forward, and there was no limitation whatever to those promises which one and all of the Tory Members offered—he would not say to the insult, but to the humiliation of promising to support any coercive measure they might bring forward; but if that measure was accompanied by any measure of redress for the Irish people, all they promised was to give such a measure their consideration. No doubt, they would give it their consideration; but there was no doubt as to what that consideration implied. The right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Government Benches had subjected themselves to the humiliation of seeking the confidence of the Conservative Party. They had, in fact, descended to the low level of bended knees to the Conservative Party for not bringing in a Coercion Bill last year, while they had not vouchsafed the slightest confidence to those who actually represented the people of Ireland. Now they proposed to take away the Constitutional liberties of the people of Ireland, and on what grounds? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading had let fall an intimation which did not come from any of the previous speakers on the Treasury Bench. He had given the House to understand that one of the intentions of the Government was to take away the right of trial by jury in Ireland. He could understand nothing else from the description of the right hon. Gentleman of what took place in Cork, and from his iteration, for the tenth time during the progress of the debate, of the statement of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, that juries in Ireland did not perform their duty—as if he and those that repeated that statement, without the slightest justification, were better judges of the facts of the case than the juries who were sworn to try it upon the evidence adduced before them. It was upon the flimsy evidence of newspaper reports and private letters, the names of the authors of which were not disclosed, that the Government proposed to take away the important right of trial by jury in Ireland. He would like to know what Government existed for the last 200 years in England that was strong enough to take away the right of trial by jury in the smallest shire in England? Yet that was the proposal which, from the statement of the right hon. Member, he judged to be floating in the distance which the Government intended to spring upon the House without the slightest notice, and which they could only guess at by inference in that way; and they were asked to shut their eyes and accept with something like the subjection which they yielded to Divine Providence any Coercion Bill which they intended to introduce. The first argument used by the right hon. Gentleman in favour of a suspension of the Constitution in Ireland was founded upon the expressions of Judges Fitzgerald, Dowse, and Barry at the Winter Assizes. He wondered whether the right hon. Gentleman had considered whether those were expressions which would have been tolerated from an English Judge. Did those three Judges so far forget their duty, did they so far depart from the recognized Constitutional usage in England—and he supposed the same usage should prevail in Ireland—as to appeal to sensational reports in the newspapers, instead of speaking of the depositions returned by the magistrates, which they were bound to do? The English Judge that would so far forget himself as to go off the depositions and appeal to the public newspapers and roadside gossip, a great deal of which had been imported into this debate, would find his place a very uneasy one on the Bench; and unless he conducted himself better in future he would not find it a bed of roses. The Judiciary in Ireland was tainted by this panic which was attempted to be got up. It was tainted by the perversion of facts which had been practised, and by the substitution of the imagination for truth which appeared in all the newspapers; and, when that was so, was it to be wondered at that they should have such political harangues from the Bench as had been referred to during the course of the debate? In regard to the alleged outrages, there was a large substitution of imagination for truth, and there had been more alacrity in giving publicity to them than in denying them when they had proved to be untrue. Out of 1,718 cases in the Return laid before the House, 851 were threatening letters, and a large proportion of the remainder were the mere statements of individuals, which had been in no way investigated or corroborated.

It being a quarter before Six of the clock Debate *further adjourned* till *Tomorrow.*

MOTIONS.

—∞o∞—

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

SIR CHARLES FORSTER moved—

"That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed:—And that such Committee have power to direct the printing *in extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it:—And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House:—Sir CHARLES FORSTER, The O'DONOGHUE, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. M'LAGAN, Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, Mr. REGINALD YORKE, Sir CHARLES RUSSELL, Viscount NEWPORT, Mr. MULHOLLAND, Marquess of TAVISTOCK, Mr. CHARLES TENNANT, Marquess of STAFFORD, Mr. HANBURY-TRACY, Mr. LOWTHER, and Colonel DIGBY:—Three to be the quorum."

COLONEL ALEXANDER said, he had given Notice of opposition to the Motion, because, while on the Committee there were no fewer than three Scotch Members from the Liberal side of the House, the Scotch Conservative element on the Opposition side of the House had been altogether unrepresented. This he had opposed for two reasons. First, it was desirable that every shade of representation in the House should be considered in the appointment of the Committee; secondly, that to serve on this Committee gave immunity from serving on any other Committee of the House. However, he understood that to rectify this error would cause considerable inconvenience at the present moment; and he would withdraw his opposition to the appointment of the Committee on the distinct promise that the hon. Member for Walsall (Sir Charles Forster), on the next occasion that he had, would nominate a Scotch Conservative on the Committee.

Motion *agreed to.*

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (NUMBER OF ELECTORS).

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved for a Return, showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in force.

MR. DAWSON wished to have a paragraph inserted in the Order, requiring a Return of the number of inhabitants in each constituency.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE explained that he was now moving for a Return in a form that had been annually issued for some years. Every few years his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands) had been in the habit of moving for a more detailed Return, which gave the number of inhabitants in each constituency; and as the results of the new Census would probably be in the hands of the Government about the month of June, no doubt his hon. Friend would move this Session for the particulars desired by the hon. Member.

MR. GRAY considered it important the two sets of figures should be given together, and no extra expense or trouble would be involved. He trusted, therefore, that the hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would consent to the small addition to the Return, which had really now become a matter of some importance.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE replied, that as the last Census was 10 years ago, the figures now would be entirely conjectural.

MR. CALLAN said, that might be; but it would afford some basis for Her Majesty to form some opinion upon. He hoped the suggestion would be acceded to.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would undertake to consult his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands), and see if he would move for the extra Return.

MR. DAWSON pointed out that the fact of the Census being 10 years old applied to both England and Ireland. He was of opinion that the Return would be quite misleading without the number of inhabitants.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE repeated that he would see his hon. Friend on the point.

MR. HEALY considered the answer of the hon. Baronet unsatisfactory, and therefore would oppose the Motion.

Motion *postponed.*

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Dr. CAMERON, Bill to amend "The Municipal Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1868," *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. CAMERON, Colonel ALEXANDER, Mr. DUNCAN M'LAREN, and Mr. M'LAREN.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 57.]

ELECTIONS (CLOSING OF PUBLIC HOUSES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CARBUTT, Bill for closing Public Houses during the hours of polling at Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CARBUTT, Mr. HUSSEY VIVIAN, Mr. HUGH MASON, and Mr. CAINE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 58.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 13*th January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment (9).

Committee — Report — Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) * (2); Judicial Committee * (3).

AUGMENTATION OF BENEFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 9.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, its object was to amend the 26th section of the Augmentation of Benefices Act, 1863, which provides—

> "That it shall be lawful for the Lord Chancellor, at his discretion, to augment any benefice in his gift to such an amount as he may think fit, provided that no such benefice shall, with the augmentation, amount to an annual value of more than four hundred pounds, nor to an annual value exceeding one pound sterling for every four inhabitants within the limits thereof."

According to the Bill before the House it would be lawful for the Lord Chancellor to augment any benefice in his gift to the annual value of not more than £200, notwithstanding that the annual value of such benefice exceeded, or would with the augmentation exceed, £1 sterling for every four inhabitants within the limits thereof, and the noble and learned Lord would also be able to make such grant from "The Lord Chancellor's Augmentation Account, No. 2," as he might think fit towards purchasing, building, or re-building a parsonage house for any benefice in the gift; provided an equal sum be found by, or on behalf of, the incumbent of such benefice.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

NAVY—ENTRY OF NAVAL CADETS, AND STOPPAGES OF PAY.

QUESTIONS. OBSERVATIONS.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will state the new regulations with regard to the entries of Naval Cadets referred to in a speech of the late Secretary to the Admiralty? In doing so, the noble Viscount said, that his first Question was caused by some remarks which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the late Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) as to the present system of admission to cadetships, and in reference to the condidates who entered the Service under it. The right hon. Gentleman spoke as to the intention of further increasing the system of competition with reference to the admission of naval cadets, and thus applying it to boys of from 13 to 14 years of age, and in which speech there were some remarks which were uncomplimentary to the present system. The speech left an unpleasant impression as to there being competitions for selection, and he was sure that if the country knew the effects of the system they would entirely object to it being thus extended. He did not himself think that they had any right to be dissatisfied with the naval officers of the country, either at the present or in former times, under the old system. He did not himself know whether the right hon. Gentleman had made such observations; but he thought that a moderate amount of selection could scarcely be objected to. No doubt, the country was perfectly wedded to the system of competition, and it was therefore utterly hopeless for anyone to attempt to get rid of it as a means of entry to the Public Service generally; but he believed the country, if they understood it, would not object to a modification of it in the case of boys of 12 or 13 years of age. He would ask the noble Earl also, Whether he will afford the House some information as to stoppages of pay?

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK, in reply, said, that as to the speech made by his right hon. Friend the present First Commissioner of Works, he could assure their Lordships that Mr. Shaw Lefevre, in his remarks, did not wish to cast any reflection upon the officers who had entered the Navy under the present system, for whom the right hon. Gentleman had, he was sure, every respect. The fact was that the system of entry of young gentlemen for the Navy had been subject to very considerable changes from time to time. For a few years before 1875 a system of limited competition, under which double the number of boys required were nominated for vacancies, and then the best were selected by examination, had been introduced by Mr. Childers. In 1874, Mr. Ward Hunt, then First Lord, appointed a Committee to inquire into that system, and that Committee recommended that limited competition should cease, and that the entries should be made by nomination, subject to a test examination. That system had lasted from 1875 up to the present time; but it had been reported to the Admiralty by the educational staff of the *Britannia* and others that the cadets of late had not been quite equal to those who had been supplied under the system of limited competition, and it was to that fact that his right hon. Friend had alluded. That being so, the Board of Admiralty took the matter into serious consideration; because, at the present time, the introduction of so many scientific branches into the Naval Service made it most desirable that officers should be appointed from those who were intellectually best. Further inquiries confirmed the report that the standard of the boys who passed out of the *Britannia* was not so high as before; and, therefore, they considered it desirable to revert again to the system of limited competition in order to select the best boys for Her Majesty's Service. Before the inquiry which was made, his own feelings were not very different from those of the noble Viscount (Viscount Sidmouth) as to the prejudicial effect of competition among young boys; he had, indeed, a strong impression in his mind against it. He, therefore, thought it desirable to make the fullest inquiry as to the practical results of competition amongst boys; and he applied to the Head Masters of Eton, Winchester, the Charter House, and several other schools, and asked whether examination by public competition among boys of about the same age, 13½, for selecting boys for the foundation of those schools had any injurious effect. He asked the Head Masters three or four questions, and amongst them whether they found that the boys who were successful in these competitions sustained any injury to their health. He asked whether, in the sports of the school and otherwise, they were found to be inferior to the other boys who had entered without competition. Their Lordships might, perhaps, be surprised to hear that the answers were conclusive and unanimous upon these points. In the first place, that no injury whatever was done to the health of the boys from the competition; and, in the next place, that in the sports of the school, such as football, cricket, and boating, those boys were fully equal to the boys who had come in without competition. That being so, it was clearly for the advantage of the Service that they should have the best boys for the Navy; and this decided the Board of Admiralty to revert to the system of limited competition. In the next examination, therefore, in June, there would be three boys nominated, out of whom one only would be selected; the number of those sent up for examination would be three times as many as those who were to be appointed. There would, however, be some exceptions made which, he thought, would be generally considered fair. Four cadetships would be given yearly to the sons of gentlemen in the Colonies without competition, upon passing the test examination, because it would be hard to have to send boys over here without knowing whether they would pass or not. Five cadetships would also be given yearly to the sons of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marines who had lost their lives in the Service, on passing the test examination, and without competition. He had endeavoured to make the competitive examination comprise the same subjects which constituted the present test examination, so that persons educating their sons for the Navy would not have to make any change in the course of their instruction. There would first be a test examination for all candidates precisely the same as the present examination, with the exception of Latin, and those boys who passed the test examination would compete in a subsequent examination, which would comprise three subjects, Latin, Mathematics — including Arithmetic, Algebra up to quadratic equations, and Euclid — and Modern Languages. There would be 300 marks for each subject; but boys would be allowed to take up two subjects only out of the three. The questions would be set simply and broadly, and care would be taken to avoid catch questions on matters of detail. He did not think this examination would be open to the objection of "cram;" indeed, he found that it was a fact that there were more complaints made by the instructors on board the *Britannia* of "cramming" under the system of nomination than under the old system of limited competition. Having said so much about "cramming," he must guard himself by saying that, to his mind, the objection commonly raised to what was called the system of "cramming" was sometimes a little unreasonable. In reality, "cramming" for any high honour, or for an important examination such as the Indian Civil Service, simply meant that a young man, or boy, was properly taught the things in which he had to be examined. It was simply the process which many of their Lordships had gone through at the Universities, which all lawyers had to go through, and through which every statesman must go before he learned the business of his Department. Cramming for an examination of low order might certainly be very different. A copy of the new regulations would be placed upon the Table in a few days. After June next there would be about £15 a-year added to the annual cost to parents for the education of boys on board the *Britannia;* but at the present the cost was very low, and the Government did not see why education on board ship should be given at a lower cost than it could be got elsewhere; but power was reserved to the Board of Admiralty to admit the sons of officers, whose circumstances called for the indulgence, at a lower rate. In making these changes he was glad to say he had been able to restore to captains in the Navy the nominations to naval cadetships that were withdrawn from them a few years ago. Each captain, on being appointed to the command of a ship, would have one nomination. He thought it desirable that the power of nomination should be somewhat dispersed, instead of being concentrated in the hands of the First Lord, upon whom the system now placed great responsibility. As to stoppages of pay, there was a Paper laid before the House of Commons, which he would be willing to produce, which would furnish information; and if further information were required, if the noble Viscount would communicate with him, he should be happy to supply it, if that could be done without placing any great additional labour upon the Departments.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Six o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 13*th January,* 1881.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Ordered*—Sligo Borough Re-enfranchisement *.

Ordered—First Reading—Medical Appointments Qualifications * [60]; Maintenance of Children * [59].

Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee—Married Women's Property (Scotland) [45]; Married Women's Property [50].

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. E. W. HARCOURT asked the Postmaster General, Whether the success in the employment of itinerant agents of Post Office Savings Banks in certain rural districts has been such as to encourage a hope that the system will be extended; and that the public will have the benefit of their services before long in other counties?

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, with the view of extending as far as possible the advantages of the Post Office Savings Bank, I stated last Session that I would try experimentally a suggestion that was made by my hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. E. W. Harcourt), that in certain villages where there is no Post Office Savings Bank one should be opened once or twice a-week under the superintendence of a clerk from some neighbouring post office. Thirty-three villages were carefully selected in different parts of the country to give the experiment a fair trial. The period selected was from the middle of July to the end of October, thus including harvest time. The number of visits paid to these 33 villages was 485. The aggregate number of transactions was 1,049, which represented an average of rather more than two transactions a visit. The entire expense involved in these 485 visits was £163; and, as this shows that each deposit and withdrawal was made at a cost to the public of 3*s.* 1½*d.*, I think my hon. Friend and the House will agree that it would not be right either to continue or extend the experiment. As much interest is taken in the extension of savings bank facilities, I may, perhaps, be permitted to add that there are two ways in which this extension can be accomplished. A savings bank and money order office are established in any village in which it is estimated that the business done will be sufficient to defray the expense, and in those cases where it is estimated that the business would not be sufficient to defray the expense a savings bank and money order office will at once be opened if the inhabitants will guarantee the estimated loss. The amount of this guarantee would not be large. It would not in any case be more than £16 for five years, to be paid in advance. The second way in which savings bank facilities can be extended is that any minister of religion or responsible person may be constituted an agent for receiving savings bank deposits in those villages where there is not a savings bank. I will not trouble the House with describing the manner in which this can be done, as it is explained in a short pamphlet, entitled *The Post Office and Aids to Thrift*, which is about to be issued, and which may be obtained on application at any post office in the United Kingdom by Monday week.

MR. E. W. HARCOURT asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is ever intended to lower the amount at present fixed upon as the smallest sum which depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks are permitted to invest in the funds?

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, my hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire will, perhaps, remember that when the Bill which enabled small investments to be made in Government Stocks through the savings banks was before the House last Session I stated that I should be very glad if it were found expedient to reduce the smallest amount that could be invested below the present minimum limit of £10; but I expressed the opinion that, as the scheme was a new one, I thought it would be better to give it a trial with the limit then proposed. The system, so far as it has yet been tried, has been, I think, remarkably successful; but, as it has been in operation for less than two months, I think it would be premature at the present moment to come to any decision as to whether or not it would be desirable to reduce the existing minimum limit of £10.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—APPLICATION OF THE ELECTRIC LIGHT.

MR. D. GRANT asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether any steps have been taken to test the Electric Light, and its fitness to illuminate the House, and with what results?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Experiments were made a few days before the meeting of Parliament, at the expense of the Anglo-American Electric Light Company, in lighting this House with the Electric Light on the Brush system. Six globes were suspended for the purpose a few feet from the roof. On personal inspection I came to the conclusion that the glare of light was far too strong, and I felt certain that it would not be approved by hon. Members. The Company has since then offered to make a further experiment by placing their lights above the present glass roof. I propose as soon as the arrangements are complete to have the experiments tried on some Wednesday evening shortly after the Sitting of the House, so that hon. Members may have the opportunity of themselves forming an opinion upon it.

TREATY OF BERLIN—THE NAVAL DEMONSTRATION.

Mr. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government will produce the correspondence with the Government of France containing a record of two conversations which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had with the Comte de Montebello, in both of which the Comte de Montebello was assured that the fleet "had no intention of firing a gun?"

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the right hon. Gentleman does not appear to have thoroughly accepted the statement upon this subject which was made by my noble Friend Lord Granville in his recent speech at Hanley. I am aware that he does not actually say so in express terms; but I gather that such is the case from the concluding sentence of his Question. In these circumstances, I must detain the House for two or three minutes while I read portions of the despatches which have passed on the subject. Despatches to Her Majesty's Minister at Athens, recording Lord Granville's conversations with Comte de Montebello in regard to the Naval Demonstration, are included in the Papers about to be distributed, as is also a despatch to Lord Lyons of the 9th of December, in which, as the Comte appeared from his despatch of the 28th of July to have misunderstood the purport of Lord Granville's observations, his Lordship wrote as follows:—

"Your Excellency is in possession of an account of the same conversation given by me immediately after it took place in my despatch of the same date. You will see that I described myself as speaking as follows:—

"'But it now appeared that M. de Freycinet wished to attach two further conditions to the French participation in a Naval Demonstration for the settlement of this question. These were —(1), that no troops should be landed; and (2), that no cannon shots should be fired. . . . The second condition tended to deprive the Demonstration of all value and effect. It seemed to me impossible to tie the hands of our naval commanders to the extent to which such a condition would involve. Suppose, for instance, that Dulcigno were in the possession of the Montenegrins, and an attack upon the town were commenced by an Albanian force, were the vessels of war stationed off the coast to be restricted from firing a shell over the assailants to show that the town was held under the protection of the United Powers?' It is very probable that in the course of the conversation I expressed incidentally my opinion that the occasion for the use of the ships' artillery was not likely to arise. . . . But to give such an assurance as Comte de Montebello's would seem, at first sight, to convey, would have been opposed to the whole course of my argument. It would have been equally inconsistent with the instructions to the naval commanders of which the draft was communicated to the French Government, and with the proposal which I afterwards made, in order to meet their objections to those instructions. . . . In consequence of the inferences which were drawn from the partial extracts published in this country of Comte de Montebello's statement, I thought it necessary, in speaking at Hanley, to disclaim having given the assurance in question. I should have been very sorry that my recollection differed from that of a diplomatist so accurate, so well acquainted with the English language, and so incapable of intentional misrepresentation as the Comte de Montebello; but I perceive from a later despatch of July 31 there is not much difference between us as to the sense of what passed."

TREATY OF BERLIN—THE MONTENEGRIN FRONTIER.

Mr. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government will produce the correspondence alluded to in the Austrian official despatches respecting the proposal of Her Majesty's Government as to the despatch of men-of-war's boats to the River Bojana?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, there was no Correspondence respecting the despatch of men-of-war's boats to the Bojana. Some conversations took place on the subject, which are referred to in the forthcoming Papers.

Mr. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government will produce the correspondence between the Powers respecting the summons issued by Admiral Sir Beauchamp Seymour to the Governor General of Albania, and the communications which took place between the gallant Admiral and the Governor General with respect to "active operations?"

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, I am not sure to what Correspondence my right hon. Friend refers; but all the communications between Admiral Seymour and the Turkish authorities in Albania will be included in the Montenegrin Papers, which will shortly be in the hands of hon. Members.

TURKEY AND THE POWERS—THE MONTENEGRIN FRONTIER.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government will produce the correspondence with the Powers respecting the proposal of Her Majesty's Government to take a material guarantee mentioned in Lord Granville's speech at Hanley, which the Prime Minister referred the House to recently?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the Papers relating to this matter are included in the Correspondence respecting the Montenegrin Frontier, which will be distributed very shortly.

LAW AND JUSTICE—THE MAGISTRACY (SCOTLAND)—MR. STOPFORD BLAIR.

MR. ANDERSON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the speech of a Mr. Stopford Blair, at Newton Stewart, on the 10th December, in which the wish was plainly expressed that the present Prime Minister should be poisoned; if this person is a deputy lieutenant for the county of Wigtown; and, if any steps are being taken to deprive him of his magisterial functions?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, the matter to which my hon. Friend's Question relates has been the subject of correspondence between the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Stopford Blair. The latter gentleman complains of the report which was made of the speech referred to. His own account of what he said is this—that

> "I then added it was a pity that Mr. Gladstone had not a little taste of it, just enough to give him a slight pain in his stomach."

Therefore, my hon. Friend will be satisfied Mr. Blair did not, according to that statement, contemplate poisoning. It was, at the most, a species of political outrage. He then proceeds to say that it was, on his part, "a cursorary remark." I should not do justice to the Deputy Lieutenant if I did not read the whole sentence. He says—

> "I can hardly understand any person attributing serious intention to such a cursorary remark. Indeed, I should have thought that the nature of it explained itself."

Whether "cursorary" is a Scotch adjective of imprecation or not I do not know; but that is the gentleman's explanation. He then proceeds to describe it as a somewhat inconsiderate joke. I remember Sydney Smith saying that a joke in Scotland was a serious matter; and an "inconsiderate joke," as my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) will perceive, is a very grave matter indeed. No doubt, if in a matter-of-fact country like England a gentleman had made such a speech, we should have reprobated it very strongly, and should have taken it for what it appeared to mean; but as, according to all accounts, this was regarded in the highest Conservative circles in Wigtonshire as a gentle sally of refined wit and humour, it would be a mistake to take it *au sérieux* at all; and as this gentleman has expressed his regret for an "inconsiderate joke," the Lord Chancellor has come to the conclusion that it is not a case for removing him from the Bench. I think the House will agree with the Lord Chancellor that such language as this does nobody any harm but the author of it; and that the most appropriate punishment for such an offence is the publication of it which has taken place.

MR. ANDERSON asked the right hon. and learned Gentleman, Whether he was aware that Mr. Stopford Blair was not a Scotchman, but an Irishman?

MR. O'CONNOR POWER asked, Whether Mr. Stopford Blair would not have been removed if he had been an Irish Justice?

MR. PARNELL asked, Whether the Home Secretary was aware that the ancestors of Mr. Stopford Blair originally came from Scotland?

[No answer was given to these Questions.]

AFGHANISTAN—THE PAPERS.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether Mr. Thomson at Teheran communicated to the Government of India any details of the large force under Ayoub Khan referred to in the Viceroy's telegram of June 27, 1880; and, if so, whether such details can be laid upon the Table; and, whether Her Majesty's Government can also lay upon the Table the text of the orders sent to Generals Primrose and Phayre, referred to in the Viceroy's telegram of July 1, 1880?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, the telegram of the 27th of June, 1880, containing these details was to be found in page 111 of the Blue Book No. 3 of 1880; and in the same Blue Book, page 187, he would find the text of the orders sent to Generals Primrose and Phayre.

INDIA—LAND LAWS OF BENGAL—REPORT OF THE COMMISSION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether, considering the great interest felt just now by the public in the question of land law reform, he would have any objection to lay upon the Table, and render accessible in this Country, the recent Report of the Indian Commission on the Reform of the Land Laws of Bengal; or, if the Report itself is too voluminous, whether he will have abstracts or a précis printed of portions at least of that important document?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, the Report of the Bengal Commissioners is a document which is of very great length, extending over more than 400 pages when printed in *The Calcutta Gazette.* An abstract of the proposal of the Commissioners has been embodied in the form of a draft Bill, which has been prepared in the India Office; and if the hon. Member will move for it there will be no objection to lay it upon the Table of the House. I will also have a copy of the whole Report placed in the Library of the House for reference by hon. Gentlemen; but I do not think it would be necessary or desirable to incur the heavy expense of printing impressions of it for general distribution. I ought to state that the proposals of the Commissioners, of which an abstract will be presented, are merely the proposals of those gentlemen. The draft Bill has been circulated in India for consideration by the public, by the High Court, and by experienced officials; but the Bill does not contain anything but the proposals of the Commissioners. The proposals have not yet been adopted by the Government of India or the Government of Bengal, but will be submitted to the Legislative Council of Bengal?

THE INDIAN ARMY COMMISSION—THE REPORT.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the large questions of the future organization of the Indian Army still pending in India, Whether any and what Papers will be laid upon the Table of the House before final action is taken; and, if so, when he hopes to be able to do so; and, whether full opportunity will be given for discussion of these questions in their large economical and political bearing before final decision is taken upon them?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, the Report of the Indian Army Commission was sent home by the Government of Lord Lytton in a despatch containing some of the recommendations, but omitting to state what the recommendations were upon which they agreed. This has been pointed out to the Government of India; and we have asked for an expression of their views upon the point. No communication on the subject, however, has yet been received; and the matter has probably been delayed by Lord Ripon's tour and illness. There are, therefore, no Papers which I can lay upon the Table at present.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON.

Sir HARDINGE GIFFARD asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether any reply was sent to the letter addressed by the Lord Chancellor to the late Lord Chief Justice of England, upon the subject of the abolition of the office of Chief Baron, and published in the newspapers, and if any reply was received; and, whether there is any objection to its being published?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James): Sir, the Question of my hon. and learned Friend may be read as implying that the Lord Chancellor published his letter to Sir Alexander Cockburn, but not the reply. That is not so. The Lord Chancellor's letter was not published in the newspapers by him or with his assent. The substance of the reply was brought to the attention of the Council of Judges before they arrived at the recommendation to abolish the offices in question. The reply of the late Chief Justice was contained in a letter which touched upon many other subjects, and could not in its entirety be made public; but I will furnish to my hon. and learned Friend, and make public, a copy of every word of the letter referring to the subject in question. As may be supposed, from the well-known and often-expressed opinion of the late Chief Justice condemnatory of the policy of the Judicature Acts of 1873 and 1876, his reply expresses disapproval of the proposed abolition. It is as follows:—

"As regards the subject matter on which you desire to take the sense of the Judges, I should be wanting in candour if I did not frankly say that I do not concur in your view. I am quite prepared to sacrifice old names and old associations for the sake of substantial good, though I do not think they are destitute of value, but I am wholly at a loss to see what will be gained by merging the three Common Law Divisions into one Court, and am satisfied that a Court of 15 Judges, under a nominal president—for the authority of such a president would be no more than nominal—would not and could not work. My opinion is that hopeless confusion would be the result. The fact is the present state of things works extremely well when the Judges can attend to their business in the Common Law Divisions. The reason why there are arrears is that the Judges are scattered over the face of the country trying Election Petitions or on extra and unnecessary Circuits."

In reply to Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS,

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, the extract could be published at once.

IRELAND—FLOGGING FOR POLITICAL OFFENCES.

MR. HEALY asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce this Session a Bill to abolish flogging for political offences in Ireland?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am advised that there is no Act in force authorizing flogging for political offences in Ireland.

MR. HEALY said, he referred to the Whiteboy Act.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The Whiteboy Act does not apply to political offences.

MR. HEALY gave Notice that he would, on Tuesday next, ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to repeal the 6th clause of the Whiteboy Act authorizing flogging in Ireland?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I may as well answer this Question at once. The view of the Government has been clearly shown by what I stated last week, that we did not think flogging an appropriate punishment under the Whiteboy Act, because in the Circular which I recently issued to the magistrates calling attention to that Act I omitted all reference to flogging, although such reference was made in a similar Circular issued by a previous Government a few years ago. No doubt, at that time, public opinion in regard to flogging was not so far advanced as it is now.

IRELAND—THE MAGISTRACY—LANGUAGE OF AN IRISH MAGISTRATE.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the reported utterances of Mr. R. S. Notter, J.P. at the Ballydehob Presentment Sessions, county Cork, in November last, when he expressed a hope that the "poor people" of that locality "would soon get powder and ball;" and, what notice has been taken of such language used by a magistrate from the Bench?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, my attention had not been called to that matter until the hon. Member gave Notice of his Question. I should hope and believe that there is an inaccuracy in the report; but the Lord Chancellor will cause attention to be directed to the matter.

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION (IRELAND)—THE REPORT.

MR. GRAY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When he expects the Report of the Municipal Boundary Commission, Ireland, to be presented; and, whether, if there is likely to be much further delay, there would be any objection to publishing the Report on Dublin separately and promptly?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am informed, Sir, that the Report will be ready for presentation on the 10th of next month.

IRELAND—DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE—THE ACCOUNTS.

MR. GILL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the full accounts of the Dublin

Metropolitan Police have not been presented to Parliament since 1869, as they had been up to that period; and, it the accounts of 1880 will be so presented and continued annually in future?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, it is quite true that for some years after 1869 these accounts were not presented to Parliament; but, on the representation of the then hon. Member for Tipperary, they were presented in 1879. I am informed that the account for 1880 is in course of preparation, and will be ready for presentation within 30 days of the meeting of Parliament, the time specified by the Act.

IRELAND—APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES.

Mr. BARRY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that the bench of magistrates which, on 1st November last, returned Messrs. Healy, M.P. and Walsh for trial on a charge of which they were afterwards acquitted, consisted of Mr. J. W. Payne (Lord Bantry's Land Agent), presiding, Lord Berehaven, Captain Hewson (formerly a military officer), Mr. J. E. Barrett (Lord Kenmare's Sub-Agent), and Mr. Warburton (a stipendiary magistrate); and, whether the Government have any intention of remedying the preponderating influence exercised by the landlord class in dealing with agrarian charges by appointing in each Petty Sessions District at least one magistrate not connected with the Government or with the landed interest?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I am not aware of the exact composition of the Bench on the occasion in question; but I think it probable that the gentlemen named, being magistrates for that petty sessions district, were present. It is the fact that Mr. Barrett retired from the Bench. It is not in my power to appoint; but the Lord Chancellor is anxious—as far as he has anything to do with it—that there should be appointed throughout Ireland gentlemen who are fit for the office, whether they are connected with the landed interest or not. There are several districts in which it is not easy to find local gentlemen fit for the Bench who are not connected with the landed interest. I admit that there ought not to be any grounds for suspicion as to the magistrates; and, as far as I can ascertain, they performed their duty with impartiality. But I must make some allusion to the terms of the first part of the Question, because, although not so stated, I think it will be understood as a sort of insinuation against the magistrates for having sent for trial a case in which there was an acquittal. ["No!"] All I have to say with regard to that is that if any hon. Member reads either Judge Fitzgerald's Charge to the Grand Jury or his Charge to the petty jury, he will see that there was a *primâ facie* case; and although the jury acquitted the accused, they took, according to the newspaper report, an hour in deliberating.

Mr. BARRY gave Notice, in consequence of the unsatisfactory answer of the right hon. Gentleman, that he, on the first opportunity, would move a Resolution on the subject.

NAVY—ABOLITION OF FLOGGING.

Mr. ONSLOW asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether, before the Second Reading of the Bill for the total abolition of Flogging in the Navy, he will lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of any Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and Officers of the Navy on the subject?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, there has been no Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and officers in the Navy on the subject of the punishment of flogging during the existence of the present Board of Admiralty. The last Correspondence of that nature preserved in the Office dates as far back as the year 1871. That Correspondence was from first to last strictly confidential, and Her Majesty's Government do not propose to lay it before Parliament.

LOCAL TAXATION AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT—LEGISLATION.

Mr. HENEAGE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce Bills for a uniform system of assessment for local taxation, and for the establishment of local government in counties in England during the present Session?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, in view of the work that the House has already before it, I fear that there will be no opportunity of introducing the first-named Bill in the present Session with any prospect of carrying it to a successful issue. As regards the second, it relates to a subject of such importance that it would be worse than useless to hold out any hope of dealing with it this year.

TURKEY — DEPORTATION OF BULGARIANS FROM MACEDONIA.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If there is any truth in the statements that, in order to terrorise the people of Macedonia, the Turkish authorities of that province have been attempting to deport to Asia Minor large numbers of Bulgarian men, women, and children, where they will be exposed to the fate to which the Turkish Government have subjected their own co-religionist refugees; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have given orders to stop any such deportation?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, some Bulgarian families were recently deported from Kuiprulu and Uskub to Polygeros and Salonica; and it was reported in a Turkish newspaper that the Government intended to send them to Anatolia. This intention was, however, denied by the authorities; and on the representations of Her Majesty's Consul General at Salonica and of the Greek Archbishop, they have, with the exception of some men, been sent back to their homes. The charge brought by the Turkish authorities against the deported Bulgarians was that they were connected with persons known to be engaged in brigandage or seditious proceedings against the Government; and it was stated that their removal from their homes was a temporary measure of police taken in the interest of public security.

NAVY—SEAMEN IN HER MAJESTY'S FLEET.

MR. R. W. DUFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether there is any truth in the rumoured large reduction of seamen in Her Majesty's Fleet?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, I beg to assure my hon. Friend that with regard to the number of seamen of Her Majesty's Fleet, the present Board propose to leave matters as they have found them. My hon. Friend well knows that under the continuous service system the only method of increasing and reducing the number of the seamen is to increase and reduce the entries of boys. When moving the Estimates in March last year, the late First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. W. H. Smith), who had considered the question maturely and minutely, stated that he had arrived at a definite conclusion that 2,200 was the number of boys whom it would be necessary to enter, one year with another, in order to supply the waste of the Navy and keep the force of blue-jackets up to their proper proportion. That number accordingly appears for the first time on the Estimates introduced last March by the right hon. Gentleman. The present Board of Admiralty are of opinion that in so vital a matter as the manning of our Navy frequent or hasty changes of system are highly undesirable; and they do not propose to make any change in either direction in the policy of the right hon. Member for Westminster and his Colleagues on this most important matter, unless the careful and continuous observation which we are bestowing on the variations of numbers in the Navy should prove that policy to have been founded on a miscalculation.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—AGRICULTURE IN VILLAGE SCHOOLS.

MR. FIRTH asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been directed to the desirability of teaching the rudiments of Agriculture in village schools; and, if so, whether they are prepared to insert this as an additional special subject in the Code about to be introduced, or otherwise to offer facilities for such teaching?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, in reply to my hon. Friend, I beg to state that the elements of agriculture may be taught as a class-subject under the new provisions of Article 19 C. of the Code, which have recently come into operation. As there has been some difficulty, owing to the absence of suitable reading-books, I may add that Professor Tanner has just published a series which will be found very useful for this purpose.

STATE OF IRELAND—RETURN OF EVICTIONS.

Mr. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will have weekly returns of evictions and outrages in each county in Ireland laid upon the Table of the House? He should also like to ask, Whether the right hon. Gentleman would grant the Returns Nos. 6 and 8—namely, a Return, in continuation of Return No. 3, showing the number of offences other than agrarian reported to the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary between the 1st day of January, 1880, and the 30th day of November, 1880, and summarized by provinces and counties, as in Return No. 3; and a Return of the number of cases tried at the last Winter Assizes in Waterford, showing the nature of each, and the number of acquittals, convictions, and disagreements?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, with regard to the Question of the hon. Member, I shall be glad to lay on the Table monthly Returns of evictions. I cannot undertake to do so weekly, as I do not believe they would be so correct as monthly. I am glad the hon. Member has asked the other Question. As far as Return No. 8 is concerned, I have no objection to its production. With regard to the other Returns, I am very anxious that as much information should be given as can be; and before the hon. Member had asked his Question I had arranged for the presentation of two Returns on the same subject. One of them shows the number of outrages in each county in Ireland in the year 1880; offences against personal property and the public peace being distinguished. I shall also be glad to present a summary of the new agrarian crimes committed in Ireland in the year 1880, showing the number of cases in which offenders were convicted, made amenable, but not convicted, and in which they were neither made amenable nor convicted. No doubt, the object of the hon. Member is the same as my own—to compare the results of agrarian outrages with other offences. As to the other Return which the hon. Member has asked for, of the outrages since 1844, it would take a long time to prepare, and the Constabulary are so desperately overworked at present that I could not have it by the time required.

Mr. GIBSON: With reference to the Return which the right hon. Gentleman has promised, referring to the cases tried at the Winter Assizes, I hope he will not restrict himself to those at Waterford, as the hon. Member for the City of Cork requests, but give us the benefit of the other Winter Assizes as well.

Mr. PARNELL: I shall have no objection to extend the Return as the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin requests. The reason why I asked for that particular Return was because at the Winter Assizes at Waterford the Crown made an application for the postponement of a trial for murder on the ground that it was impossible to get a jury to try it properly.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked what was the meaning of the term "made amenable" in the Returns?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, that was the Irish legal term for offences in connection with which somebody was charged.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE CAPE COLONY—DESPATCH OF ARMS.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any arms have been lately sent out to the Government of Cape Colony from the arsenals of this country?

Mr. CHILDERS: Sir, in reply to my hon. Friend, I have to state that no arms have been given to the Cape Colony for some time; but that during last year, on requisition through the Colonial Department, we have sold to the Cape Government, since the 2nd of October, 4,000 carbines, 1,000 revolvers, 1,000 swords, three mortars, and three howitzers. It is important that Colonial Governments should buy their arms through the War Office, to insure uniformity of pattern; but no arms have been given without payment to the Cape Government.

STATE OF IRELAND—DOMICILIARY VISITS.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If his attention has been called to a visit to a meeting of a Land League branch at Bruff; and if such domiciliary visits by the police are justified by any Law at present existing?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON), in reply, said, his attention had not been called to the circumstances. He should be able to answer the Question on Monday.

IRELAND—THE STATE TRIALS.

Mr. W. CORBET asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he is aware that difficulties have arisen in the production by the clerks of the peace for the counties of Armagh, Cork (East Riding), Cork (West Riding), Down, Fermanagh, Kerry, Kilkenny, Londonderry, Mayo, Monaghan, and Sligo, in Ireland, of the Returns of Eviction since 1844, required for the defence of the traversers in the present State trials; whether this is owing to the fact that certain clerks of the peace, having first written to the traversers' solicitors that they would produce the Return on payment of a fair remuneration for their trouble, have since stated that "circumstances prevented their doing so," alleging that the Treasury required a fee of 1*s.* 6*d.* for particulars of each ejectment (under 40 and 41 Vic. c. 56, and Order of 19th February 1878), which fee, if exacted on each ejectment, would amount to many thousands of pounds; and, whether the Treasury will insist on the clerks of the peace breaking off their original engagement to supply the Return for a lump sum?

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH: Sir, the facts of the case are these. The traversers have subpœnaed the clerks of the peace of the respective counties to produce in Court all their office books which contain ejectment decrees from the 1st of January, 1844. They have further requested to be furnished with a list of the several ejectments or decrees from the same date. The application for the lists is practically a request for a search as regards every ejectment or decree contained in the lists, and for each search there is a statutable fee of 1*s.* 6*d.* In those counties in which the offices of Clerk of the Crown and clerk of the peace are united these fees are payable into the Exchequer. In such cases the Clerk of the Crown and peace have been authorized to forego the fees and to furnish the lists required on payment of the actual clerical cost of making them only. In those counties in which the offices of Clerk of the Crown and clerk of the peace are not united the fees are payable under Act of Parliament and are the property of the clerks of the peace, and the Treasury has nothing to do with them.

PREVENTION OF FLOODS—LEGISLATION.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the President of the Local Government Board, If he can state whether the Bill for the Prevention of Floods will be introduced in the House of Lords, and when it will be brought forward?

MR. DODSON: Sir, in order to facilitate the progress of the Bill, I have arranged with Earl Granville that it shall be introduced in the House of Lords. I hope that it will be ready for presentation almost immediately.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—THE MAGISTRATES.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If any of the justices of the peace who have organized counter-meetings to those of the Land League were the same persons who swore informations representing that such demonstrations and counter-demonstrations were dangerous to the public peace; or, if the said magistrates, or any of them, were the same persons who dispersed the meetings of the Land League on the ground of the danger to the public peace?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had already pointed out that in the present circumstances it would be highly inexpedient to give any clue to the names of persons who had sworn informations in Ireland. He might state that to the best of his knowledge—in fact, he might say he was sure—no magistrate had sworn an information who had organized counter-demonstrations.

Subsequently,

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR begged to give Notice that on Monday he should ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland the following Question:—Whether the information representing the Land

League proceedings as dangerous to the public peace in consequence of counter-demonstrations were sworn before or taken before any of the magistrates engaged in organizing these demonstrations; and whether in any case the persons who swore such information were agents, bailiffs, or in any other way the employés of such magistrates?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I may state that I shall not be able to answer that Question, as questions of that kind have a tendency to give a clue to the identity of individuals.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: In consequence of the Answer of the right hon. Gentleman, I shall put the Question on the Paper; and in case the right hon. Gentleman should refuse to answer it, I shall call the attention of the House to the fact that I do not ask for the name, but merely to ascertain the identity of the magistrates, and that, therefore, the only reason, as I understand, he can have is—[" Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER was understood to say that the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman was not a matter for debate; the hon. Gentleman was out of Order.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: The right hon. Gentleman has stated that he will not answer the Question which I, under the privileges of this House, have a right to put in this House; and I beg, therefore, in reply to the observation, to state as I have not asked for the names of the magistrates or anything which would give a clue to their identity, his only reason for refusing to answer the Question—[" Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is out of Order.

STATE OF IRELAND — THE LAND LEAGUE — ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE.

The O'DONOGHUE asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If his attention has been drawn to the conduct of Mr. Morphy, Local Crown Prosecutor, now engaged in carrying on the proceedings against the arrested members of the Land League at Tralee, who is reported, on a statement being made by Mr. Jonathan Walpole, a witness, that he had been forced to join the Land League by Mr. Morphy, to have jumped up and declared that before dinner he, Mr. Morphy, would swear an information for perjury against Mr. Walpole; whether Mr. Morphy did not actually do so; and, if so, whether the honourable and learned gentleman will advise Mr. Morphy in future to exhibit less warmth? With the permission of the House, he wished to read a telegram he had received from the solicitor for the defence. It says—" Mr. Morphy has actually sworn an information"—[" Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: If the telegram is necessary in order to make the Question plain, the hon. Member would be in Order; but, as it is, the Question is quite plain, and therefore the telegram is not necessary.

The O'DONOGHUE: The telegram has an important bearing on the Question, and, if I may be allowed, I will read it. It is as follows:—

> "Mr. Morphy has actually sworn information and issued a summons against Mr. Walpole for perjury for next ordinary petty sessions. It will be impossible for me to do my duty to my clients if the Crown Solicitor goes on intimidating witnesses; and the magistrate did not stop him, and refused to take note of my protest and my warnings not to proceed."

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: And, perhaps, I may, before an Answer is given, supplement this by a further Question, as a connection of Mr. Morphy's; and, in doing so, I will say that I derive my knowledge from the correspondent of *The Daily News*, and until I read it through I knew nothing of the case. I would ask the Solicitor General, in addition to the Question put, Whether Mr. Walpole did not, at the inquiry at Tralee, state on oath that he had been coerced by Mr. Morphy, the Crown Solicitor, to join the Land League; whether Mr. Morphy did not at once ask that his words might be taken down with the intention of taking steps to vindicate his character in a Court of Law; whether, in doing so, he exceeded his duty; and whether, if any warmth was exhibited, it was not natural and justifiable when his character as a professional gentleman and Government official was attacked and his personal honour impeached? I may add that from Mr. Morphy being designated as "local" solicitor instead of "Crown" solicitor, shows that the question is the action of the Land League, and not of the hon. Member for Tralee, who is Mr. Morphy's personal friend, and therefore well acquainted with the office he holds.

THE O'DONOGHUE: Perhaps I may be allowed to say a word in reply to the remarks of the hon. Baronet, as they contain an imputation. ["Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member from Tralee put his Question; the hon. Baronet the Member for the King's County interposed with another Question; and now the time has come for the Solicitor General for Ireland to give his Answer.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I am certainly in the hands of the House in this matter. My great inexperience of the Forms of this House makes me unable to say whether I should answer both these Questions together or not. I may say, however, that I think it is a very inconvenient course to make a statement as to an absent man under cover of a Question, as has been done in the present case. But in reference to the Question of the hon. Member for Tralee (The O'Donoghue), I have to say my attention has not been drawn to the matter, except by the Notice of this Question given yesterday, and also by a subsequent communication I have had from another hon. Member late last evening. Therefore, I am not in a position to state whether the facts are as reported. But the case is one at hearing before magistrates who are responsible for the control of their own proceedings before themselves in their own Courts. I must assure the hon. Gentleman that I have no authority to interfere with them in the discharge of their duty, or to advise the Crown Solicitor as to the manner in which he should conduct his case. But I have directed an inquiry, and, so far as I have the power, I will take any steps that may be necessary,

THE O'DONOGHUE: I may be allowed to say that I called attention to this before I received any information from Tralee.

INDIA—CONSPIRACY AT KOLAPORE.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Secretary of State for India, If he has received any official information as to the alleged conspiracy recently discovered at Kolapore?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: No, Sir, we have received no official information whatever as to the alleged conspiracy.

IRELAND—OUTBREAK OF FEVER.

MR. GRAY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, as President of the Irish Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the following paragraph in the "Times" of Tuesday, January 11th:—

> "Fever in Ireland and Dublin. Correspondent telegraphed last night a terrible outbreak of fever supposed to have been imported on foreign flax is reported at Tandragee. 109 persons are now prostrate and many deaths take place daily; 11 persons were buried to-day. There is great consternation and business is suspended in the town;"

and, whether he has any information on this subject?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I have telegraphed to the Local Government Board for information with regard to this matter. I am sorry to say there has been a bad outbreak of fever in this place; not, indeed, owing to the importation of foreign flax, as stated in the paragraph quoted, but owing to impurity in the water of a well in the town. As far as I can see the Local Government Board did all they could to check the epidemic; the well has been closed, a second medical officer has been appointed, and an Inspector from the Board is on the spot at present. I telegraphed to find the number of deaths, and find that up to that time there had been seven, and not eleven, as reported.

AFGHANISTAN (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—THE "DISASTER" AT MAIWAND.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, With reference to his reply to his question on the 12th August last, regarding the details of the recent disaster to British arms at Maiwand, near Candahar, on the 27th July, 1880—

> "That a searching inquiry ought to be made," . . . "in order that the experience gained may not be lost sight of" . . . "in the improvement of our existing Indian military system;"

whether such inquiry has been made; and, whether he can lay upon the Table of the House any papers on these points, besides those in Blue Book, No 3; and, if so, when he expects to be able to do so?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, subsequently to the Answer I gave on the 12th of August, some communications passed between the Government of India and myself on the subject of investigating the cause of the disaster alluded to; but these communications, being of a private and confidential character, could not be laid on the Table of the House. The general effect, however, was that I expressed the opinion that, after what appeared in the despatches from India, unless the Inquiry by the Government of India should enable them to form a judgment as to the conduct of the officers in question, it would be necessary to hold a court martial. No general Inquiry has been thought necessary, but two officers have been, or are being, tried by court martial. The question as to the organization of the Indian Army which arises in connection with these events is, no doubt, under the consideration of the Indian Government, with those wider questions which have been raised by the Report of the Army Commission; but no Papers have as yet been received on the subject which can be laid on the Table of the House.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN said, that in consequence of the incomplete answer he had received, he would return to the question at a later period of the Session.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE.

Mr. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the visiting committee of Tralee Gaol have assembled since the arrest and imprisonment on the 5th of January of several members of the Tralee Land League; and, if so, when; whether the cells in which they were first placed were without fires or any other means of warmth; whether, in accordance with the rules for local prisons in Ireland, sub-section 1, rule 22, the committee have permitted these prisoners to occupy a separate room or cell specially fitted for such prisoners, and furnished with suitable bedding and other articles in addition to or different from those furnished for ordinary cells; and, if so, when; whether they have been permitted to exercise with each other in accordance with sub-section 2, rule 22, which provides that untried prisoners shall be permitted to exercise with selected untried prisoners; and, if so, when they were first permitted to do so; whether they have been permitted to have at their own cost, in accordance with sub-section 3, rule 22, the use of private furniture and utensils suitable to their ordinary habits; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with sub-section 4, rule 22, they have been relieved from the performance of any unaccustomed tasks or offices; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with rule 23, the visiting committee have permitted the governor to modify the routine of the prison in regard to these prisoners, so as to dispense with practices which are clearly unnecessary in their cases; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with rule 24, the visiting committee have permitted these prisoners to have supplied to them books, newspapers, or other means of occupation other than those furnished by the prison, and whether such books and newspapers have been supplied; and, when first supplied; and, whether in accordance with rule 25, these prisoners have been permitted to supply their own food; and, if so, when was the permission given for the first time? He had put this Question on the Paper on Monday in order that the right hon. Gentleman might have time to answer it. If he was not prepared to answer it to-day, he proposed to postpone it.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was going to ask the hon. Member to postpone the Question, as he was not quite prepared to answer it. He could inform him, however, that he was aware that the Visiting Committee of Tralee Goal had assembled several times at Tralee Prison, and found that the prisoners were perfectly satisfied with their condition and treatment.

AFGHANISTAN (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—"ABANDONMENT" OF CANDAHAR.

Captain AYLMER asked the Secretary of State for India, If, before any steps are taken for the abandonment or surrender of Candahar, he will undertake that the House shall have an opportunity of discussing the matter; and if, in the mēantime, he will consent to lay upon the Table of the House any documents in the possession of the Government emanating from the Governor General in Council, from the individual members of Council, from Sir Frederick Roberts, and others, specially bearing on this subject?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I ought, perhaps, to take some exception to the language of the Question, and the manner in which the hon. and gallant Member speaks of the abandonment or surrender of Candahar. I ought, perhaps, to point out that Candahar was occupied by Her Majesty's troops as a military operation in the course of war, and has never been formally annexed by the British Government, and it is not, therefore, a proper description to say that there was any proposal to "surrender it." In the Papers which have been presented to Parliament, and will shortly be in the hands of hon. Members of the House, there will be found some Minutes from Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Frederick Roberts, which bear more or less directly on this subject, and I think, perhaps, the hon. and gallant Member had better wait till the information contained in these Papers has been obtained. It is not probable that any movement of the troops now at Candahar will be possible for some little time, and I trust it will be in the power of the House, if it thinks fit, to discuss the Papers laid on the Table without any great delay. I cannot, however, undertake that the movement of troops which may be considered necessary should be postponed in order to enable the discussion to take place in this House, and I think the hon. and gallant Member will probably be better able to form an opinion when the Papers are in his hands.

IRELAND—MR. DAVITT.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: With the permission of the House, I shall put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, of which I have given him private Notice, and which, on account of the peculiar circumstances of the present time, and the peculiar speeches delivered by the individual referred to in the Question, I think I am perfectly justified in asking — namely, Whether Mr. Michael Davitt is a convict at large on a ticket-of-leave; whether the attention of the Irish Government has been drawn to a speech delivered by Mr. Michael Davitt, at a meeting of the Land League, in Dublin, on Tuesday, the 4th of January, in which he stated that if the branch meetings of the Land League were prohibited by Proclamation, the only remedy which would then remain would inevitably be in the direction of illegal meetings and illegal action; whether the attention of the Irish Government has been drawn to a speech made by Mr. Michael Davitt, at Tralee, on the 8th of January, in which he stated, among other things, that the two men then sleeping in Tralee Gaol must be Representatives at a future time of the county of Kerry; whether these two men alluded to are not in gaol at the present moment on a charge of sedition; whether Mr. Michael Davitt did not make this speech at an assembly in Tralee in spite of the Proclamation of the Goverement prohibiting the Land League meeting at or near Tralee; and whether Mr. Michael Davitt has since his release on a ticket-of-leave made several speeches at public meetings in Ireland of a distinctly seditious character; and whether, in view of the critical condition of Ireland, the Government do not intend to cancel Mr. Michael Davitt's ticket-of-leave?

MR. PARNELL: Mr. Speaker, before the right hon. Gentleman answers that Question, I would, with your permission, ask him to answer another one in reference to Mr. Michael Davitt's speech. I would ask him, Whether he is aware that Mr. Michael Davitt, immediately upon his return from America, made a speech, in which he deprecated strongly the commission of all outrages and murder, and pointed out that nothing so tended to alienate the public opinion of the world from the cause of the Irish tenant farmers as any outrages or murder as the accompaniment of agitation; and whether Mr. Davitt has himself in other speeches also made the same references and allusions? And I would also ask the noble Lord who has just put the Question, Whether Mr. Michael Davitt was not a convict on ticket-of-leave during the time when the noble Lord's father was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland? ["Order, order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in Order in putting a Question of that character.

Mr. CALLAN: Before the Question is answered, I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, Is it not a course to be deprecated that in this House Questions should be asked on controversial matters into which heat is likely to be imported, and which will give rise to a discussion, without submitting such Questions to you, as is the usual form, by placing it on the Notice Paper of the House?

Mr. PARNELL: As I am not in Order in addressing my Question to the noble Lord, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether Mr. Michael Davitt was not a convict at large on ticket-of-leave during the time when the late Government was in Office, and when the father of the noble Lord was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and whether any step was taken by the Irish Government to revoke the ticket-of-leave; and I would also ask the Chief Secretary, whether the offence for which Mr. Michael Davitt was convicted was not a political offence, and whether he has not sufficiently expatiated that offence by suffering 11 years' penal servitude?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, in answer to the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan), which was not so much a Question as a suggestion, I wish the course to which he referred was always carried out, as it would save a good deal of trouble. As to the Question itself, it is true that Mr. Davitt is a convict at large on a ticket-of-leave. The ticket-of-leave was granted by the late Government. The offence for which he was convicted was treason-felony, and not unnaturally the attention of the Government has been drawn to the speeches which Mr. Davitt made since his return to Ireland. I cannot go through all these speeches that either the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock or the hon. Member for the City of Cork alluded to. I can only state that the Irish Government have thought it their duty to carefully watch the proceedings of Mr. Davitt, and if his proceedings oblige them to further action they will unhesitatingly take it. But it must be remembered that the ticket-of-leave was granted npon certain conditions, which conditions were on the back of the ticket. I will not say absolutely that it it is not legally in the power of the Government in the name of Her Majesty to cancel that ticket; but I believe it would be contrary to all precedent to cancel it unless the conditions were broken, and I am not aware that any of the conditions have been broken. With regard to the speeches alluded to by the noble Lord, I think that probably the first is reported to have been made at the Land League meeting. Whether it was actually made or not I cannot tell, because we have no legal evidence of the report of the Land League meetings. With regard to the second speech, I leave it to Mr. Davitt and his friends to say whether it was good taste; but I do not know that there was anything seditious in it. The two gentlemen that were brought before the people of Kerry were certainly in gaol on a charge of sedition, but they had not not been proved guilty of sedition, and I do not know that there was anything seditious in urging that they should be returned as Members of Parliament for Kerry. It is quite true, I think, if the charge was proved, that the men of Kerry would not think for a moment of returning them. There can be no doubt than any individual who has so far offended against the laws of the country as to be convicted of treason-felony, must have, and must be expected to have, his conduct very carefully watched by the authorities.

Colonel MAKINS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he would lay upon the Table of the House a copy of Mr. Davitt's ticket-of-leave, together with the conditions endorsed on it?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: My right hon. and learned Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, no doubt, will be happy to show the hon. and gallant Member a facsimile of the ticket.

STATE OF IRELAND—ALLEGED ANARCHY.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I beg to give Notice, that, on Monday next, I shall ask the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock, Whether he was correctly reported in a speech which he made at Woodstock, in which he stated that there had never been since 1798, such scenes of anarchy and outrage in Ireland as during the last twelve months; what foundation he had for that gigantic calumny against the Irish people; and whether, in his opinion—["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: In putting the Question, the hon. Gentleman would be committing an irregularity, because he would be referring to a past debate in this House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I assure you, Sir, you misapprehend me—["Order, order!"]—the speech to which I allude was not made in this House. I wish to ask, Whether the expression of such an unfounded and lying calumny against the Irish people is not calculated to estrange the feelings of the two countries, and, therefore, to promote the cause of sedition?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I shall answer the Question at once. I did say that such scenes of anarchy and outrage in Ireland have not, in my knowledge, been equalled since 1798; and I also wish to say that I take my information from the public Press.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∽0∽—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SIXTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

DR. COMMINS said, that when he was compelled to suspend his remarks at the previous Sitting of the House, he was about to point out that the reasons which had been assigned for the suspension of the Constitution in Ireland were entirely insufficient—that they were insufficient to warrant such a change in the law as would amount to an abrogation of the rights of personal liberty in Ireland. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India seemed to think that because the Irish Judges went beyond the bounds of their duty, because they delivered political harangues from the Bench, because, instead of confining themselves to the depositions returned by the magistrates, they referred to newspaper reports and unauthenticated gossip, that, therefore, the strong opinions they expressed should justify the House to suspend the Constitution of the country. Those political harangues served more to throw light upon the character of judicial appointments in Ireland than to throw light upon the state of the country; and if inquiry were made into the causes which produced disturbance in Ireland, it would be found that it was one of the causes which made the people distrust the administration of the law, it made them distrust the purity of the Bench, and it made them distrust the intentions of the Government and the will of the House to do justice to Ireland. The next reason urged by the noble Lord and almost every speaker in support of the anticipated coercion was founded on the Police Returns. On this point, he could only say that if the reason adduced from the anomalous character of the Irish Bench was a bad one, that adduced from, or based upon, the Police Returns was even worse. He was rather astonished at a paragraph in the papers that morning in reference to Irish "outrages," for that word was now extensively used to inflame the public opinion of England, and to urge on the Government in its headlong and unfortunate career to pass Coercive Laws for Ireland, He was astonished to find by the papers that morning that the Return of "outrages" for this year amounted to 5,609. By the Return of agrarian crimes, which he had three days ago—and he would prove that it included every offence in the Calendar—it appeared that the number was 1,718; and hence his astonishment to find, by the Return submitted the previous day, that the number amounted to 5,609. He referred to that for the purpose of showing that a worse reason could not be given for the suspension of the Constitution in Ireland, and a more thorough condemnation of the accuracy of the Police Returns. The offences more particularly noticeable in the Return referred to were those of sending threatening letters and posting threatening notices, and he found in page 28 that the whole number of offences under that head was 750; but, incredible almost to say, if he had not the document in his hand, on the previous page the total number had been made up, and the number had actually been increased by 1,000. He had a good deal of experience of falsification of evidence; but he confessed that in any Court in the Kingdom, much less in the High Court of the Realm, had he ever heard of such an attempt being made to palm off a false statement to deceive public opinion in England, and to throw odium and calumny upon the people of Ireland. To show that it was not a mere clerical error, this 1,000 had been taken into account in addition to the figures. And it was by this falsification and by this fictitious addition of numbers that the demand for coercion in Ireland was supported by those acting under Her Majesty's Government. But, even supposing the falsified Returns to be accurate, how did crime in Ireland compare with crime in England and Scotland? He was not able to compare the Returns for the Three Kingdoms, as far as last year was concerned; but he could put alongside the Irish Returns the figures as far as they related to England and Scotland in previous years. [The hon. and learned Member then proceeded with this comparison, drawing from it the conclusion that the Returns of crime committed in England and Scotland showed that very much less crime prevailed in Ireland.] Dr. Neilson Hancock, a very high authority, had, in his official Returns, himself instituted the comparison. He stated the number of offences, punishable on conviction, committed in Ireland in the year 1879 as 3,842, or about 300 more than the number mentioned in the Return laid upon the Table. Whether, in the Return before the House, the number had been reduced for the purpose of contrasting with the Return for last year, he could not say. The fact, however, as stated by Dr. Hancock, was that, comparing that number—3,842—with the number of indictable offences committed in England and Scotland in the same year, and making the necessary allowance for difference of population, the number of crimes committed in Ireland was less for the year by 933 than those committed in England, and by 2,645 than those committed in Scotland. The excess of crime in England and Scotland over that in Ireland, even with the 1,000 added for threatening letters, would, he believed, be found to be greater on a comparison of the Returns for last year. Dr. Hancock gave some instances from which might be gathered the manner in which crimes—or, as they were termed, outrages—were manufactured. Turning to the Returns for the year 1869—and, no doubt, the same facts would be found to apply as well to 1879 and 1880—he pointed out that a party of 20 men visited 30 houses in Mayo and swore the tenants on a book not to pay more as their rent than the Government valuation, now said to be a crime hitherto unknown, and in each case levied contributions. These were recorded as 60 offences, the 30 cases being doubled. Again, in 1870, two threatening notices were posted on the doors of the houses of poor persons, and the record stated that as 22 offences. Two offences were, thereby, magnified into 82.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER explained that a typographical error had been made in the Return to which the hon. and learned Member alluded. In the last page of it, referring to the threatening letters, the total was put down at 750, whereas it should have been 1,750. Anyone looking over the column would see that the error required to be corrected in order to make up 5,609. It was obvious there was a typographical error, although the Return almost corrected itself.

Dr. COMMINS, while accepting correction, was compelled to add that comparisons had already been made on the assumption that the Return was accurate. But, making the correction, the proportion of crime for Ireland was less than it was for either England or Scotland; and, apart from such errors, what explanation was to be given of two offences being made to count as 82? The only inference must be that the Returns were got up in order to inflame public opinion, and to assist the Government in passing coercive legislation. He only objected to the Returns as grounds for suspending the Constitution. He must protest, with all the earnestness of which he was capable, against the charge that he or his Friends had encouraged crime or failed to repudiate the commission of crime. It was an unfair argument, and altogether a new doctrine, that men were to be deemed guilty of complicity in crimes which they did not repudiate. The Irish Members did not feel it necessary to accuse themselves by excusing themselves in respect of any crime. Over and over again it had been urged that those who committed crime were only playing the game of the coercionists and of the panic-mongers of the Press, who seemed to gloat with detail over the reported outrages; and he was sorry to see the spirit even in the speech of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India. Who did he mean when he gave his domineering look across the House, and talked of miscreants in Ireland? If that was meant for hon. Members who sat on that side of the House, why did the noble Lord not have the courage and the manliness to say so? He repudiated the statement, and flung back the term "miscreant" in his teeth. If he meant others, let him say so, find them out, and punish them, for the Irish Members did not wish to defend miscreants. In addressing meetings in Ireland he had warned his hearers against committing crimes, because by so doing they would give strength to the enemy—little thinking at the time that the enemy would be found on the Treasury Bench. He did everything to dissuade the people from crime, and he ventured to say that not one single word of that went into the Police Reports. No; they were not sent to take speeches of that character; they were sent to make Reports which could be used to support the charge of conspiracy. From the language used with reference to the alleged state of anarchy in Ireland, the intelligent foreigner would suppose that things were as bad as they were in Paris at the time of the Commune; but there appeared to be an almost total absence of some of the crimes that were supposed to be associated with anarchy. There had been eight cases of homicide in a year, when one would expect to find that there had been eight a-day or eight a-week; and of attempts of murder there was not one. There was not a single case of "conspiracy to kill or murder." To take another offence very likely to occur in a state of anarchy, the "plundering of provisions," notwithstanding the deplorable state of the country, no single instance was given. There was no case of "levying contributions," "appearing in arms," or "combinations for illegal purposes." As to these offences this Return was a perfect blank. As to what were called "outrages and offences," he wanted to know what proof there was that they were "offences" at all? As to "threatening letters," which had been so much adverted to on the Treasury Bench, what was to hinder a man who did not wish to pay his rent from writing a threatening letter to himself, going to his landlord, and saying he dare not pay because he had received a threatening letter? In this Return there was a heading for "incendiary fires;" but no indication was given as to the value of the property destroyed. He believed that one case referred to was the burning of what was called in Ireland "a cock of turf." Little boys with lúcifers did strange things, and he would like to know what was the value of that plot of turf? "Malicious injuries to property," in this Return, numbered 506; but he believed them to be nearly all fictitious, or of the most trifling character. One of these injuries, he understood, was caused by some little boys pulling the coping-stone off a bridge in Roscommon, the damage done being about 6*d.* That was reported as an outrage; and the local Land League, in order to rebut the charge brought against them in respect to it, sent a man with a hod of mortar to repair it. One of the constant arguments for coercion was derived from the reports in the newspapers; but reports from anonymous persons were quite unreliable. As a set-off to these anonymous reports, he would call attention to a fact stated that morning, that at a meeting of the Land League yesterday a subscription of £120 to the Defence Fund was presented from a commercial traveller named M'Gough, who bore testimony to the efficiency of the Land League, and stated that he had been on the road for 30 years, and never knew the country to be in a better state. The subscriptions represented 120 commercial houses doing business in Ireland to the amount of £12,000,000. That was evidence which showed that capital was not being frightened from Ireland. It was stated in *The Daily Telegraph* of that day that 700 magistrates had signed a Circular calling upon the Chief Secretary for Ireland to bring up some measure of coercion. That was not a very convincing argument for coercion. Attention had already been called in the House to the partizan character of the Irish magistracy, who were drawn entirely from the landlord class, and who history showed to be entirely out of sympathy with the people amongst whom they lived, for whom they were supposed to administer justice. When had 700 magistrates been induced to band together to advocate any reform or any measure for the amelioration of the condition of the Irish people? When famine was stalking abroad, was there a Circular from 700 magistrates, or from one magistrate, calling attention to the condition of their own tenantry? He would like to know what amount of subscriptions had these gentlemen given to the Famine Funds which saved the people from starvation? Their temper and the amount of credence which ought to be given to their assertions might be judged from what had occurred at Tralee as late as yesterday, according to telegrams in the newspapers of that morning. A charge was made against men for holding an illegal court; and one of the witnesses who had been summoned, being asked whether he had not been intimidated into joining the Land League, said he had not.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) appealed to the hon. and learned Gentleman whether it was consistent with what he thought proper as a lawyer to refer to a case still pending?

MR. BIGGAR said, he had heard the hon. and learned Gentleman himself, a night or two ago, refer to speeches given in evidence in a case pending in Ireland.

DR. COMMINS quite recognized the propriety of not referring to a pending case; but the matter in question was not so much a pending case as a preliminary investigation. He was only referring to a newspaper report, which was public property; and in 20 years' experience in the Courts of this country he had never heard of such a case. It was stated that the prosecuting counsel, being disappointed in getting the evidence he wanted, directly charged the witness with perjury, and the magistrate actually issued a summons for perjury on the spot. They had heard a great deal about intimidation, and they were told the magistrates had not the power to bring witnesses forward. But the fact was, the magistrate might issue a summons to anyone to give evidence, put him in the witness-box, and commit him to prison and let him rot there if he refused to give testimony or prevaricated in any way. He did not know what more right hon. Gentlemen wanted, unless they would introduce what in the Middle Ages was called "the question;" or, in other words, the rack, to compel people to give evidence. The epistle of one Archbishop had been referred to; but it should be remembered that there were three other Archbishops and many Bishops in Ireland, and that they pointed out that it was by a better adjustment of the relations of the people to the land that murders and agrarian outrages could be prevented. Then private letters were read describing the state of the country; but the names of the writers were not given. They were told, for instance, that a priest had been "Boycotted," and his dues reduced to 1*s*., but that the priest declined to give his name, for fear of being known. And yet, as he had been "Boycotted," his name must have been known to everyone in the district. However, even supposing that a good many of the statements made were correct, what reason was there for attributing the present state of the country to the action of the Land League? The truth was that the League, so far from being the cause of outrages, had done more to prevent them than either the Chief Secretary's Circular or the efforts of the magistrates; and the League had constantly advised the Irish people to abstain from all kinds of violence as being extremely injurious to their interests, and prejudicing the ends the League had in view. But then, it was argued, that the cessation of outrage was due to a triumphant and unopposed system of terrorism, and that an additional reason was thereby afforded for the suppression of the Land League. He did not know how the Land League could legally be put down. Its members did nothing illegal, but taught, in common with all political economists, that the insane competition for land caused the present unsatisfactory relations between landlord and tenant, and, as a consequence, produced agrarian crime. Speeches to that effect were, of course, not unlawful. He admitted that words had now and then been said that were not strictly defensible; but that had happened in the course of every agitation, and a wise Government would have treated such language as extravagant rather than criminal. It was a terrible injustice to the freedom of the Irish people that magistrates should be allowed to use force to disperse a peaceable public meeting. One magistrate had openly stated that he was prepared, if necessary, to disperse a meeting by the use of the rifle and the bayonet. In such action this functionary would be acting illegally, and if bloodshed resulted he would be guilty of murder. Magistrates had the power to cause the Riot Act to be read if they anticipated that there would be any serious disturbance at a meeting; but in superseding that protection to individuals which the Riot Act afforded magistrates would be acting illegally, and these magistrates were the functionaries whom the Government proposed to arm with additional powers—men who had shown their incompetency to hold even the power they possessed at present. It was said that coercion was necessary, and that something like the Peace Preservation Act would be one of the proposed enactments. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had, however, admitted that that Act would have been powerless to prevent the outrages which had occurred; and, as it had been ineffectual in the past, it would be so, if renewed, in the future. Even if the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act were added to it, the power of arbitrary arrest would not prevent one of the outrages complained of. The existing laws were sufficient to maintain law and order. A policeman could arrest any man for felony if he had reasonable grounds for suspicion; but then he would have to specify the precise charge against the prisoner. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act would enable the police to fill the gaols of Ireland with suspected persons, 99 out of 100 of whom were innocent. He quite admitted that the Land League could be put down, as nothing would be easier, when the Habeas Corpus Act had been suspended, than to arrest every member of the committee and every person who was known to have taken part in the proceedings of the League. But the arrest of hundreds of people who had committed no criminal offence would not remove the causes of crime; and all the conditions which produced the present deplorable state of the country would remain in full force. There would likewise exist an intolerable sense of wrong, for every man who had been arrested would naturally feel indignant at the injustice perpetrated in his own case. The increase in the number of offences was easily explained. It was directly traceable to the bad crops of 1877-8-9, and it would be found that the number of evictions increased proportionately with the misery of the people. In 1877 the evictions numbered 2,005; in 1878, 2,571; and in 1879, 3,526. In the face of these figures, could it be asserted for one moment that evictions had nothing to do with the increase of crime? If the number of evictions was reduced in 1880, it was simply because the spirit of the people had been aroused to resistance. But the figures he had quoted did not represent the full measure of the misery of the Irish population. There were evictions by magistrates' warrants to the number, in 1878, of 11,160, and in 1879, of 14,868. The turning out of poor people by magistrates' warrants was not technically termed eviction; but it really amounted to eviction of the most miserable and deplorable kind. Previous to 1880 there had been comparative quiet in Ireland, because the people, having given up all hope from the Government then in Office, looked forward with hope and expectation to the reins of power falling into the hands of one who had done something, and had shown a wish to do more, towards the amelioration of their condition. They had, however, been bitterly and grievously disappointed, for they had found that the Government had neither the power nor the will to carry out even microscopic measures of justice. It was no wonder, then, that they should express their disappointment so strongly that their enemies accused them of disloyalty. Discontented they were; discontent might be fanned into disaffection, disaffection into disloyalty, disloyalty into insurrection. The Government, by their intention of employing coercion, had entered on this downward course. This great Empire had lasted a long time, but it was not in human things to last for ever; and it was possible that at length the British Empire might be dismembered. Upon the heads of those who brought about that dismemberment by the refusal to do justice to Ireland would the blame lie. Give the people justice, and they would be orderly and contented; give them security, and they would be industrious and thriving; give them protection, and they would be peaceable and law-abiding. But, in adopting coercion, this country would have advanced one step further upon that downward course of which no one could foretell the end.

Mr. P. J. SMYTH said, it was not his intention to prolong this painful debate; but he would have contented himself by giving a silent vote on the Amendment, if the speech of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India on Tuesday night and a statement of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had not afforded some ground for hoping that the Land Bill would be of a more liberal character than that indicated in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. He did not say that it was altogether impossible to frame a useful measure by simply amending the Land Act of 1870; but experience told the House that it was better and cheaper in the end to build anew from the foundations than to attempt to prop and patch up a crumbling structure. England's legislation for Ireland, not alone with reference to land, but also almost every subject, had failed; because, however well-intended, it did not take into account the sentiments and traditions of the people, who for 700 years had not been English in thought and sentiment. For example, the principle of the "three F's" was not of modern invention. It had the sanction of an ancient Irish custom; and unless fixity of tenure, free sale, and fair rent were accorded the people would not be satisfied, nor would the country be pacified. The "Bright Clauses" of the Land Act might be so extended as to give needful facilities to tenants to acquire perpetuities; but he regretted that the Royal Speech was silent on the subject of waste lands—an important branch of the Land Question. He ventured also to suggest that a Land Bill would not be complete which overlooked the condition of the agricultural labourers. It was scarcely possible, he thought, to settle the Land Question by the adoption of any particular scheme dealing with a branch of the subject only. Several plans had been suggested, and some of them by bodies of gentlemen entitled to speak with a certain degree of authority. The Government could not allege that in that matter they had been left without advice and assistance from Ireland. It ought to be borne in mind, in the division which would soon take place, that the present agitation differed from all former ones in this—that it was purely social. Whether as regarded its means or its ends, it stood alone without a precedent in Irish history. He did not say that by way of reproach. It might be a merit, or it might be a demerit; but it was a fact, from which he drew the conclusion that, if met by a strong Land Act, and not by any means by a Coercion Act, strong or weak, it would pass away like one of those storms occasionally sent us from the other side of the Atlantic. Where discontent sprang from admitted grievances, the first duty of a Government was to remove the grievances. Whatever might be the immediate inciting causes to the discontent, the House might rest assured that it was the natural and inevitable outcome of a conspicuous act of coercion and spoliation perpetrated 80 years ago. And, with the feelings which he entertained regarding that transaction, he could scarcely conceive of a state of circumstances which would induce him to recognize a moral right in that House to pass a Coercive Law against his country.

Mr. W. CORBET rose to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City, and craved the indulgence of the House while he very briefly stated his reasons for doing so. In speaking of Ireland he meant the agricultural classes; because, since, unhappily, the manufacturing industries of Ireland were deliberately destroyed by English legislation, agriculture was the only substantial industry left to the country. The Irish people now wanted security for their natural rights in the soil—security that they should no longer be required to toil, a large proportion of them in nakedness, hunger, and misery, for the exclusive benefit of the landed class; security that they might be able to earn, he was going to say, their daily bread, but, remembering the description given the other evening of the humbler classes in Ireland by the hon. Member for County Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry), he would say their daily dole of Indian meal. They did not require to be coerced by bayonets or by buckshot. Session after Session Ireland had been conspicuous by its absence from Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, or, if it was referred to at all, the reference was of the briefest character. In the present Speech from the Throne it was conspicuous by its presence, occupying about one-half of that document. The prominence given to Ireland on this occasion was, however, not a subject for congratulation. As long as Irishmen had been content to bear their wrongs in patient silence, England left them to struggle along as best they could; but when they made their voice heard, and cried out complaining of the wretched condition to which, after 700 years of English connection, they had been brought by landlord greed and English misgovernment, and demanded legal redress at the hands of the British Parliament, attention was excited, their cry was heard. But how was it responded to? The people asked for bread, and the Government gave them a stone. They demanded justice; and now, as heretofore, with the most powerful Liberal Government England had ever seen in Office, coercion was their doom. He would point out the extraordinary fusion they had seen taking place between the opposite sides of the House—the extraordinary spectacle of the lion of English Liberalism, as represented by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India, lying down with the mild and gentle lamb—the pet lamb, he might say—of Toryism, impersonated by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill). If he spoke strongly in his own words he might be regarded as being prejudiced in favour of his own country; and he should, therefore, have recourse to the language of one who had never been regarded as a friend to Ireland. In a recent number of *The Fortnightly Review* an article appeared from the pen of Mr. Froude, in which was written—

> "Seven hundred years have now passed since Henry II. attached Ireland to the English Crown. For all these years successive English Administrations have pretended to govern there, and as a result we saw there the miserable Irish people sending their hat round the globe to beg sixpences 'for God's sake' to save them from starving. The Irish soil, if decently cultivated, would feed twice the population of that unhappy country."

He held that it was a disgrace, not only to the English Government, but to the people of England, that in the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century—after 700 years, during which Ireland had been held in subjection—an anti-Irish English writer should thus feel bound to express himself respecting the present condition of Ireland. Coercion had been practised with a vengeance, and a long catalogue of Coercion Acts had already been cited to the House. It was, therefore, unnecessary for him to enumerate the various massacres which had been perpetrated in Ireland under the British flag. One typical instance he would, however, quote from the same authority—

> "Tens of thousands of men were killed, and tens of thousands of women and children crawled into the woods, and perished of hunger. So frightful was the desolation that it was said the lowing of a cow or the whistle of a ploughboy was not to be heard from Waterford to Dingle."

He thought, therefore, that it would be plain to the House that where coercion of such a decided character as that had failed to win the good will and affection of the Irish people, it was unstatesmanlike to go back again to it now. But Parliament had been misled by false information, which came to them from tainted sources; and the Government had now, as a last resource, been tempted to try the measures recommended by the author of *The English in Ireland.* He had said—"As soon as authority has been properly asserted the Land Laws might then be dispassionately revised." He thought that was as good an instance as could possibly be devised of putting the cart before the horse. Coercion had never succeeded against Irishmen, and never would succeed. Another writer on the subject took a more merciful view. The Rev. Malcolm M'Coll, in describing the state of things, said—

> "Seven centuries have passed away since England took possession of Ireland, and yet to-day the Irish question is still the question of the hour in our domestic policy; it still distracts the relations of political Parties, it still baffles the calculations of politicians, and threatens to impair the popularity and the reputation of statesmen."

The fact was, that a great though peaceful agitation had been carried on; and he challenged the Government to specify a single authentic instance of violent outrage in connection with the Land League meetings. Hundreds of thousands of people had assembled in public meetings, and there had not been as much row as might be looked for on a racecourse in England. The Government had been besought to settle the Land Question, and to protect the tenantry from the oppression of their landlords, by an agitation in which the people had made themselves heard and felt in the only way open to them. The Government said—"Yes; we will bring in a Bill, we will give you some relief, but we will not tell you what it is; we must first coerce you, not into peace, because the peace is not disturbed; not into obedience to the law, for—beyond this strike against unjust contracts, in which one of the contracting parties, the tenant farmer, has been powerless to defend himself against the unjust and unfair exactions of the other—the law has not been broken; but we must coerce you into silence." He denied that the agrarian outrages of the past year exceeded ordinary years. Of course, he omitted bogus "outrages" put into the Returns to swell the catalogue. In an able work just printed by a gifted authoress, the "The Nun of Kenmare," whose heart beat warmly for Ireland, he found a large number of cases in which reported outrages had been refuted and explained. In one, a Mr. Barry wrote to contradict a statement that an outrage had been committed on him, and said the only foundation he could find was that an enterprizing pig had made a determined raid on a henhouse. He hoped that pig would be coerced. So much, then, for the manufacture of outrages. He wished the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had been present, as he did not know how far in his absence it would be proper to make an appeal to him. But he would remind him of a speech which he delivered in this House some 13 years ago. It was on a similar occasion to the present, when the state of Ireland was under consideration, and the right hon. Gentleman then said—

> "Many sources of error have been pointed out both from this and the other side of the House; but if I am right there is one source of error which exists more widely and penetrates more deeply even than these, which is that Her Majesty's Government have failed to realize, in any degree at all approaching to truth, the grave, and I would say the solemn fact, which is that we have reached a crisis in the history of Ireland. Ireland has an account opened with this country, and she asks—nay, she expects—that it shall be settled. Ireland has a controversy with this country which has endured through centuries, mitigated, as it has been from time to time, by the removal of one cause of heartburning and dissension; but, unfortunately, enough still remains to be done."

Now, he himself adopted the language of the right hon. Gentleman; because it would be impossible to describe the situation of Ireland more truly or more forcibly than the right hon. Gentleman had done. He would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman not to listen to the evil suggestions of the hereditary enemies of Ireland, or of vacillating and timorous friends. He would ask him rather to listen only to the inspirations of his own genius, throwing aside all considerations except those of natural justice, and refuse to put his hand to assist in forging a new link in the long chain of oppression of a gallant and brave people. He would entreat him not to sully the only bright page that appeared on the Statute Book of England in the shape of legislation for Ireland, and which page had been written by his own hand.

MR. ANDERSON: I do not wish altogether to give a silent vote on this occasion, and my reasons are that I hate coercion just as much as any man; and during all my previous Parliamentary career, whenever a question of Irish coercion has come up before this House—and it has often come up—I have systematically voted and spoken against it. I wish to explain why I find myself forced to take a different course of action now; and I must say that the onus of it rests entirely on hon. Gentlemen opposite. I mean the Leaders of the Land League. We have heard this evening from the hon. and learned Member (Dr. Commins), a short while ago, a very glowing picture of the evils that may attend coercive measures in Ireland. I agree very much with what he said. I believe there are likely to be great evils from coercive measures in Ireland; but we are driven to a choice of evils. There is evil whichever way you look at it. At present, the evil we have to deal with is a state of lawlessness which is altogether unendurable in a civilized country. And whose fault is it that we are in that condition? It is entirely the fault of the Land League—["No, no!"]—of the Land League. The action of the Land League at first might have been of a kind to carry with it a great deal of sympathy from the Radical Party; but the Leaders of the Land League lost their opportunity.

What they might have done to gain our sympathy was, that they should have from the first denounced outrages. They should have endeavoured to put down lawlessness; but they failed in both of those respects. In the next place, they suggested utterly impracticable remedies — ["No!"] — well, we will come to that presently. And, lastly, they showed that they had ulterior objects in view, and that Land Law Reform was not the main object they had at heart. Well, we will take first their failure to denounce outrage. I do not mean to say that the Leaders of the Land League have ever preached assassination; that would have been a very gross way of conducting the Land League agitation. They did not do that; but what they did was, that either by absolute silence, or by the mildest of possible disclaimers, they undoubtedly encouraged it. Then, with regard to the impracticable remedies; they proposed the putting down of the landlords. You cannot put down landlords. You must have landords. The only possible idea, in putting down landlordism, is to put down one set of men and raise up another set; and it is quite on the cards that the new set you put up might turn out worse than the one you put down. Suppose you take the land from the present landlords, and give it to a new set of peasant proprietors; what is to prevent those peasant proprietors beginning to let their land the very next day? Then they become landlords, and the probability is that in process of time they become as tyrannical as the others. Coming next to the ulterior objects beyond Land Reform, the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) said he would not take off his coat for that. It is something altogether different from that for which he commenced his agitation. He said he did not take the trouble to oppose the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, because he knew the House of Lords were going to oppose it; otherwise, he would have opposed it himself. So he told them in Ireland. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power), in a speech at Clerkenwell not very long ago, said that no alien Government, however just it might be to Ireland, could ever rule Ireland, and, therefore, the Irish Nationalists would never rest while under an alien Government. Now, I think I have shown three reasons why the Irish Land League have failed to get the sympathy of the Radical Members—at least, these are the reasons why they have entirely failed to secure my assistance. I have said before that I hate coercion as much as anyone does, and I regret exceedingly that we are in the position now to require to have recourse to such an evil remedy; but I firmly believe that Her Majesty's Government hate coercion as much as I do. I believe that with them we shall have as mild coercion as they can possibly do with; and I trust that they will give us only that, and nothing more. What would be the effect if the Radical and other Members of the Liberal Party were to go against Her Majesty's Government, and refuse them support in a crisis of this kind? The only effect would be to drive them in the direction of seeking support more from their natural enemies on the Conservative side. That must be the effect of the Liberal Party not cordially and fully supporting Her Majesty's Government; and what would be the tendency of that result? It would be to give us greater coercion, and less remedy. Now, Sir, I want to have as little coercion as possible, and as much remedy as possible; and, therefore, I shall support Her Majesty's Government.

MR. BARRY said, that the remarks of the hon. Member (Mr. Anderson) on the question of peasant proprietorship were falsified by the experience of every European country. With regard to that portion of Her Majesty's Speech which referred to Ireland, it had been received in that country with the deepest feelings of disappointment; and if any reliance could be placed on the reports which reached them from the country constituencies, this feeling was largely shared by Liberal constituencies in England. The Irish constituencies had strong hopes for believing that a Liberal Government, in which there were men whose names were so much associated with measures of liberty and freedom, would never yield to the noisy clamour for coercion which had been set up by the landlord Press. The feeling had been ably expressed in a letter written by a life-long admirer of the Prime Minister—the Very Rev. Dr. Kavanagh, of Carlow College—who, writing a few days ago, expressed his confidence that the great, good, and just man who now guided the destinies of the Empire would never resort to the policy of Eldon and Wellington. He felt sorry for the feelings of his rev. friend when he found his high ideas were not to be realized; but that, instead, the Prime Minister had come down in hot haste to this House, and insisted that all their Business should be suspended in order that the Constitutional liberties of the Irish people should be taken away. He should support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City, because he believed there existed no sufficient reason for a coercive measure. A false and mistaken public opinion had been created in this country by the deliberate manufacture of lies in reference to lawlessness and outrage. For months past the Press of this country had teemed with abominable crimes and revolting outrages. They could not take up a newspaper without seeing a long list of agrarian offences. The other day he read with surprise and some alarm in a London paper a detailed and circumstantial account of an attack on a rev. friend of his in County Wexford. His friend, it was said, was driving from New Ross to Dungannon, when he was stopped on the road by four men with blackened faces. They presented revolvers at him, but, declaring that he was the wrong man, let him pass as a warning. Now, the whole of the story was a pure fabrication; in fact, the rev. gentleman was not in the county at the time of the alleged occurrence. The contradictions which were promptly given to those fabrications rarely found their way to the English papers. He had read in a Manchester paper an account of a landlord being tarred and feathered, and in the same paper a long article commenting on the cruelty and savagery of the Irish people; but the landlord himself who was said to have been so treated had shown that the story was entirely untrue. And, in the same way, another landlord, who was said to have been fired at at Loughrea, gave an absolute contradiction, adding that he was on the best of terms with his tenants, and that he was a member of the Land League. So with the story of a man who was said to have had his ears split in the county Clare because he paid his rent. It appeared from *The Freeman's Journal* that such an outrage never took place. In fact, there had been a deliberate attempt to set the English people against the Irish people, and that was why the Government met Parliament that Session with proposals for coercion. Another important factor in conducing to this state of things was the famous Charge of Judge Fitzgerald. But although that learned Judge declared he was alarmed for his own safety, he was seen, two or three days after the Charge, in the midst of a population whom he had represented as all armed with revolvers and in a lawless state of mind, entirely unattended, and with no more formidable weapon of defence about him than an umbrella. It might be useful to contrast that Charge with the one addressed to the Grand Jury of Wexford, in 1813, by Mr. Baron Fletcher, who boldly pointed out that the evils afflicting Ireland were the result of a vicious land system, and spoke of the tyranny of landlords and agents, who so often used their power for the purpose of oppressing the tenants. They exacted, he said, the utmost penny of the value of the land. If a lease happened to fall due they let the farm to the highest bidder, and showed no predilection to the tenant for past services, and that they were ever busy pouring falsehoods into the ears of Englishmen. In such circumstances, said Baron Fletcher, it was not surprising that the wretched peasant sought to extort from the fears of his landlord the treatment he had failed to win from gratitude and good feeling. The remedy for this state of things was to remove the cause of the disturbance by giving the people a property in their farms and an interest in the peace of the country. These were remedies, added the learned Judge, which would be far more effectual than coercion, the cord, or the gibbet. That was in 1813, before the full effect of the system had worked its evil way, and the ermine of the Judge became the reward of political servitude. He wished to draw the attention of the House to the features of the Return laid on that Table of agrarian offences, particularly relating to the 12 counties of the Province of Leinster. That Return showed that in the first 11 months of last year there was in those 12 counties not a single case of murder, manslaughter, administering poison, assault endangering life; only one case of firing at the person, and only one case of aggravated assault. Could any English Member name any 12 English counties of which such a thing could be said? They had heard a great deal about the difficulty of administering the law, and yet there was not a single case of assault upon a process server or bailiff. How was a Coercion Act to improve that state of things? There was not a single conviction for incendiary fires or arson, and only one commitment and 21 cases reported of taking and holding forcible possession, only one case of levying contributions, not a single case of killing, cutting, or maiming of cattle, only one case for trial, and two reported, in respect to one of which it appeared that some mischievous boys had cut off a cow's tail. From the list of offences he observed that there were 148 cases of threatening letters. Now, threatening letters formed about three-fourths of the agrarian crimes. But surely the persons who wrote those letters must be people of very undecided minds, because in very few instances were the threats carried out. It was well known that the system of writing letters had become a pleasant pastime in Ireland, and for some time past constables and sub-inspectors had been well occupied in correspondence; in fact, nearly all the letters were written by the police or by those interested in the land. Well, that was the tenant side of the question. Now look at the landlord side. During the year, in Leinster, 484 families had been evicted, and this effected a total of 2,195 persons. That represented by far the greatest aggregate of agrarian outrage. Upon what did the Government rely as a basis for carrying its coercive proposals? Was it upon independent testimony? No; they relied upon a military police, a tainted magistracy, and a partizan Bench ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen might say "Oh, oh;" but it could be proved that the magistracy of Ireland, to the extent of about 95 per cent, consisted of men who were directly interested and connected with the land. Every channel of independent evidence was on their side. There was not a corporate body in the whole of Ireland that had not passed resolutions expressing sympathy with the Land League. There was not a Board of Poor Law Guardians in the country that had not given expression to a similar opinion. Ministers of religion, Catholic and Protestant, had gone together in protesting against coercion, and in pointing out that the real cause of Ireland's misfortunes was the abject poverty and misery of the people. Would he be told that all this was the result of the Land League terrorism; and would he be told that the Lord Mayor of Dublin, when he protested against the Government measure, was coerced by the Land League? The thing was utterly absurd. It was ridiculous to suppose that an organization, started by half-a-dozen obscure men, could in 16 months' time exercise the unusual terrorism that was said to exist. It was very remarkable that at a time when his hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell) was charged with inciting the Irish people to assassination and murder, he should be asked by a unanimous vote to accept the freedom of nearly every city and town in Ireland. He had another reason why he opposed, and would bitterly oppose, this attempt to coerce his countrymen, and it was that the measure would fail. He would never be a party to any legislation calculated to produce nothing but failure. They had a long record of failure to look back upon. If the Government could show any single instance in which the imposition of coercive measures in Ireland had tended to restore order and loyalty among the people there would be a good case. Within this century they had 48 times partially suspended, and 10 times wholly suspended, the Constitutional rights of the Irish people, and with what result? Failure. If they failed when Irishmen were weak and powerless and disorganized, was it likely they would succeed when they were combined, organized, and determined? Would they succeed now, when, for the first time in Irish history, the Protestant Orangemen of the North clasped hands with the Catholics of the South. He told them they would fail; and it appeared to him that an appeal to common sense would be quite sufficient to justify hon. Members of the House in opposing coercive measures of a so-called Liberal Government. It could easily be shown that coercive measures had failed, and that hitherto, when they had been passed, crime instead of diminishing had actually increased. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended in 1866, and what was the result? In that year the number of offences against the person was 704; in

1867 they reached 713; in 1868, 785; in 1869, 857; and in 1870, 1,029. In 1866 the number of outrages against property was 797; in 1867, 773; in 1868, 891; in 1869, 815; and in 1870, 1,183. Again, take the offences against public peace. In 1866 they amounted to 418; in 1867 to 492; in 1868 to 803; in 1869 to 1,430; and in 1870 to 1,079; and there was no reason to suppose that any different result would follow coercive measures now. What ground had the Government for supposing that if the Constitutional rights of the Irish people were superseded they would not be forced into secret combinations? If there was any difficulty between the two countries it was this—that with all the power of England it was impossible to coerce the minds or cripple the consciences of the Irish people, and he warned the Government against any attempt upon their part to do so. Coercion, it was true, might be brought to bear with reference to certain offences; but he did not consider it was a crime for men to combine in order to remove an odious and foul system, which had robbed the Irish people of their rights from the first moment of its creation. He should certainly look with sanguine hope to the Irish people to defeat any such measure of coercion as was foreshadowed.

Mr. HERMON said, that some hon. Members spoke as if they thought that it was a pleasant task for any Government to propose measures of what he would call protection rather than coercion for Ireland. They seemed to think that it was not distasteful to any Minister. No one could have listened to the Chief Secretary for Ireland without feeling convinced that it was to him one of the most distasteful duties he ever undertook, and that he was impelled alone by a stern sense of imperative duty. ["No, no!"] That, at any rate, was his own opinion; and he hoped that hon. Members who differed from him would permit him to express his conscientious convictions. He was sorry to hear the hon. and learned Member for Roscommon (Dr. Commins) allude in such a bitter tone to that masterly speech of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India. It was marked by the calmness and the dignity which became a man who felt his responsibility. He uttered no word that should give uneasiness or displeasure to those who differed from him; it indicated rather an inclination to draw a veil over the troubles of the past. That speech he had read and re-read with considerable satisfaction, as the first speech made by a Lancashire Member; and it had been received in the county which the noble Lord so ably represented with satisfaction. He could not say he agreed with every portion of that speech; but if it truly represented the Government and the measures they intended to propose they would have his cordial support. He was sorry that Parliament had not met in November to pass either protective or remedial measures. He trusted that the Irish Members would now recognize that there was no disposition to check discussion or to shorten the debate, and would allow this general discussion to come to an early close. Parliament was ready to listen to the grievances Irish Members might bring forward, and to redress wrongs that were clearly proved. Remedial measures, however full and wide, so long as they were characterized by that justice which the noble Lord spoke of, would have his candid support, and, he believed, that of the Conservative Members. It was, he thought, somewhat premature to discuss the scheme which the Government was about to introduce. It had been referred to, however, by the hon. Member for County Wicklow (Mr. W. Corbet) and he had described the measure of coercion in words which the Government had not put before the House. It was a measure, according to the hon. Gentleman, to coerce the Irish people into silence, and to hang them. For his own part, he preferred to wait until he heard what the measure was before discussing it. He was glad to learn that the Irish Members were prepared to come to a division to-morrow. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He might be mistaken, but he trusted he was not. The country would wait with anxiety, however, to hear what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) would say before the debate closed. They should wait with even more anxiety to hear what would be said by his right hon. Colleague (Mr. Chamberlain), who, no doubt, was a most able administrator, but who, he was afraid, was rather redundant in mischievous policy. He regretted that in the early part of the debate there was so much of recrimination between the two Front Benches. It was a contest as to whose fault it was that these measures had not been brought in earlier; but the time was gone by for that, and the time had come for more important Business. They were all animated by a sincere and fervent desire to restore peace to Ireland. With regard to the agitation, no Irish Member had stated that it was either spontaneous in its origin or natural in its progress. His own belief was that the relentless hands of the Land League had coerced well-meaning people and made them afraid of expressing their own minds, and from doing what they considered was right; indeed, they had been controlled in such a manner that their lives had been placed in danger, and the peace of the country imperilled.

MR. RYLANDS said, if the Amendment were an abstract proposition he should find some difficulty in refusing to vote for it; but it was something very different; it was intended to be a condemnation of the policy of the Government as indicated in the Queen's Speech. It was only fair and courteous to wait for the proposals of the Government and the justification offered for them, and those who had confidence in the Government could not but respond to the appeal made to them to suspend judgment for the present. The Government were perfectly aware that the measures which they were about to introduce were of an exceptional character, and measures that would require strong arguments indeed to justify. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) had said, in the course of the debate, that—

> "Parliament is rightly jealous of Constitutional liberty and the forms which guard the Constitution, and Parliament will not—and ought not—to sanction any exceptional measures, except an overwhelming case can be proved beyond the possibility of doubt."

The Chief Secretary for Ireland used similar language when he said—

> "I am perfectly aware that in the present case the House of Commons will demand, and rigorously demand, that we should establish a very strong case before they will grant us the extraordinary powers we now ask for."

A strong case would have to be made out; it would have to be all the stronger in consequence of the course the Government had hitherto pursued, and he sympathized with the Chief Secretary for Ireland, knowing how he felt his responsibility and his repugnance to proposing coercive measures. [Mr. BIGGAR: Oh, nonsense!] But in his position the right hon. Gentleman was not free from bias; he was subject to the influence of Dublin Castle, where traditions were in favour of landlord supremacy, and where the right hon. Gentleman on entering upon his Office would find piles of papers and letters from the magistrates, the police, and landed magnates in favour of coercion. He resisted these influences last Session, and said that the Government policy was remedy and not coercion. The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India had justified the non-renewal of the Peace Preservation Act, on the ground that to have begun the proceedings of a new Parliament with such a proposal would have ruined its chances for good, and surely the same argument held good in regard to the present proposal of the Government. Since the last Session there had been constant pressure brought to bear upon the Chief Secretary for Ireland by magistrates and by the police officials to induce him to bring forward measures of coercion. There was reason to believe that the administration of the ordinary law for the repression of crime had only been feeble; and it seemed as if those officials had sought to force the hand of the Government and to compel them to give them greater powers. The late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), in his eloquent speech the other night, said there had been a manufactory in Ireland for the denial of outrages; but he (Mr. Rylands) would say, at all events, there had been a manufactory for exaggeration. He had no knowledge of the proceedings of the Government except through the Press; but there was a general belief that the Chief Secretary for Ireland, on several occasions, had thought it his duty, no doubt with perfect conscientiousness, to represent the urgent necessity for Parliament being called together at an earlier period than usual to pass measures of coercion, and the pressure under which he had acted culminated on Monday the 13th of December, when the Cabinet was suddenly called together. On the previous Saturday it was stated that his right hon. Friend had been closeted in Dublin with the ex-Lord Chancellor Ball and Chief Justice May. [Mr. W. E. FORSTER: That was quite incorrect.] He (Mr. Rylands) was very glad to hear his right hon. Friend's denial. Well, the calmer judgment of the Cabinet overruled the urgency of the Chief Secretary. The Tory Party were loud in their condemnation of the Government, and some of them used expressions of the most outrageous character. The noble Lord the junior Member for Liverpool (Lord Claud Hamilton) wrote a letter to the West Kensington Conservative Association, which was received with tumultuous applause, and what did he say? He said that Messrs. Bright and Chamberlain should be indicted for conspiracy, rather than the miserable Land Leaguers, for having contributed, by their speeches and action, to the murders, bloodshed, and rapine in Ireland, more than the Land Leaguers. [Mr. WARTON: Hear, hear!] Such were the intemperate expressions of political youth and inexperience. The same excuse could not be made for Lord Salisbury, who charged certain Members of the Government with being ready to tamper with disturbance and crime, in order to strengthen their arguments in favour of their Land Bill. The leading Members of the Party joined in one common chorus of condemnation of the Government, holding them responsible for delay in applying their coercive measures. The fact that the Government had not yielded to this obloquy of the Conservative Leaders met with the approval of the entire Liberal Party. The conduct of Earl Grey in 1833, and the language of Sir Robert Peel justifying the policy of postponing coercive measures, was surely a precedent for the delay of a few months by the present Government. He thought it would have justified a delay of a few weeks longer; and if, instead of proceeding with a Coercive Bill in the first instance, they had brought in a bold and complete Land Bill, giving absolute security to the tenant, putting aside all other Business to pass such a measure as a matter of urgency, the announcement of such a course would have assuaged the disturbances in Ireland, and given confidence in place of distrust, hope in place of despair, and gratitude in place of dissatisfaction. He deeply regretted that the Government had not considered that it was competent and wise for them to take that course. He did not presume to criticize or condemn them. Up to December 13, at all events, the Government did not think the necessity of coercion was urgent, and they must now give overwhelming evidence of its necessity. The Liberal Party had been placed in great difficulty. The Members of the Government, and even the Premier himself, had said that it was humiliating for them to be driven to take the course they felt compelled to take. It was humiliating, because many of them, during the autumn, denounced in public meetings the principle of coercion; they declared that they as a Party had no confidence in coercion, and that they should go to Parliament determined to support substantial remedial measures. In one of the most eloquent and powerful speeches ever addressed to his constituents, the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) said, amidst the cheers of thousands who listened to him, that "force was no remedy," words which were received with acclamation throughout the country and read by millions of his fellow-countrymen with pleasure. There was no one in the House he was more willing to follow than the right hon. Gentleman, who, he well knew, would be most anxious to give a substantial measure of justice to Ireland. In that magnificent speech, delivered on the 16th November, not two months since, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "At this moment you have before you two appealing parties. You have the tenantry with their discontent, with the outrages committed by some of them, with the repudiation of contracts, with all those evils, some of which I have attempted to describe: and you have, on the other hand, the landed proprietors very anxious to gain your ear and the ear of Government and Parliament. Until now, for the past 100 years and longer, the British Government and Parliament have always come to the rescue of the Irish proprietors. England has done it in the past, and the question is now, will she do it in the future?"

He had some fears that she would. History repeated itself. There were social and political influences of great power inside and outside the Cabinet, and it seemed almost impossible to oppose them. The result was they were to have coercion immediately—in hot haste—while remedial measures might be taken at their leisure. Coercion Bills would be cordially supported by the Conservatives—always distrustful of remedial measures—would pass that House by a large majority, and would be received with rejoicing by the House of Lords. But what would happen with the Land Bill? He saw the other day a letter in *The Times*, written by Lord Meath, in which he said they should produce calm before men's minds would be in a position to judge wisely of any land measure. That being accomplished by the repressive action of the Government, then, at some future time, after due consideration, they might pass judgment on a Land Bill. The noble Lord further said that it was necessary that they should have the Reports of the Royal Commissions which had been sitting, and that they should calmly consider, and not hastily act on, those Reports. Well, for the last 250 years there had been discussions without end as to the condition of Ireland and the origin of its evils. There had been the testimonies of wise statesmen, the calm judgments of philosophical writers, the conclusions of Select Committees of that House, and Reports of Royal Commissions, and the great thing in which all these testimonies mainly agreed was that they must give absolute security of tenure to the people of Ireland if they wished to do away with the distress. A noble Duke, in "another place," warned the Government that if they dealt with this case with a rod in one hand and sugar in the other they would fail. The noble Duke wanted the rod; he would have it vigorously applied, and would not be equally anxious to give the sugar. He had the greatest confidence that the Government intended to bring in remedial measures for Ireland, notwithstanding sinister rumours and articles in *The Times* and *The Daily News*, which had created the impression that the Government were about to bring in a weak Land Bill. He did not believe it. He was convinced no half measures would do. He did not believe for a moment that with a Cabinet possessing men of such eminence and wisdom they should have a weak land measure. No declaration of the Government, nothing in the Queen's Speech, nothing in the speech of the Prime Minister implied any such a thing. Nothing less than the security of tenure would bring 500,000 tenants of Ireland to the side of order, by giving them confidence and contentment. If they wanted to destroy the power of the agitators and of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), they must do what would win to their side the large body of the Irish people at present discontented. A great many Members of the House were irritated by what had been done by Members from Ireland; but he trusted they would not on that account be biassed against them, inasmuch as those Members were true Representatives of a great portion of the people of Ireland. A short time ago one of those hon. Gentlemen was charged on an indictment for intimidation, and the effect was to send him to those Benches. He believed, if there was a Dissolution now, after the measures indicated in the Speech from the Throne, such was the irritation unnecessarily excited in Ireland, that some of his hon. Friends from Ireland on the Ministerial side would probably lose their seats, and the hon. Member for the City of Cork would have a still larger following. He understood the significance of that fact. It proved that the Irish people were profoundly dissatisfied, and that they called upon their Representatives to act, probably in a violent, certainly in an indiscreet manner. He hoped the feeling already excited in the House would not be still further excited by violent measures of obstruction. If they were to have the humiliation of passing measures of coercion, he hoped they might have the satisfaction of inscribing on the Statute Book remedial measures, which would secure peace, contentment, and prosperity to the poor and wretched people of Ireland.

MR. WARTON said, that that was certainly an indulgent House. The hon. and learned Member for Roscommon (Dr. Commins) began yesterday like a good cricketer, and secured 31 runs, he meant minutes. According to the law which allowed the cricketer who had not finished his innings to go in again next morning, the stumps having been drawn at a quarter to 6 last evening, that able cricketer went in again this evening, and with the success of Grace, if not the style of his hits, put in an innings of 127 minutes. He appealed to the sense of fairness which animated that Assembly to hear him (Mr. Warton) for a tenth of the time. The hon. Member for Burnley, who had spoken last, had referred to a meeting of Conservatives at Kensington. He was present at that meeting, and as he was not one of those who would venture to say behind persons' backs what he was afraid to say before their faces, he might say that the cheer which he gave when he heard the hon. Member read a sentence spoken by the junior Member for Liverpool (Lord Claud Hamilton) at that meeting was the repetition of a cheer which he gave at that meeting, and, in doing so, he hoped he was consistent, and perhaps the House would kindly allow him to say something which he had said at that meeting. At that meeting he treated the Conservatives of Kensington, whom he had the honour to address, to a version of the "three F's," which, he thought, befitted the occasion. He would give them the Land Leaguers' version; and he thought it might, perhaps, be expressed in doggrel rhyme. The Land League version was this—

"Fair rent we must first obtain,
Fixed hold will the land retain,
Free sale of what thus we gain—
Fair rent, fixed hold, free sale."

The version of the right hon. Baronet, whom he was proud to regard as the Leader of the Conservative Party, might be thus expressed—

"Fraud to steal what's not their own,
Force to keep all they can bone,
Folly seasoning crime thus shown—
Fraud and force and folly."

The views of the gallant Colonel Burnaby, who also spoke at the West Kensington meeting with respect to the conduct of the Government, might be rendered as follows:—

"Feeble counsels weakly planned,
Funk that fears the traitor band,
Forster in supreme command—
Feeble, Funky Forster."

However, as the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hermon) had said, the present was not the time for recrimination, but for supporting the Government like honest Tories when they did right. And that they were now endeavouring, though tardily, to do their duty, was, in his opinion, perfectly clear. He had no wish to make any lengthened observations; but he felt bound to denounce the attempts that had been made to minimize the outrages in Ireland. For his part, he took them at the estimate of the Government, and did not believe that they had misrepresented the real state of things. He held in his hand a letter from a young lady in Ireland, the daughter of a widowed mother, who had written in indignant terms of the lawlessness and violence that prevailed in the neighbourhood of her house. This poor young lady—they were rich some time ago—stated that they dare not have lights in the house; that no one in the house ever went to bed without expecting a nocturnal attack; and that her mother had been threatened, though she had given back 50 per cent of her rents in the spring. So many outrages were kept from the knowledge of the newspapers that only a small part of the truth was known respecting them. In a second letter, his correspondent mentioned that a man who had been detected buying soap at a "Boycotted" shop had been compelled to eat what he had purchased; that another had been taken out of his bed and "carded," and burnt with a hot iron after being carded, and that the tortures inflicted on the cattle of obnoxious persons were too horrible to be related. They themselves expected to be "Boycotted" for having refused to subscribe to the Parnell Defence Fund. [*Cries of* "Where?" *and* "Name!"] He must refuse, for obvious reasons, to give any clue by which his correspondent might be identified. Now, when such statements were made, it was idle to suppose that a solitary instance of exaggeration discredited the accounts of all the outrages. He would not detain the House any longer, because he was anxious that no further time should be wasted. As he had said, he believed that the Government had stated the case accurately; and he, therefore, trusted that the promised measures for the protection of life and property would be passed without undue delay.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, the debate, since its commencement, had turned almost upon the condition of Ireland, and the alleged demerits of the Irish National Land League. That organization had been charged with all sorts of misdeeds and illegalities in speeches delivered from both the Liberal and Tory Benches of the House; and in so doing it seemed to him that the case which was now being tried before the Courts in Ireland was being very unfairly prejudged. The allegation had been made that the League sought dishonest and illegal objects by dishonest and illegal means. The question was being tried out judicially, and he could not see the fairness or propriety of pronouncing an opinion upon the case in that House. The jurors empanelled to try the case would, of course, read what had occurred in the House on the following morning. He did not, however, fear that they would judge of the case otherwise than impartially; but there were not only jurors to be considered. There were also the Judges. He had noticed that during the debate almost all those who pleaded for the conviction of the traversers flattered the Judges engaged on the trial. That, he believed, was a specimen of English fair play; but then he had never believed in English fair play. He knew that, as between Englishmen, there was fair play; but, as between England and Ireland, there never had been fair play, and he did not believe there would be fair play now. It was not fair play which violated the Treaty of Limerick and the Act of Union; and he did not see any change in the temper of the legislators of England which led him to expect that there would be fair play in this case. One of the prosecutors in the case now pending in Dublin had been empowered to speak from his brief in the House. He had heard from the Solicitor General for Ireland some strong accusations against the National Land League and its leaders. He had heard some days previously a very similar speech delivered in the opening of the League prosecution by the Irish Attorney General, and he had heard the same extracts read. In fact, it was like the Corsican brothers appearing in the House. He would read some of the extracts to which he had alluded. What did the Solicitor General for Ireland read? He read from an Irish newspaper a report of a meeting which had created great emotion, the resolutions passed at which were very strong, and the speakers more than usually outspoken. He did not think there was anything very terrible in that account, or in any of the other extracts read by the Solicitor General for Ireland, or he would undertake to prove the truth of every allegation contained in the extracts. It was quite true, for instance, that the land system in Ireland tortured, robbed, and enslaved the people. In the Acts of Parliament which were passed by the British Legislature there had been, from time to time, several amendments made in the Land Laws of Ireland. What was implied by that fact? It was implied that the Land Laws were oppressive. Previous attempts had been made in that House to curb the power of the Irish landlords. Why was that done? Because their power was unjust, and there was a necessity for an Act of Parliament. Attempts had been made to curb the power of rack-renting the Irish peasantry, and that proved that rack-renting existed, and was being carried on in Ireland. What was rack-renting? It was robbery—legalized robbery, if they liked, but robbery nevertheless. It was alleged in the extracts referred to that the system tended to enslave and degrade the people. Unquestionably it did. Taking the case of good landlords in the country—and no one denied that there were some individuals of that class—was not the position of the Irish tenant living under him one of absolute dependence? He would give a few facts with regard to rack-renting. One of the correspondents of an English newspaper, who had been lately sent over to Ireland to report on the condition of the country, said, in one of his letters to the paper, that in the district he had been visiting there lived a Mrs. Blake, who owned one of those heavily mortgaged estates. Her rental was about £2,000, and her personal income about £300. That was the case of many Irish landlords and landladies; but that only proved that they were a spendthrift class. The correspondent went on to say that the £300 was obtained by making a charge for the seaweed obtained from the sea. The land was not enough for the Irish landlords, but they must also take toll from the sea. In proof of his assertion that the land system tended to degrade and enslave the Irish people, he invited the attention of the House to the following notice served upon the tenants of a large property in Ireland:—

> "I hereby require you to prevent the trespass of any person with dog or gun on the lands you occupy from me, or in the adjoining bog or mountain; and should you at any time after the service of this notice permit such a trespass, I

> shall give directions for your removal from the property."

That notice was signed by F. A. Knox Gore, and was dated August 15, 1860. He might also mention that on the occasion of the Royal visit to Killarney, in 1861, Lord Castlerosse's tenants were obliged to wear hats with the name of their landlord printed on them, just as dogs wore a collar. So much for the manly feeling of independence and self-respect expected to be created under this blighting land system. They had heard something about crime in Ireland and crime in England, and the Solicitor General for Ireland had said that crime in England was always detected, although he could not conceive that crime being detected made any great matter; but in England there was a detective police, whilst in Ireland it was a military police. Every Irish policeman considered himself a son of Mars, whose favourite reading was about battles, sieges, and sorties, and whose favourite song was, "Let me like a soldier fall." He had been greatly struck by the unity that prevailed in the House when the question was one of coercion for Ireland. There were two political Parties in that Assembly who differed on most questions, and who argued them with great energy, and even bitterness; but when it came to a question of destroying the small remnant of liberty still left to the Irish people there was brotherly love and union between them at once. Indeed, the only charge that the Tories made against the Government was that they did not commence to coerce soon enough, and did not mean to flog hard enough when they did set about it. It was alleged that coercion was necessary in order to protect life and property in Ireland. But it was only intended to protect the lives of a class, and the so-called property of that class. What protection had been given by the Legislature to the lives and property of the Irish tenants? They might talk of the safety of life in Ireland; but he contended that life was more safe in Ireland than in England. ["Oh!"] He maintained that the destruction of human life by violence in England was greater than in Ireland. Of course, he did not wish to urge that two blacks would make one white; but he certainly failed to see why, if measures of coercion were unnecessary in England, and exceptional laws were also unnecessary in England, where violent deaths were so prevalent, they should be considered necessary in Ireland. He would show them what was the condition of things in England by reading extracts from English newspapers. One paper, dated the 4th of November last, said—

> "Never, in our experience, have we read of so much serious crime as exists at the present time in England. Day after day the newspapers are teeming with reports of murders and other serious offences."

Another, dated the 5th—

> "The state of Ireland has become a daily chapter in our newspapers; agrarian outrage and fearful assaults; but if England were to be scrutinized in the same manner, the condition of Ireland, notwithstanding all its shooting from behind hedges and the houghing of cattle, would show a brilliant contrast."

The Times, at the end of last year, in an article, stated—

> "We are accustomed to be startled by the lists of murder that occur again and again at our Assizes; but seldom has there been such an abundant crop of atrocities as has received its punishment this autumn. Now there are two others added in a season which has teemed with murders. The believer in civilization generally, and in English civilization in particular, must feel his faith considerably shaken on a contemplation of this fearful list."

He had a handful of other instances giving details of ferocious atrocities and disgusting crimes perpetrated within a recent period in England—perpetrated not upon landlords, not upon men who could do something for their own protection, but upon the most defenceless portions of society—women and children. Still, no coercion was thought necessary to curb this state of things. Yet they in Ireland must endure coercion whenever there was an outbreak of crime. The other night the ex-Attorney General for Ireland made a very impressive speech on the subject of the National Land League, Irish illegalities, and Irish crimes. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had related how a woman and daughter had been taken out of the house in Ireland, and the hair cut off their heads; but in an English newspaper the right hon. and learned Gentleman would have read of women and children not having their hair, but their throats, cut. It was a one-sided affair to refer to crime in Ireland. Why not consider that there was crime in every country? But he (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) thought the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman was prompted through the hard exigencies of Party feeling and Party servitude. What was this coercion against which such a cry as had been raised to be introduced for? They had heard a good deal of humanitarian sentiment from the opposite Benches about the torture of cattle in Ireland; but very little consideration seemed to be bestowed upon the torture likely to be the result of coercion. It was considered a light matter to tear away the bread-winners of a family from their homes, to cast them into gaol unaccused, and leave them there as long as Her Majesty's Government chose to detain them. Such things might be passed by lightly in England, but they were felt very keenly in Irish families, because Ireland had been ravaged by such Acts before; and when such Acts were visited on Ireland the English people had their reward in the feeling entertained towards them by the great masses of the Irish people. As regarded criminal statistics, it was admitted that all countries had ordinary and extraordinary crimes; but the crimes of Ireland, both ordinary as well as extraordinary, had all been put into one Return and called the extraordinary crime of Ireland. A great deal had been said about the infliction of physical cruelty upon individuals, such as cutting off their ears and "carding" them; but he believed that all such accusations were baseless. He (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) had a letter from an Irish lady, in which she said—

> "Mr. Bence Jones refers to the case of cutting off ears in Limerick. After an exordium he announces that it is becoming quite an institution in Ireland."

Now, the man's ears were on his head today. He got a threatening letter, and that was all. Had the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin forgotten the daily outrages that were taking place in England at the moment that he was holding up his own country to the execration of an English audience? Had the right hon. and learned Gentleman read of a case in England where a mother reddened a poker and thrust it into the body of her infant? Had he read of a case where a man reddened a poker and ran it through the body of his sleeping paramour? ["Oh, oh!"] Were they not justified in referring to these things, when their country was being calumniated in such a gross and atrocious manner? He was there to defend his country, and he claimed his right to do it. Even the young Member for Thirsk (Colonel Dawnay), in a maiden speech, spoke strongly in favour of coercion for Ireland. One would have thought that an hon. Gentleman in his position would have raised his voice in favour of liberty, and that, if he could not say a word in that behalf, that he would have held his tongue. The present Prime Minister, speaking in that House on the 17th of February, 1866, said he declined to recognize the voice of the Irish people, or to accept an interpretation of their real feelings and opinions, other than that which was conveyed through the mouth of its Representatives lawfully chosen. So much for the representative character of the Irish Members. One word on behalf of the National Land League, a body which had been so freely abused and assailed in that House. They had heard that Her Majesty's Ministers intended to propose remedial measures; they intended to bring in a Land Bill which they believed would be satisfactory to the Irish people. Who was to be thanked for it, if they were about to bring it in? Who had caused them to take the question into consideration? What, however, compelled them to deal with this question? It was not the habit of that or any Government to meddle with questions that were not pressing. Their motto was to "Let sleeping dogs lie." Who had wakened up the Irish people which had compelled Her Majesty's Government to deal with this grievance? The Irish National Land League. In a wide-spread organization and agitation something might be said, and perhaps something might be done, that was unadvisable; and they knew very well that things had been said at meetings of the Irish National Land League that were reprehensible. Who could control the tongues of thousands of people? In a movement of this sort, why should the movement be judged by the words of some foolish men? But the aim of the National Land League had been the benefit of the Irish people; and, whatever abuse might be heaped upon them, whatever sufferings might come upon them, they would have the satisfaction by-and-bye, and the glory, too, of having contributed to bring about a great and beneficent reform for the benefit of the Irish people.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, had not my conduct when in Office been challenged in the course of the debate I should not have risen to take part in it. I have no intention of entering upon many subjects which have been alluded to, and I shall not attempt to discuss the character of the Irish Land League. That is a subject on which every Member of this House has already formed a judgment one way or another. Nor shall I enter on the very interesting topic which was raised by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands)—namely, whether or not what is now going on is a humiliation for the Liberal Party, or whether the promises of the present Government during the last autumn, or the expectations held out to their followers, have been adequately performed. Those are matters which we may very well leave to be settled among the Liberal Party themselves. It seems to me that what we have to decide upon the present occasion is this very plain and simple issue—Is the state of Ireland such, or is it not such, as to require exceptional measures to be taken for the protection of life and property in that country? And when I speak of the state of Ireland I hope that I shall be understood as not merely referring to the position of Irish landlords. We must all feel that matters have gone far beyond that. I refer to the condition of the peaceable and law-abiding subjects of the Queen in that country, whatever social position they may happen to hold. We have heard on this important question, as we always do hear when any topic relating to Ireland is concerned, very different opinions expressed. We have heard hon. Members below the Gangway on this side of the House take one view of the matter, and we have heard Her Majesty's Government express another view. Which is this House to believe? I have no wish to be guilty of any discourtesy to hon. Members below the Gangway; but, having listened to many of their arguments, I feel bound to believe the statements made on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, rather than the views they have expressed. They have not merely questioned statistics, but they have made allegations themselves which, perhaps, if we consider them for a moment, may help us to judge of the value of the rest of what they have stated. They have actually alleged that such deeds as rick-burning, as the sending of threatening letters, have been done by the police, and not by those who ought to be made amenable to the law; and in the whole discussion on this subject, so far as I have observed, they have entirely ignored the fact that, whatever the result of a comparison of crime between Ireland and Great Britain may be, in their country a certain class of crime remains undetected, and there exists in certain parts of Ireland a reign of terror. That being the state of affairs in Ireland, Her Majesty's Government have, not one day too soon, thought it necessary to announce their intention to ask the House for exceptional powers, and, on the very threshold of the question, are met by the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). I hope that I shall be believed when I assure the House that I am no friend to measures of this kind, and that I regret as much as any hon. Member below the Gangway the necessity for coercion in any form. I, however, feel bound to admit that the statement of the Government on the subject is sufficient, and amply sufficient, to justify the consideration of the proposals which they have announced their intention of submitting to the House. Therefore, I feel that it is my plain and simple duty, first to support Her Majesty's Government in their attempt to obtain an early opportunity for the submission of their measures to the House; and, secondly, not to interpose anything which might tend to delay the enactment of those proposals, if they should appear to be necessary and adequate to meet the present crisis. Holding these opinions, I should have been very glad had I been able to refrain from taking any part in this debate, and to give a silent vote in support of Her Majesty's Government. But in the course of the last two speeches which have been delivered on behalf of Her Majesty's Government remarks have been made with regard to my conduct, and with regard to the conduct of the late Government when in Office, which were absolutely uncalled for, and which I shall be able to prove were entirely unsupported by the facts. I shall refer very briefly to the speech of the Solicitor General for Ireland. We all listened to that hon. and learned Gentleman with pleasure; but I think that he would do well in future not to attack those who are inclined to give him their support. The Solicitor General for Ireland went into a long history of the Irish Land League, and traced its origin to a letter written by a Mr. Devoy, which appeared in a Dublin newspaper in January, 1879, and to a meeting in the county Mayo held in the same year. The hon. and learned Member referred to the prosecution of certain individuals by the late Government, to the delay in carrying on those prosecutions, and he made sundry charges against us on account of these matters. The hon. and learned Member said that we should have taken some notice of Mr. Devoy's letter; but I do not know what notice we could have taken of a letter written by a gentleman living in America. If the late Government had prohibited meetings on account of that letter they would have found no greater opponents than some of the right hon. Gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury Benches. There was nothing whatever in the state of Ireland at that time which would have justified the Government in taking so arbitrary a proceeding. The Solicitor General for Ireland has told the House that if there had been a serious intention to prosecute those who were instrumental in getting up those meetings the hon. Member for the City of Cork would have been included in the prosecution. Does the Law Officer of the present Government mean to say that he has so low an opinion of the love of his Predecessors for justice as to suggest that they ought to have prosecuted the hon. Member for the City of Cork not for words used by himself, but for words which had been used by other persons in his absence. The hon. and learned Gentleman talks of the law's delay in the matter; but did he ever know of any important case in which there were not delays in the law? Have there been no delays in the prosecutions now impending? And is it well for the Law Officer of the Government—who, if the story be true, so managed matters that the trial was only commenced by the kind-heartedness of the traversers in waiving their right to challenge a juryman—is it right for the Law Officer of the Government, who risked such a failure as that, to taunt his Predecessors with the law's delays? The hon. and learned Gentleman had told them that he did not wish to make any charges against the late Government on this question; but, if that were so, with what object was that part of his speech made unless it was to show that Ireland at the time the present Government took Office was in a state of incipient anarchy; and that, with the country in that state, they had deliberately abandoned the powers of the Peace Preservation Act? I do not want to enter into that question; but I think it unfortunate that some reasons for that course which we have heard in this debate should ever have been given. I should like to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his task would not be less difficult if the people were not in possession of arms? The real reason for abandoning the Peace Preservation Act was, of course, that which Her Majesty's Government stated in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne when Parliament met in May last. It was the reason fairly stated by the noble Marquess opposite—namely, that they thought they could govern Ireland without the exceptional powers of that Act, and they desired to make the attempt. I am not inclined to bring a charge against the present Government in that respect. I can understand the difficulties under which they laboured. They wished to avoid the possibility of any question being raised as to the consistency of their performances when in Office with the promises they had made when in Opposition. I can well understand the temptations of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to attempt, for once in a way, to dispense with those exceptional powers in the government of that country. I have had some experience—I am not sure that I have not had as long experience as any Member in this House—in connection with the Government of Ireland; but I will venture to say that in the whole course of my connection with that Government I never remember having to perform so odious a task as that of renewing the Peace Preservation Act in 1875. It was then my duty to renew that Act, not in its entirety, but with such relaxed powers as were adapted to the improved state of the country. The renewal of the Act last Session would have been more disagreeable, and I am not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman shrank from so unpleasant a task. But, having decided not to renew the Act, the right hon. Gentleman, at the end of October last, was face to face with a condition of the country which has been described by the Attorney General for Ireland in the course of the trial now proceeding in Dublin. During the autumn I addressed a portion of my constituents in a speech which has been referred to "elsewhere." I said, not having as full information as to the state of Ireland as was in possession of the Government; not knowing precisely what course they were about to pursue further than that it was stated some steps were to be taken under the ordinary law, I was glad they were proceeding under the ordinary law before they applied to Parliament for exceptional powers. I see no reason to regret those words; but when I spoke I believed that in acting under the ordinary law they would apply the whole of the powers which the ordinary law placed in their hands. Did they do so? There is one point, and only one, on which I feel I must criticize their conduct in that respect. It has been well referred to by my right hon. and learned Friend the junior Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson). Why did not the present Government prohibit future meetings of the Land League when they initiated prosecutions against its principal members? I cannot venture to express a very confident opinion; but I have conferred with many men who are well acquainted with Ireland, and I do believe that if the Government had taken this course, to which, looking to the circumstances then existing, I think they were both morally and logically bound, the result would have been a very different state of affairs from that with which we are now called upon to deal. Why, the prohibition of those meetings would have prevented that agitation extending into parts of the country which had hitherto been untouched by it; it would have prevented the spread of that reign of terrorism which the noble Marquess opposite the other night pictured in such vivid colours; and it would have had this further effect—that in applying now for exceptional powers, if they were required, the Government might have confined them to a much smaller portion of Ireland than that to which I fear they will now be compelled to apply them. I will not dwell on the question whether that action could or could not have been legally taken; but in that matter I attach, and I think the House will attach, great importance to the opinion deliberately expressed by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for the University of Dublin the other night in favour of its legality; and I would add that if any hon. Member cares to turn to the terms of the proclamation prohibiting the meeting in the county of Cork on the 2nd of January, and remembers the circumstances in which that meeting was held, the condition of the population in that district, and the utter absence of anything like Orange opposition, he will feel that if the prohibition of that meeting was legally justifiable the prohibition of the other meetings which have been held since the beginning of November would have been equally justifiable. Yesterday the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) felt it necessary, in a speech in which he entered into the Land Question at length—a question which, so far as I am aware, is not now really before the House—felt it necessary, both specially and generally, to impute blame to the conduct of the late Government. Although, in comparison with the important issues before us, the special accusation of the right hon. Gentleman refers to a small matter, I hope the House will bear with me, for that special accusation was directed against myself. The right hon. Gentleman, while good enough to refer in kindly language to myself, as Chief Secretary for Ireland, yet made the special charge against me that I had allowed one part of the Land Act to lapse. I confess that I was astounded by that charge. Of course, it meant that by my action, or by my inaction, I had prevented what are known as the "Bright Clauses" from having such a wide and useful application as Parliament had intended. As some proof that the charge is unfounded, I may say that although the right hon. Gentleman has been for the last three years actively engaged in the promulgation of his opinions on this question he never made it before. Turning to the Report of the Select Committee appointed by the last House of Commons in 1877 on this subject, I find that in the Report drafted by the right hon. Gentleman, which was not, however, adopted by the Committee, while the question is very fully discussed, the late Government is never charged with any want of attention to, or any inaction whatever in, the matter. The right hon. Gentleman says in that Report—

> "It is clear, from the evidence which has been given to the Committee by the officers of the Landed Estates Court and others, that even if such Amendments be made in the Act, and in the practice of the Departments concerned in administering it, as have been suggested, no great increase will be effected in the sales to tenants. The difficulty of the residues will still remain."

He went on to say—

> "As now framed and worked, the clause of the Irish Land Act of 1870 having this object in view—the purchase of their freeholds by the tenants—are wholly inadequate for the purpose, and are the cause of much disappointment; and but little better result is to be expected from them by such minor Amendments as have been suggested, which will leave the administration of them divided between the Landed Estates Court, the Board of Works, and the Treasury."

The right hon. Gentleman then goes on to propose that a Special Commission should be constituted to protect the interests of the tenants; and when the Committee finally considered their Report, it was resolved, on the Motion of the present Attorney General for Ireland, that—

> "The fundamental difficulty of the present system was this—So long as the practically inconsistent duties of forming the land into lots to suit the tenant purchasers, and, at the same time, paying due regard to the interests of those whose property is being sold through the Court, continue to be imposed on one and the same functionary, your Committee believe that no substantial results can reasonably be expected from the clause of the Irish Land Act to which their inquiry has been directed."

There is not one word blaming the late Government for their action or their inaction in the matter. I should like to know what it is that the right hon. Gentleman would have wished us to do. Would he have wished that we should have attempted, without some inquiry, to amend those clauses of the Land Act which undoubtedly deal with a very difficult and complicated question, as the fact of the continuance of his inquiry for two years conclusively proves? Is that the way that the present Government are proposing to deal with the whole of the Land Act? If so, why, last summer, did they appoint a Commission to make a preliminary inquiry into the subject? That, Sir, is precisely analogous to the course of the late Government in the smaller matter to which I am now referring. When the right hon. Gentleman proposed an inquiry into these clauses when I was Chief Secretary for Ireland, I readily, as he will remember, accepted his Motion. I then expressed the opinion, which I have always felt, that it would be a great advantage to Ireland if the number of proprietors could be increased, provided always that it could be done consistently with the natural growth of properties of this kind, and not by attempting to force them; and consistently also with the avoidance of any loss to the State, and with justice to the existing owners of property. That opinion, Sir, I still hold; and last year, when the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) brought the Report of his Committee before the House, and asked the House to adopt a Resolution on the subject, that opinion was by no means discouraged by my right hon. Friend, then the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Stafford Northcote). My right hon. Friend consented in the following words:—

> "We accept the Resolution with the intention at present in our minds of making as soon as may be convenient a proposal which shall, at all events, facilitate the working of these clauses."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxlv. 1667-8.]

And if that intention was frustrated by the more pressing necessity of relieving the distress which existed in Ireland last winter, and by the subsequent events of the General Election, at any rate, the late Government can hardly be accused of blame in that respect. The right hon. Gentleman made not only this special charge against myself, but he also made a general charge against Her Majesty's late Government in reference to the law regulating the tenure of land in Ireland. He told us that our neglect for six years of all questions relating to land tenure in Ireland was really the cause of the difficulties in which we now find ourselves—the main cause, for he put it first. Well, Sir, I think it is rather too much for a right hon. Gentleman sitting on that Bench—a Member of the Government which passed the Land Act of 1870—to assume that we, who were not responsible for that Act, ought, within 10 years of the passing of that measure, which has been so often boasted of by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite as a great settlement of the Land Question—ought, within 10 years of the passing of that measure, not merely to have re-opened the question, which they had claimed to have settled by the Land Act, but to have attempted to deal with it on entirely different principles. It is perfectly true that when Mr. Butt, on more than one occasion, brought forward proposals in the late House of Commons for a radical and entire change in the system of land tenure in Ireland, we met his proposals in the only way in which they could be met—namely, by a decided negative. But in that negative we were joined, as the right hon. Gentleman will find, if he cares to refer to the debates, by none more heartily than the two noble and right hon. Members who represented the present Government in discussing that question. I will only say this — we declined at that time to meet demands of that sort with concessions which could not satisfy those who made the demands, but which, perhaps, might have led to false impressions as to the likelihood of our being able to comply with their real desires. I think, Sir, we were right in taking that course; and it is a principle which, with all humility, I would venture to recommend to the Government in dealing with Irish legislation. I do not at all wish to discuss the Land Question, which, as I have already said, is not now before us; but I own that I was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman should, apparently, have expressed an opinion that any measure which could be proposed dealing with the system of land tenure in Ireland in conformity with the principles which were, the other evening, enunciated by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington), could either have prevented or remedied the state of things which is now existing in that country. I trust that when Her Majesty's Government approach this great question they will approach it in the spirit of the speech of the noble Marquess, rather than in that of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), who used, in expressing his hopes in regard to it, that dangerous and, I think, very mistaken phrase of dealing with it according to Irish ideas. Of course, in dealing with it, Her Majesty's Government and the House at large would consider well the undoubted differences between the system of land tenure in Great Britain and Ireland, and between the circumstances of the different classes that are connected with it; but I do trust, in whatever they do, they will adhere firmly to the statement of the noble Marquess, that they will deal with it on principles conformable to justice. If Her Majesty's Government follow that course, I will venture to assure them that they will receive, not merely fair consideration, but something like hearty co-operation, from those who sit on this side of the House. Sir, before that question can be approached, we have to settle the Business which precedes it in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne, and to discuss the measures which are proposed to be introduced by Her Majesty's Government for restoring the reign of law and order in Ireland. Parliament has been called together a month sooner than usual, in order to deal with this question. The state of Ireland has been described in language to which I need merely refer, by the responsible Members of the Government who sit on that Bench, and yet all we have done is this —that for a week we have been engaged in what is merely a preliminary discussion. Sir, I feel sure that in the conduct of these discussions everyone in this House will agree that full liberty of debate should be allowed, and especially to those who represent Irish constituencies. But I think, at the same time, we must see that there is a growing impatience in the country of the delay under such circumstances as these — that there is a desire that something should not only be promised by the Government, but that something should be done by this House, and promptly done, to restore the authority of the Queen in Ireland; and I do trust that in the future conduct of this debate, and in their general dealing with this question, Her Majesty's Government will, both by their influence and by their example, show that what they have told the House of the state of Ireland is really present to their minds; that their promise of legislation is one which, so far as they can secure it, will be carried into effect on an early day; and that they will, by every fair means in their power, accelerate the arrival of the hour when the law of Parliament may again be supreme, and the Queen's authority rule throughout the whole of the United Kingdom.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN thought that both sides of the House would fully admit the unfortunate position of the landlords in Ireland. As a Liberal, and not a Liberal of last week, he hoped to be allowed to say a few words on the question. He had taken an humble part in previous agitations, and he had protested in that House against the measure of 1870, because he believed it was one that would not bring peace and prosperity to Ireland. Under these circumstances, he thought he was now warranted, in the year 1881, in saying to the Government that any amendment of that measure would not satisfy the wishes of the people. He was one of those who supported principles in regard to Irish legislation which, he regretted to say, had not found so universal an acceptance as he could have desired. He was not one of those who were in favour of measures rendered expedient to-day, but he took his stand on the three F's; and although he found from recent utterances, both in England and Ireland, that there was a strange conjunction of opinion in opposition to it, he believed, however, that that was not the true expression of the opinion of the people either of England or Ireland. The right hon. Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) denounced the three F's as "fraud, force, and folly." A gentleman who had now arrived at great distinction, and whose name was in as many mouths in England, Ireland, and America as that of the right hon. Gentleman—Mr. Davitt — paraphrased the right hon. Gentleman's expression, and spoke of the three F's as "feud, folly," and something else which he had forgotten. Men not generally united in political views were united in supporting the present measures of the Government and in opposing the three F's. The landlords opposed them; but where were they? Mr. Davitt and the right hon. Gentleman were in happy conjunction in opposing them; but the Northern Orangemen, the Southern farmers, the priests from Cork, and the priests from Kerry, were united in their favour, together with the Presbyterian Church, so ably represented by the minister who had a seat in that House (Mr. Nelson), and the scion of one of the great proprietary families of Ireland. It might be said that this was not strictly the question before the House; but he contended that it was, for it was impossible to separate the application of remedial measures from the coercion which was to be applied. They must both be considered together. He was not there to press on the Government the adoption of any particular measure as a remedy for Irish grievances, or to inflict upon the House the speeches of others, or details that were by no means novel. What he did say was, at any rate, his own. The hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. T. D. Sullivan), who addressed the House a short time ago, came forward manfully to support the position of the National Land League of Ireland. He had listened attentively to the speech of the hon. Member, and had waited patiently, for he thought that at last the good time was coming, and that he should hear from the hon. Gentleman what the policy of that body was. Yet all he succeeded in discovering was that the hon. Member protested against the three F's, and against the platform universally accepted throughout Ireland by the League, not eight months ago. He regretted that the Land League Representatives had not favoured the House with the advantages of their intelligence, and the result of their inquiries. If they had, the House would have been able to see why, in the twinkling of an eye, the stage had been changed; why what was only eight months ago right and deserving of support and patronage was now the abomination of desolation; and how it was that contentment and land tenure were two things that could never be connected together. He was not one of those who swallowed his opinions, or hid his light under a bushel. When he thought a thing, he said it out straight; and he hoped, before the debate closed, that the Members of the Land League would say what it was they proposed; what they would accept; what their real object was. If not, their position was an anomalous one. He knew they were loudly cheered when they got upon a public platform; that they were met with flags and played upon by bands; but, nevertheless, their position was untenable. What Parliament was called upon to do was to repair a practical injustice—to wipe away an old confiscation; but he did not see why they should be called upon to hug and embrace and treat as patriots and the only true friends of Ireland the descendants of the planters whom James had placed to fatten upon the marrow and bone of the Irish people. Even the descendants of the Dutchman were now found to possess qualities far different from those formerly attributed to them, when they were regarded as fit only for that place which Dante called "Inferno." The Irish Members were told that the League had changed its ideas, and that they must change with it. He ridiculed the notion of calling this National Land League a national concern. It was a social concern, and ought only to be considered as a social concern. He freely admitted that at the present moment, on any platform in Ireland, he might not have a very happy opportunity of enunciating these sentiments; but if he were permitted to do so, he would declare, as he now declared, to the Representatives of the people, that, in his belief, many of those who had joined the Land League were perfectly contented with the arrangement in regard to the three F's previously arrived at. No doubt, something was required in addition to the three F's. In the West of Ireland, if they gave the people their land for nothing, they could not live upon it; and, in order to maintain them in the country, it would be necessary for the State to make some additional provision. Recognizing this fact, he asked Her Majesty's Government to pass measures which would give the surplus population of Ireland some hope and expectation of possessing a home. He was not in favour of the compulsory expropriation of the property of landlords, and he was equally opposed to the compulsory emigration of tenants to America or elsewhere. As he had mentioned emigration, he might remark that people would do equally well in emigrating from England and Scotland as in emigrating from Ireland. Emigration to America was taking place largely from Germany—much more largely than from Ireland—and their only inducement, possessing, as they did, full security of tenure at home, was the hope of improving their position. Touching the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), he wished to say that he had been in that House on many former occasions when coercive measures had been introduced, and that it would be a difficult thing indeed to get him to forsake old principles and forget old promises, and induce him to join in a step which he had always met with unremitting opposition. But, while he said so, he refused to join those who desired to make a Pandemonium of the country. He admitted that outrages were committed: but he did not believe that such outrages should be met by the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, which would imprison a few individuals and leave the rotten sore still festering. As to "Boycotting," it was one thing for Jack to say that he would not deal with Bill; but it was altogether a different thing for Jack to say that he would break Jemmy's head if he did deal with Bill. He asked his hon. Friends not to fence with this question; let them hold up "Boycotting as a holy pursuit;" but let them not deal in generalities as to what might be done in Sussex, Naples, or anywhere else. They were endeavouring to remedy the state of things which now existed in Ireland, and he contended that no coercive measures introduced by the Government would be effectual. He admitted that the proceedings to which he had referred must be discouraged; but coercive measures were no remedy. The tyranny of them was unexampled in the history of modern Europe. It was abominable that four or five men were to act together in a town, and, because they had a grudge against an individual, were to hold a court and condemn him, telling him that if he did not consent to do as they required in regard to his property he must be put down and sat upon. He believed Ireland to be in a bad state. If, therefore, the Government came forward with a measure for the good of the country, he should give it his support, and cared not what might afterwards be his popularity in Ireland. He should cease to consider it an honour to hold a seat in that House, as he had done for 29 years, if his action must be guided by this confederation, which had its origin in America amongst a section connected neither with the people there, nor with any political Party. He was content to be ruled by no class of his countrymen, who, although they could not make him change his opinions, might, perhaps, make him change his course of action. With regard to the assistance to the Irish people which had been spoken of, he had conversed with many hon. Gentlemen who were fully acquainted with American opinion, as far as it could be gathered; and he could say that not one of them had ever heard a good word expressed by the Americans for the Irish residents in New York. It was idle to say that any body of native Americans would do aught in a revolutionary sense to assist the Irish people; but he should forget himself in omitting gratefully and respectfully to acknowledge the conduct of the great mass of Americans during the distress which had prevailed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Synan.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he rose, not to offer opposition to the Motion for adjournment, but to express a hope that the debate would be allowed to close this evening (Friday).

MR. PARNELL said, they could not come to an understanding of a definite character that the debate would terminate that evening, as that would be an admission of the principle of the *clôture;* at the same time, he was willing to allow that at the time referred to sufficient discussion would have taken place, and would be quite willing that a division should then be taken. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland did not intend to take either of his Coercion Bills after the adjournment of the debate?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR hoped that some reply would be given to the question of the hon. Member for Cork.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, there were only two minutes unexpired before the time when Opposed Business could not be taken, which could be occupied with other matters.

MR. CALLAN said, it would have been more in keeping with the usual practice to have occupied those two minutes by proceeding to the Business on the Paper than by detaining hon. Members. With reference to the closing of the debate, he thought it would have facilitated the discussion had the House been favoured with speeches from the Representatives of the borough which had two Members in the Cabinet. The expression of the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and the President of the Board of Trade was awaited with greater interest than any speeches which had been delivered in the course of the debate; and had they been given he believed that a division might have been reached within a short time at the present Sitting.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (SCOTLAND) BILL.—[BILL 45.]

(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Sir David Wedderburn.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ANDERSON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, this Bill was the same as had been read a second time last Session. He was quite willing that it should be submitted to a Select Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Anderson.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, if the Bill was the same as the English Bill, and on the understanding that it would be referred to a Select Committee, he thought it would be well that it should be read a second time.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would agree to the second reading of the Bill, on the understanding that it would be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. GRAY said, he had always been under the impression that a Motion for the second reading of a Bill should be accompanied by some explanation of its details. He certainly deprecated the course which it was sought to pursue on that occasion, and saw no reason why he should countenance it.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he could not understand why the Bill should not be read a second time merely because the course taken by the hon. Member for Glasgow did not stand well in the eyes of some hon. Members opposite. He could hardly have imagined that opposition should be offered by them to an act of remedial legislation of this kind, which had received favour on all hands, and was of great importance to large classes of the community. He was quite sure that the hon. Member opposite and his Colleagues would be well represented on the Select Committee to which the Bill would be referred.

Dr. WEBSTER said, he hoped the second reading would not be opposed. Overburdened as the Session must be with Irish Business, it was but fair to give an opportunity to consider questions of importance to Scotland, such as this Bill involved. It was, no doubt, one admitting of great alteration and improvement, and he was glad that the hon. Member who introduced it had agreed to refer it to a Select Committee, a course which had been attended with great advantage last Session in the case of the Fraudulent Debtors' Bill for Scotland.

Mr. DALY said, he should not pin his conscience to every proposal of the hon. Members for Stockport and Glasgow. If the Bill were submitted to the House every man that voted for it would do so on his own responsibility; and being himself in complete ignorance of its details, as well as an unmarried man, he knew not how his future might be affected by the measure, and therefore claimed his right, before giving so important a vote, to know something of its principles.

Mr. DICK-PEDDIE said, the hon. Member for Glasgow got the Bill discussed in the House very fully last Session, and after the discussion obtained a second reading for it. If the hon. Member had refrained from explaining the principles of the measure to-night it had been merely for the purpose of saving the time of the House. Instead of there being any charge brought against him for having taken that course, he should be commended and receive every consideration.

Mr. HEALY said, that one point seemed to be overlooked in this discussion—namely, that the hon. Member for Glasgow had a good opportunity yesterday of carrying it through Parliament. The Government might give the hon. Member a day for the debate; and as it was very inconvenient to take measures of this kind at such an hour of the night he would move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Healy.*)

Mr. ANDERSON said, he had refrained from making a speech because from the lateness of the hour he wished to save the time of the House, and because the measure had been so abundantly discussed last Session, or only a few months ago. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gray) said he was ignorant of the provisions of the Bill. Well, the hon. Member had only himself to thank for that, as the measure had been printed and distributed amongst the Members of the House. The hon. Member himself had received a copy, and it was his own fault if he had not read it; and it was his own fault, also, if he had not seen in the Orders of the Day that the measure was down for second reading. The hon. Member should have properly informed his mind with the materials before him if he wished to form a judgment to enable him to vote on the question. He was quite ready, if desired by the House, to explain the principles of the Bill; but he thought it was altogether unnecessary to take that course, and that he should only be wearying the House if he did. But, in order to show the House the extreme necessity of some measure for the protection of the property of married women, he would refer to a case that came before the Courts only the other day. It was the case of Mr. Birchell, who had a wife with £45,000 in her own right. There was no ante-nuptial settlement, and accordingly the money went to the husband. The husband, however, to make the wife safe, made a will in her favour, and handed that will over to her. The husband died in the house of his mistress, and it was then discovered that he had actually made a subsequent will, by which the whole of his wife's property was conveyed away to the children of a former mistress. That was an example of what a bad husband could do under the present law. Bad husbands like this were, he believed, the exception; still there were bad husbands, and women ought to be guarded against them. The law, as it at present stood, was faulty; and he had merely mentioned the Birchell case to show the necessity for some greater protection of the property of married women than married women at present enjoyed. He sincerely hoped the House would pass the second reading on the condition he had named—namely, that when it was read he would move its reference to a Select Committee.

MR. CALLAN said, he made a point of never reading a Scotch Bill until he heard it explained. Those measures were usually so abstruse that it eased his mind to have them explained. Hearing the hon. Member's statement about a certain individual's former mistress, present mistress, and deceased mistress, he should have thought it could only have been in Scotland that such a complicated case could occur; but, although it had been seriously urged as an argument in favour of reading the Bill a second time and referring it to a Select Committee that an injustice of this kind had happened in Scotland, if his memory served him right the case did not occur in Scotland at all. [MR. ANDERSON: It might any day.] Of course, it might; but, at the same time, it might not. It was a mere suppositious case as far as Scotland was concerned. If it had been applied as an argument in favour of the Bill that stood third on the Paper it would have had some weight, as that measure referred to England, in which country the case had occurred. The case had occurred in Lancashire within the last few months. It was one of a most painful character, and he would refer to it no farther. There were two classes of property which he objected to being dealt with at that hour of the night, one being real property—even real property in Ireland—and the other being married women's property. Both classes of property should be dealt with in a calm mood, and at an early hour—at such an early hour as it could have been considered yesterday if the hon. Member for Glasgow had cared to have it discussed. As the hon. Member had not availed himself of the opportunity he had had of explaining the measure, hon. Members should not be asked to remain out of their beds to take it after midnight. He should give his support to the proposal for the adjournment of the debate.

MR. W. FOWLER said, he should be glad to stay out of his bed for a short time longer, in order to help the hon. Member for Glasgow to pass his Bill to remove a law so abominable as that which at present applied to married women. He hoped the hon. Member would go on with his Bill, and failed to see what good hon. Members opposite could hope to effect by opposing such a valuable measure. These hon. Members were showing themselves the enemies of all married women in the United Kingdom.

MR. GRAY said, that, no doubt, it was a very dreadful example which had been exposed to the House; but trusted that it would not, as usual, be sought to be shown that the monster in the case was an Irishman. He hoped the matter would not be pushed any further, because he did not think it of sufficient importance to justify a division. As a matter of principle, he did not see that because a Bill had been read a second time last Session it should be accepted this year without explanation or discussion. If that doctrine were accepted it would be found to apply to most Bills; but the hon. Member must know that the argument would not hold water. He (Mr. Gray) trusted the Motion for adjournment would not be pressed.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER wished, in the first instance, to express the very strong repugnance which he felt to the transaction of any Business whatever after half-past 12 o'clock at night. In the last Parliament he had made a point of opposing most strongly every measure brought on after that hour, without having regard to whether it applied to England, Ireland, or Scotland. When hon. Members, then, were called on to waive their strong convictions in a matter of this kind, the appeal being made to them on the ground of courtesy, the request should come from those who had established a claim to the courtesy of the Irish Members. He made this observation in the hope that it would convey some instruction in a modest and modified form to some hon. Members of the House. The hon. Member for Glasgow was fighting his side of the question under considerable advantages—namely, under the protection of the married women; and he was sure that his hon. Friend the Member for the

Borough of Wexford (Mr. Healy) would, in deference to them, withdraw his Motion for adjournment.

Dr. COMMINS said, he should have the greatest pleasure in seeing the law as to married women's property amended, not only in regard to Scotland, but also in regard to England and Ireland—if, in the last-named country, any married woman had any property. He knew the difficulties of the subject as well as the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood); and he did not think that a better illustration of the inexpediency of dealing with the matter now could be offered than that contained in the argument of the hon. Member for Glasgow. The hon. Gentleman said that at that late hour of the night they should take the second reading without discussion. When they wished to correct a wrong of any sort they should try to understand what the wrong was. He had not had time to read the Bill of the hon. Member for Glasgow; but it certainly must be a very extraordinary one if it provided a legislative remedy for such cases as the one he had referred to. He (Dr. Commins) knew something about the case; and if ever there was one in which the protection of the Law of Settlement was given to the property of a married woman, it was that. Every penny of Mrs. Birchell's money was in trust under the Law of Settlement; but the husband managed to become possessed of it; in fact, he simply embezzled it. He should like to know what remedy could be provided in the present Bill which was not already embraced in the general Criminal Law. Mr. Birchell, it would be remembered, had been a man who had occupied a very considerable position, being Clerk of the Peace for the County of Lancaster; but, notwithstanding his position, if his offence had been discovered during his lifetime, he would have been amenable to a Court other than any the Bill might propose to provide. He showed the utter inappropriateness of the arguments of the hon. Member for Glasgow in order to point out the necessity for properly protecting discussions of this nature, and for preventing measures from passing without adequate explanation. The matter of the property of married women had been dealt with over and over again, and every successive judicial decision showed the difficulty of the question.

Mr. HEALY said, an appeal had been made to him to withdraw the Motion; but, before he said anything as to that, he should like to point out that although, no doubt, the Bill was printed —["Order!"] He was speaking on the question of withdrawing the Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to make a second speech; but if he desires to explain the grounds on which he proposes to withdraw the Motion, doubtless the House will grant him its indulgence. He is not allowed to make a second speech.

Mr. HEALY said, he would withdraw the Motion in deference to the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power), and not in deference to hon. Members opposite.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time.

Mr. ANDERSON moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee."—(*Mr. Anderson.*)

Mr. BIGGAR: I object to that.

Mr. CALLAN: I have to ask Mr. Speaker, for my own information, whether it is now competent for me to avail myself of the half-past 12 Rule to object to a Motion of which no Notice has been given, and, by so doing, to prevent its being further proceeded with to-night?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) is quite in Order in making the Motion he has submitted to the House.

Mr. CALLAN: Am I to understand that I am also in Order in objecting to it?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in Order in objecting to the Motion of the hon. Member for Glasgow. The Question is, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee."

Mr. CALLAN: I object to the Motion. We have read the Bill a second time to-night—a thing which we could have done yesterday quite as well—and now we are asked to agree to a Motion which is not on the Paper, and to which, therefore, I have had no opportunity of putting down Notice of opposition. The matter has now come within the half-past 12 Rule; and I ask if I am not within my privilege in objecting to any further progress being made at this hour?

MR. SPEAKER: I have already stated that the hon. Member is not in Order in raising the objection that he now does to the further progress of this Bill.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, that as Mr. Speaker had decided the point against the hon. Member for Louth, the only thing for him to do, and for the House to do, was to leave it to the hon. Member for Glasgow whether he ought not to be content with having advanced his Bill a stage. For his own part, he had the greatest sympathy with the hon. Member and all engaged in amending the law in this direction; and if the hon. Member would only consider the matter he must see that it would be to the benefit of the cause he represented that the House should have an opportunity of discussing the Bill a little further. Hon. Members might have Amendments to propose. He assured the hon. Member he entirely sympathized with him.

MR. ANDERSON said, he had been allowed to carry his Bill through the second reading stage only conditionally on his promising to make the Motion to refer it to a Select Committee immediately after. He had, therefore, been bound to make the proposal. The House might object to the Motion; but he had simply fulfilled his pledge. He trusted the House would allow the measure to go before a Select Committee, where its details could be well considered and discussed. No doubt, if any Irish Representative desired to be a Member of the Committee, he would be put on it.

MR. CALLAN said, he wished to ask a question. As he was not in Order in his previous objection, and as he did not hear the promise made to which the hon. Member referred, and as he believed it was not made to the House— ["Order, order!"] He did not mean that the hon. Member had not made the promise; but, under existing circumstances, he felt bound to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HEALY seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Callan.*)

MR. PARNELL said, that as the House had allowed the hon. Member for Glasgow to take the second reading stage, he did not think they could fairly prevent his referring the Bill to a Select Committee. If there was any objection to the measure, it could be expressed by putting Notice of opposition on the Paper a little later on. He did not think there was much to be gained by prolonging the present discussion.

MR. CALLAN said, as it was pointed out to him how he could effectually stop the Bill at the next stage, he would withdraw his Motion; but it should be understood that in acceding to the suggestion of the hon. Member for Cork City, he only did it as an act of courtesy to that hon. Member, and not to the hon. Member for Glasgow.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *committed* to a Select Committee.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

(*Mr. Hinde Palmer, Sir Gabriel Goldney, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Horace Davey.*)

[BILL 50.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. HINDE PALMER, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, expressed his willingness that it should be referred to a Select Committee, together with the Bill of the hon. Member for Glasgow.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Hinde Palmer.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time.

MR. HINDE PALMER moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee."—(*Mr. Hinde Palmer.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *committed* to a Select Committee.

MOTIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (NUMBER OF ELECTORS).

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE moved for a Return showing, with respect to each Parliamentary constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of electors on the registers now in force. The hon. Baronet, referring to a conversation he had had with the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) on the subject of the debate which had taken place yesterday, said, it was the object of the hon. Member to point out, by means of statistics, that there was a different franchise in Ireland from that in England and Scotland, and also that, even given the difference in the franchise, there were certain registration difficulties in Ireland which had been discussed last year——

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Baronet that as there is a Notice of Motion on the Paper with regard to this Motion, although it may not be of a hostile character, still, having regard to the Constitutional Order of this House, I do not think it is competent to the hon. Baronet to proceed with the Motion.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Then I will consult with the hon. Member.

SLIGO BOROUGH RE-ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. SEXTON, Bill to Re-enfranchise the Borough of Sligo, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SEXTON, Mr. D. M. O'CONNOR, Major NOLAN, Dr. COMMINS, and Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR.

MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS QUALIFICATIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ERRINGTON, Bill to alter the Qualifications required for holding certain appointments, and otherwise amend the Medical Act, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ERRINGTON and Mr. ARTHUR MOORE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 60.]

MAINTENANCE OF CHILDREN BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HOPWOOD, Bill to provide a remedy by Law for Married Women against their Husbands neglecting or refusing to maintain and educate their Children, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HOPWOOD and Mr. THOMASSON.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 59.]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 14*th January,* 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee—Report*—Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment * (9).

Third Reading—Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) * (2); Judicial Committee * (3), and *passed.*

ARMY — ARMY RETIREMENT — LORD MORLEY'S COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

EARL BEAUCHAMP asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether the paragraph which appeared within the last few days in the "Times" newspaper, and purported to give the recommendations of Lord Morley's Committee on Army Retirement, was authentic? In the paragraph to which he referred, *The Times,* which was usually well informed in such matters, gave figures showing the number of general officers who were to be retained on the active list under the proposed scheme.

THE EARL OF MORLEY, in reply, said, he was glad to take this opportunity of removing any misapprehension which might have been caused by the insertion of the paragraph alluded to by his noble Friend in *The Times,* a newspaper the information of which was generally extremely accurate. The Committee referred to as "Lord Morley's Committee" was engaged only in inquiring into certain matters relating to regimental officers of the Royal Artillery and the Engineers, and had nothing to do with general officers. The question of the retirement of general officers was now under the attentive consideration of the Secretary of State for War; but as no scheme on the subject had yet been matured, the figures relating to those officers given in the paragraph were not authentic.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

EARL FORTESCUE gave Notice of his intention to ask, Whether Her Majesty's Government will not, for the sake of saving time in a case where every day is of importance, introduce into this House the Bill for the better protection of person and property in Ireland which was stated more than a week ago by Her Majesty's Ministers to be urgently required, now that there seems no immediate prospect of their being able to introduce that Bill into the House of Commons?

IRELAND—LETTER OF H.H. THE POPE TO THE IRISH EPISCOPATE.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

LORD BRAYE said, that some days since there appeared a statement in all the newspapers that a letter had been addressed by His Holiness Leo XIII. to the Irish Episcopate in reference to the deplorable state of things in Ireland. That document was looked forward to with the most profound interest by many in England, as well as other parts of the British Empire, as an indication of the solicitude felt by the Pope for the maintenance of order in Ireland. But for some reason the text of the letter had not appeared in our principal newspapers. Only a *résumé* of it had been before the public. He did not wish to enter upon a topic which naturally suggested itself in connection with this question—namely, the re-establishment of some kind of diplomatic relations between our Government and the Vatican, however unofficial in their character those relations might be; but he did venture to make one remark, and that was that, in the opinion of many whose convictions were entitled to respect, the whole of this miserable agitation among the Irish would have been reduced in its proportions had those relations existed. The medium of advice had been discontinued; and, therefore, the task of imparting that advice had become infinitely more difficult to the Vatican. He wished to learn whether the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs could furnish any information as to the circumstances in which this letter of Leo XIII. was written, and whether the noble Earl wished to make any remark in reference to it. He, therefore, formally asked, Whether the Government have any information respecting a letter said to have been addressed by Pope Leo XIII. to the Archbishop of Dublin on the present state of Ireland; and whether they can state if it is probable that this document will shortly be published?

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, the letter of Pope Leo XIII., referred to by my noble Friend, shows a great interest in the present state of Ireland, and gives, as it seems to me, excellent advice in the interest of religion and of morality to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. It has appeared in the Roman newspapers, the *Osservatore Romano* and the *Aurora*, and I believe it to be authentic. I can, however, give no opinion as to its probable publication in this country. That must depend upon the Court of Rome and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.

House adjourned at a quarter past Five
o'clock, to Monday next,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 14th January, 1881.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Contagious Diseases Acts, *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Landed Proprietors (Ireland)* [63]; Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland)* [61].

First Reading—Sligo Borough Re-enfranchisement* [62].

QUESTIONS.

MINES—EXPLOSIONS IN MINES—APPROPRIATION OF RELIEF FUNDS.

MR. BURT (for Mr. MACDONALD) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been directed to the fact that during the last half-century, for nearly every one of the great explosions in mines, funds were collected to afford relief to the sufferers thereby, but that no public record has been kept in regard to the disposal of such funds; and, if he will direct the Inspectors of Mines in their various districts to make inquiries regarding the disbursement of them; and whether any balance remains?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I am afraid that the Inspectors of Mines have no more authority than other persons to investigate this matter, and obtain the necessary documents. But, at the same time, I do agree with the hon. Member who has asked the Question that it is very desirable that something should be done in this direction. I have caused the Charity Commissioners to be consulted on the subject, and I will read one sentence from the letter of the Chief Commissioner, which I think is to the purpose. He says—

> "Associations supported by voluntary contributions are, unfortunately, specially exempted from our jurisdiction, and I have no doubt this affords the most undesirable immunity to managers and dispensers of voluntary relief funds. I think legislation on this subject is loudly called for, although it would be difficult."

As the law stands, I think such cases as the hon. Member points out are without legal remedy. I do think, however, it would be very desirable if we could arrive at some public audit of these contributions. The subject is well worthy of consideration.

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES OF THE CITY OF LONDON—LEGISLATION.

Mr. CUBITT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is his intention during the present Session to introduce any Bill to provide for the better administration of the Parochial Charities of the City of London?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I observe that my hon. Friend has altered his Question in one very material particular, and that is by omitting the words, "if the state of Public Business will allow." Subject to that condition, I should be very glad to introduce a Bill on the matter; and I think I ought also to mention that I have had under consideration whether, by enlarging the powers of the Charity Commissioners—a thing which is on other grounds desirable—they might not be made available for such a purpose as that indicated.

SOUTH AFRICA—DELAGOA BAY.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that Her Majesty's Government have asked the Portuguese Government to permit the landing of troops and stores at Delagoa Bay; and, if so, whether he could inform the House what answer they have received?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, there is no foundation for the report, and I have reason to believe that Her Majesty's Government have no present intention of making such a request.

POST OFFICE—THE MAILS IN ARGYLLSHIRE.

Lord COLIN CAMPBELL asked the Postmaster General, Whether any arrangement has been made for the transmission of Mails in the northern districts of Argyllshire, in connection with the Oban and Callander Railway; and, if so, whether he will state the arrangement?

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, I am glad to inform my noble Friend, and other Members interested in the districts to which he refers, that I have been able to make arrangements that, I believe, will effect most important improvements in the postal arrangements of these districts. I do not want to trouble the House with details; but two steamers will each week-day leave Oban throughout the year on the arrival of the London mail. This will be about half-past 12 or 1 o'clock. One of these steamers will go to Fort William, calling at intermediate stations, and the other will go to Tobermory, calling at Morven and other places. To show how important is the improvement, I may mention that whereas the London mail now arrives at Fort William at 8 o'clock in the evening, it will arrive at 4 o'clock, and instead of leaving at 5 in the morning it will leave at 9. In regard to other districts the improvements will be still greater. For instance, a letter posted on Tuesday night does not arrive at Morven till Thursday morning. By this arrangement it will arrive at 3 on Wednesday afternoon. These changes will give the whole of these important districts a daily service throughout the winter, whereas now they have only a service once a-week. I have drawn up a table, which I shall be glad to place in the hands of my noble Friend, or any Member interested.

MAGISTRACY (IRELAND).

MR. M'COAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return of the Irish Magistracy, paid and unpaid, showing the religious communions to which they belong, and indicating those members of the body who are landlords, or the agents of landlords, in the counties for which they hold commissions of the peace ?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I do not think I ought to lay upon the Table of the House this Return. I think this would be an impertinent question for anyone to address to me—as to what religious denomination I belong, and I do not think that I would be justified in asking it of the Irish magistracy.

MR. M'COAN said, that in consequence of the answer of the right hon. Gentleman, he gave Notice that he would move for the Return mentioned in the Question.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I have no intention to grant it; and, in fact, the information would not be serviceable. There are many landlords who have only one or two tenants under them.

STATE OF IRELAND—POLICE CONSTABLE QUINN.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether it be true that Police Constable Quinn, who had been found guilty by a coroner's jury of the crime of manslaughter, and who had been committed to trial by the coroner, bail being refused, has since been allowed out on his own recognisances by the Court of Queen's Bench; and, whether he will issue a Circular to the magistrates on the general question of receiving bail ?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Sir, I have not had Notice of this Question ; but I see by the Dublin intelligence in *The Times* of yesterday that the constable was admitted to bail by the Queen's Bench Division in Ireland on his own recognizance, and I therefore believe that the fact is so. It is not my intention, Sir, to issue a Circular to magistrates on the general question of bail.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE LAND LEAGUE — ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE.

THE O'DONOGHUE asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether the members of the Executive Council of the Tralee Land League, who have now been ten days in custody, will be liberated on bail ?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON), in reply, said, he had no information on the subject ; but the case was still at hearing before the magistrates, who, therefore, could deal with the matter.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—THE FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. R. H. PAGET asked the Vice President of the Council, What are the causes of the delay in circulating to local authorities the Order of Council of the 3rd of January, relating to the temporary closing of markets, with the view of preventing the spread of foot and mouth disease ?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, there is no doubt that a delay occurred in circulating the Orders in question, which is much to be regretted. The Orders were passed on the 3rd instant, and gazetted on the 4th, but do not come into operation until the 17th. The printers, who were much pressed with Privy Council work, did not supply the requisite copies till the evening of the 11th, too late for the post. They were, however, posted to all local authorities on the 12th instant.

NAVY—MURDER OF LIEUTENANT BOWER AND HIS BOAT'S CREW.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the Admiralty have official information of the death of the Lieutenant commanding H.M.S. "Sandfly;" and if he will state to the House the circumstances of Lieutenant Bower's unfortunate death, and of the seamen who shared his fate ?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, in reply to the right hon. and gallant Baronet, I may save the time of the House by saying that the painful details of the murder of Lieutenant Bower and his boat's crew which have appeared in the newspapers are confirmed by the official Report which reached the Admiralty. It was a downright murder; and I am glad to say that it was unprovoked by any action deserving of reprobation on the part of the murdered men or of their comrades. In Lieutenant Bower the country has undoubtedly lost a singularly intelligent, energetic, and accomplished officer, who fell in the execution of his duty. He was engaged in the surveying service, which is one of the most useful and honourable functions of the British Navy, and this sad story proves that it is not without its perils. I cannot sit down without expressing the strong approbation with which the conduct of Sub-Lieutenant Bradford was viewed by the commanding officer of the station and by the Board of Admiralty. He is a very young man. His commander, and no small portion of his crew, had been mysteriously murdered. He was left on his own resources among a people who to savage craft and ferocity joined the advantage of possessing and being able to use modern weapons. He did not shrink from responsibility or return to head-quarters for definite orders and larger reinforcements. He would not leave the neighbourhood until he had recovered and buried the bodies of his countrymen, and ascertained, in great minuteness, the circumstances of the tragedy; and nothing but his skill and caution preserved his crew from suffering even more than they did suffer from the enemy's fire while engaged in this most valuable service. On receiving the Report of the Commodore, the First Lord of the Admiralty at once promoted the young man to the rank of lieutenant, and I have very little doubt that the country will hear of him again. When the news came to Sydney, Commodore Wilson, who commands in those waters, acting with promptitude and decision, despatched to the scene of the outrage Her Majesty's Ship *Emerald*, a corvette, commanded by Captain William Maxwell, with a crew of 232 men all told. The instructions given to Captain Maxwell are worthy of note. He is not to inflict that wholesale and sweeping retribution, like the burning of villages, which too often misses the guilty, and, by inflaming resentment, lays the seeds of future outrages. His orders are definite—

> "On arrival, and having satisfied yourself who the murderers are, you are to follow them up wherever they may go, sparing neither time, trouble, nor a legitimate amount of risk to deter you from pursuing them even into the interior of the country, and inflicting upon them the severe punishment they so well deserve."

Captain Maxwell is likewise enjoined very liberally to reward the chief and the leading men of the islanders who protected the life of the only one of our party who escaped. I am glad to be able to conclude by saying that the steps taken by Commodore Wilson have the full approval of Sir Arthur Gordon, the High Commissioner in the Western Pacific, who telegraphs that he has the fullest confidence in Captain Maxwell's discretion.

INSPECTORS OF FISHERIES.

Mr. BIRKBECK asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, and if so when, the vacant appointment of Inspector of Fisheries will be filled up?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that arrangements were being made by which the vacant inspectorship would be filled up.

STATE OF IRELAND—REPRESENTATIONS OF FOREIGN POWERS.

Mr. BIGGAR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question, of which I have given him private Notice. I wish to know Whether any representations have been made to Her Majesty's Government by the Government of the United States, or of any other Foreign State, as to the present unsatisfactory condition of Ireland, and the sufferings of the Irish people, owing to the tyranny of the landlords who have been supported by the English Government, as represented by an incompetent Chief Secretary? ["Order!"] I wish further to ask, If it is true, as reported, that the Sultan has intimated that he intends to send his Fleet to the West Coast of Ireland to assist England in perpetuating the present state of things. ["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that the Question, in its present form, cannot be put. It must be amended and brought to the Table of the House in order to be placed upon the Notice Paper.

Mr. BIGGAR: Then I beg to give Notice that I will repeat the Question, in an amended form, on Monday.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SEVENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

At the end of paragraph 9, to add the words "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. SYNAN expressed his regret at the absence through illness of the Prime Minister during the continuance of the debate. They all knew that the Government had been repeatedly urged by the Members of the Opposition to propose measures of coercion for Ireland. The question now before the House appeared to him to be simply a Constitutional one, and he was glad that the Chief Commissioner of Works had cleared away the uncertainty that his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) laboured under with respect to the proposals of the Government, when the right hon. Gentleman stated that the measures to be proposed were substantially suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and some modifications of trial by jury. Now, according to Burke and Fox, who were, he trusted, still regarded as Constitutional authorities by the Government, or, at all events, by the Radical Members, it was unconstitutional to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, except in the case of treasonable conspiracy. The Returns laid on the Table did not disclose any such conspiracy; and he denied that either the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act or of trial by jury would contribute to the removal of the evil or disorders from which Ireland was at present suffering. Though force might be remedy for treason, it was no remedy for social disorders such as those which at present arose from the state of the Irish Land Laws. These must be met, and could only be met, by remedial measures. He had always refused to go beyond Constitutional means for alleviating the miseries under which the peasantry of Ireland, or at least three-fourths of them, were now suffering; and to those Constitutional means his hon. Friends near him, he believed, intended to adhere. The Returns of crime in Ireland which had been laid on the Table were voluminous. He had compared those statistics for the past year with those of previous years; and although the number of agrarian crimes in 1880 were beyond the average of other years since 1844, yet the number of the high agrarian crimes, such as homicide, murder, and offences of that character, fell below six or eight of those years, and were not much above the rest of those years. He admitted that in regard to threatening letters, intimidation, and the taking possession of farms, there was an excess over the other years; but he asked, and he hoped he should get an answer to the question, what remedy would the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act afford against threatening letters and similar offences? They had heard the jest about burning a house to roast an egg. The suspension of the Constitution to check the sending of threatening letters and notices was an equally absurd proceeding. In England the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act would not be resorted to for the suppression of these crimes; and it was clear that if the existing laws were not sufficient for their repression, the proper course was to make these laws more stringent, and not to abrogate the Constitutional rights of the Irish people. No stronger argument against the course which the Government proposed to take could, indeed, be adduced than the admission of the Chief Secretary that if the present law could be enforced it would be sufficient. It was true the right hon. Gentleman said that the law could not be enforced, because evidence could not be got, and juries would not convict. But how would the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act procure evidence or get verdicts? It was clear that the object of such a measure was not to prevent or punish outrages such as those enumerated on the Returns on the Table, but to enable the Government to seize the leaders of the land agitation. Was this the time when such an application should be made to the House? Those leaders were now on their trial before an Irish jury; and, pending that trial, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act ought not to be applied for to the House. If the traversers were acquitted by an Irish jury, would the Executive Government, nevertheless, suspend the Constitution and put them in gaol? Would not the effect of that be most alarming as regarded the maintenance of law and order? As to the agitation in Ireland, it was Constitutional, or it was not. If the former, it ought not to be interfered with; if the latter, it was a ground for applying redress to the grievances complained of. It was said by the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) that an attempt was being made to "Boycott" the Whigs; but the real attempt at "Boycotting" was made by the Opposition on the Prime Minister. The Opposition had gained this by their "Boycotting"—they had forced the hands of the Government to put coercive measures on the Table of the House instead of remedial measures. Why was that done? He believed the Government would yet regret it. The Irish people, from their long suffering and their grievous disappointments, were naturally suspicious. Ministers had often been unfaithful to them. He had no suspicion of the Prime Minister. He had no doubt that what the Prime Minister did he would do openly and above-board. But that was not what the Opposition wanted. They wanted the Government to pass coercive measures first for the purpose of crushing public opinion, in order afterwards to make the Land Bill weak and valueless. It was time for the Government to free themselves from the difficulty in which they were placed by the aid of the Opposition. It was time for them, and he hoped it would be done as soon as the Prime Minister was able to take his seat on the Treasury Bench, and he hoped that would be on Monday, to disclose what was the character of the Land Bill which the Government proposed to bring in. Surely the Government might have introduced the Land Bill and the Coercive Bill, if there was to be one, contemporaneously. Why could they not put the Report of their Land Commission on the Table, and state how far they were disposed to go? He was a party to the Land Act of 1870; but all his attempts to extend and improve the Bill in that year were defeated. He could not see the crime of giving advice such as they had heard of with regard to providing for their own special necessities to the tenants. He admitted that the Irish people were indebted to Providence for a bountiful harvest; but that bountiful harvest could not deprive the peasantry of the West of Ireland of the terrors of the famine which last year produced upon their mind; and he contended that it was hard to fix it as a criminal or immoral act upon those people that they endeavoured to keep something out of the rent as a defence against future visitations of that kind. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman the junior Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) knew the circumstances of the tenantry of the country, he would not accuse them of immorality or greed for what they had done. An accusation of greed might much more appropriately be brought against such of the landlords in the West and South-West of Ireland as tried to extort rack-rents from their poor tenants, than against those tenants who offered to pay Griffith's valuation. He knew there were cases in Ireland where people had not paid their rents who were perfectly able to do so; but where was the movement, either political or religious, that ever existed in which cases of that kind did not occur? To his mind, the course of the Government was plain; it was to apply remedial measures to the admitted grievances of Ireland. What was the cause of threatening letters and refusals to pay rent but the bad Land Laws of the country? The people were justified in the course they had taken by what had happened during the last 12 months. The Prime Minister ought to have adopted a different course from that which he had chosen, and he had a great authority for doing so. Sir Robert Peel had said—

> "You must break up this formidable conspiracy against the British Government. I believe you cannot break it up by force; but you may do so by kindness, forbearance, and generosity."

He commended those words to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. Let them try those remedial measures first, and, if they failed, then apply coercion. Until they did that, to put down Constitutional agitation in Ireland, and to apply to the Irish peasant loss of home and liberty, and to put him into gaol by the ukase of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, was a practical severance of the allegiance of the Irish people to the Constitution of this country. The only effect of this coercion had been to put men into prison. Coercion could not try men, nor procure evidence against them. Why should the Government put into goal persons who were constitutionally agitating for the removal of their grievances? Suppose a state of things like that existing at the present time in Ireland existed in the cotton districts of England — suppose the operatives in those districts refused to give up the cottages and gardens let to them by their employers and struck for higher wages, would the Habeas Corpus Act be suspended? Why, no Government which proposed such a step could endure for 24 hours. But in Ireland, during the last 80 years, that Act had been suspended for 30 years. He would give the years since Catholic Emancipation during which the Act had been suspended. It was suspended from 1833 to 1835, from 1843 to 1844, from 1846 to 1848, from 1866 to 1870, and also in 1871. The English people had conquered their Constitution. Would they submit to its being suspended every 10 years? Ireland was to be the *corpus vile* of such an experiment. No doubt, the state of things in Ireland was very bad. He could not sympathize with some of the acts that had been done; but for all those acts the hon. Member for Cork ought not, in his opinion, to be held responsible. To expect that the starving peasantry of Ireland, or even the middle class, could be kept in prison was entirely out of the question. That was a forcible argument for hon. Members opposite not giving the sanction of their votes to such a measure as that of the Government until remedial measures had been adopted. The consequence of giving coercion before remedial measures would be that public opinion would be crushed in Ireland, and that the Land Laws would not be radically amended. Ten months ago the Irish people were in the pangs of hunger, and they had scarcely emerged from the midst of that famine when a Bill was brought in by the present Government—the Compensation for Disturbance Bill—amending the Act of 1870. That Bill, after being carried by large majorities in that House, went up to "another place," and it was rejected by something like five to one. What was the language used by the Prime Minister in the passage of that Bill through the House? The Prime Minister said that the Irish people were within a measurable distance of civil war; and the Chief Secretary declared that he would not be responsible for the government of Ireland if the Bill was rejected. What did the Government do on its rejection? They accepted their defeat; but what was the result? The people of Ireland rose *en masse.* Then his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) told the Irish people not to rely upon the British Government, but upon themselves. In that way his hon. Friend ascended to the height of his present eminence. His word was now law in Ireland. Who had made it law? None other than the landlords of England and Scotland—the action of the Opposition, and the imbecility and weakness of the Government. It had been said by a great man that no government could long be carried on in a state of siege. They might govern Ireland in a state of siege; but how long would they be able to do so? Grievances were acknowledged to exist. Let them be redressed, and then peace and prosperity would return to Ireland. It had been said that his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City did not desire a settlement of the Land Question. That statement he believed to be a calumny. But if it were true, the responsibility of the Government was all the greater. If the Government wished to have peace, and order, and prosperity in Ireland, the best mode they could adopt for the purpose of bringing that about was to stop their Coercion Bills, and to pass a Bill that should lay in Ireland a foundation for the permanent settlement of the Land Question; then happiness and prosperity would soon return.

MR. DILLWYN said, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had last night referred to the limited confidence he had in the proposals of the Government in reference to the affairs of Ireland; but it appeared to him that the Government, in the course they were about to pursue, were taking the only course they could properly and rightly adopt. The Solicitor General for Ireland, in the able speech which he had recently delivered to the House, stated the grounds on which Her Majesty's Government had decided to bring in this measure, and it appeared to him that they had made out an unanswerable case. ["No, no!"] The responsibility for such a measure, resting, as it would, on the shoulders of Her Majesty's responsible Advisers, to feel compelled to have recourse to such a measure must cause them even more pain and grief than it would hon. Members of the House. They all regretted that legislation of this character should be necessary; but he was bound to say he could not see how it was to be avoided. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), and other hon. Members on the Irish Benches, had declared that the extent of crime in Ireland had been grossly exaggerated, though he did not consider they had made out a very strong case. A great deal of positive evidence required a vast amount of negative evidence to upset it; and the House had had comparatively little evidence of a negative character, as against overwhelming affirmative evidence. The Home Rulers did not even agree among themselves very well. Some did not think there had been much outrage, others treated the matter as a practical joke, while it was also admitted that a reign of terror did prevail in some parts of Ireland. The speeches of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork in the House had, he would further remind hon. Members, been very different to the utterances he addressed in Ireland to excited Leaguers. ["No, no!"] It should, however, be borne in mind that he spoke under different circumstances; surrounded, as he was, by excited mobs, he was undoubtedly led away by the excitement of the moment to say that which he did not intend to say, and what, too, he would not say in that House.

Mr. PARNELL: Will the hon. Member tell me what it was I said in Ireland that I would not say in this House?

Mr. DILLWYN reminded the hon. Member that he had said at an earlier stage of the debate—

"That at several meetings which he addressed, up to the time when the Chief Secretary sent extra constabulary into Mayo and Galway, he reprobated outrage and crime, and endeavoured to urge the people to act in a Constitutional manner."

He wished to contrast this with what the hon. Member was reported to have said at a meeting held after the murder of Mr. Boyd in August. The substance of what the hon. Member said was that such proceedings would not have been necessary if the organization which the hon. Member had promoted so successfully since had been in existence. Well, those words seemed to him to contain nothing else than an incentive to crime, and a justification and excuse for the foul and atrocious murder which had been perpetrated. At all events, the tone of those words was very different from the tone of those used by the hon. Member for the City of Cork in the House of Commons. He could not sit down without alluding to a circumstance which occurred in the debate on Tuesday, when, with astonishment, indignation, and disgust, he heard the allusions of the Solicitor General for Ireland to the murder of Lord Mountmorres greeted with derisive laughter from Home Rule Members opposite. A gentleman some time ago had told him that he was on the spot where that murder was committed very soon after the occurrence, and that he saw some of the peasantry trampling in triumph in the fresh blood of Lord Mountmorres. It was a friend of his who had seen this. [*Cries of* "Name!"] He could not give the name, for it would not be safe to do so. Under the Land League, terrorism and excommunication had reached a pass which made it very unsafe to name people in connection with such a matter as he had described. He might, however, state that his informant was an Englishman.

Mr. PARNELL: I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether the hon. Member for Swansea is entitled, on the authority of an anonymous person, whose name he refuses to give, to calumniate the Irish nation? It has been proved that the people who trampled in the blood of Lord Mountmorres were English soldiers and not Irish peasants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Swansea is perfectly in Order.

Mr. DILLWYN denied that they were English soldiers who trampled on the blood of Lord Mountmorres; they were, as he had already told the House, Irish peasants. The person who gave him the information was one who could be relied upon; and the derisive cheers they heard from certain Irish Members on the other side of the House were a fitting commentary on the incident he had mentioned. The Government, in his opinion, were bound to ask for greater powers than they possessed at present. They had very little alternative what course to pursue. They must either let matters drift on as they were—they had allowed them already to drift too far—and if they permitted them to continue it would inevitably lead to bloodshed and civil war, or they could hand over the rule of Ireland to the Land League. God, however, forbid that any country forming an integral part of the British Empire should ever be handed over to the tender mercies of such a body of men as the Irish Land League! What else, then, could they do but ask Parliament to strengthen their hands in the present emergency? Then, again, they could adopt repressive measures; and the question was, What was the nature of the proposals the Government intended to submit to the House? The Prime Minister was a man who would never lend himself to unnecessary repression of the rights of the people, but was always in favour of giving the poor man the utmost liberty. He had watched the career of the much-maligned Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. W. E. Forster), and he did not believe that there was a Member of the House who possessed a more humane disposition, and who more objected to repressing the liberties of the people unnecessarily, than the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Was the senior right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) the man who would lend his sanction or presence to any measure which would trespass upon the rights of the people, unless he saw a necessity for it? He had no doubt that the right hon. Member did see a necessity for it with regard to Ireland. He, therefore, had every confidence in the Government, and he hoped that they would not have many deserters on that side of the House. He had such confidence in the Government that he was satisfied that any measure they might bring forward would be less prejudicial to the liberty of the people, and less dangerous to the Constitution of the country, than the reign of terrorism and tyranny of the Land League.

MR. MULHOLLAND was happy to say that he represented a large constituency devotedly attached to the Constitution and to the union of Ireland with Great Britain, in which they resembled the majority of the inhabitants of the Province in which they lived. His constituents viewed with alarm and abhorrence the progress of the Revolutionary Party in Ireland, and welcomed the prospect, of the long-wished-for day, of some measure which would restore security to life and property. He did not intend to go into a discussion of the many subjects which had been brought forward in the course of the debate; the question before the House was, "What is the condition of Ireland? and, if that condition be intolerable, is there any reasonable hope that it can be remedied, and without the concession of some additional powers to the Executive?" Ireland was in the position of a patient suffering from a violent attack of fever, in whose case a physician would not consider the *regimen* that would be suitable in a state of health, but the best means of subduing the fever. On that ground he would not say what measure, in his opinion, would be for the ultimate welfare of Ireland; but he would rather address himself for the moment to the existing state of things. Since this debate commenced many hard words had been used against the Irish landlords; but the House should remember that the alleged misdoings of the landlords of Ireland had only been charged against them, and they had never been proved. Therefore, it was not too much to suspend its judgment until the defence had been heard; and he, for one, should be surprised if, when all the facts were fully investigated, it would be found that the majority of Irish landlords were distinguished for justice and liberality in the management of their estates. He would not say anything in reference to the question whether the Government had or had not a share in bringing about the existing state of things, beyond remarking that there was a general feeling of irritation among those who had been suffering from the reign of terror at the apparent apathy with which it had been regarded by those to whom they had a right to look for protection; and they felt, also, that but for the indiscretions of speech of some Ministers, and indecision of actions of others, things would not have reached their present position. There was, however, scarcely any position of affairs or current of events out of which good might not come; and, in the present case, it was pretty clear that the Government had seen the error of their ways and intended to amend their errors. Now, what was the condition of Ireland? Every unprejudiced man must have been convinced by the speech of the Solicitor General for Ireland what the real condition of the country was. Now, with respect to the facts, the statistics which had been brought forward must have convinced most people that the matter was not coloured; but, even supposing it was, it would only show, to his mind, taking into consideration the condition of Ireland in other respects, how completely the Land League had got possession of the people. Where there was no antagonism there could be no field for violence, and figures had clearly shown that there were in Ireland a large number of persons under police protection, in addition to which a considerable number of persons had been compelled to leave that country on account of threats of personal violence. They had abundant evidence of this, which showed that the Land League had "made a solitude and called it peace." They had been told that there was less crime of a serious character in Ireland than at former periods; but he had yet to learn that forcible appropriation of another person's property without payment did not come under the description of crime of a serious character. That these things could be done without resistance, either on the part of the individuals wronged or of the State, was only a proof of how completely society and the law had been paralyzed in Ireland. They had been told this was excusable, because it was done in obedience to an unwritten law which had its sanction in public opinion—a law which ought to have supremacy over the law of the State, for the reason that in making the laws of the State the Irish people had no voice. They had, therefore, an opportunity of seeing what sort of law would be enacted by hon. Members below the Gangway if they happened to possess legislative power. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had told the House that the tenants of Ireland did not object to pay rent at all, but were only prepared to pay a fair rent; but on this point they had been told by the hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham) that payment of rent had been withheld in cases where the landlords were willing to accept less than Griffith's valuation. If it was once left to the debtor to say how much he would pay, and the law was powerless to compel him to pay more, the debtor would very soon enlarge his ideas as to how much he should deduct, and he might say—"If I may deduct one-third, why should I not deduct two-thirds—in short, why should I pay anything at all?" As to public opinion, he denied that there was any freedom of opinion in Ireland at all; and the opinion spoken of was only the opinion of a class whose cupidity had been inflamed by the harangues of the hon. Gentleman and his followers. He admitted that he had no personal experience of the state of affairs in the disturbed districts, because, fortunately for himself, he lived among a loyal people, to the majority of whom too much praise could not be given for the firmness with which they had hitherto resisted the enormous temptations thrown in their way to draw them into this movement. On Thursday last, the very day on which this debate commenced, there was a Land League meeting held in the immediate neighbourhood of the town which he represented, and at this meeting the chief speaker was Mr. Davitt, who might be accepted by the House as at least an equal authority with the hon. Member for the City of Cork with respect to the objects of the League. The speech of Mr. Davitt offered a most amusing contrast to that which was being delivered in the House by the hon. Member for the City of Cork about the same time. These gentlemen seemed to carry about with them a complete stage wardrobe, and to change their characters and dresses in accordance with the place at which they appeared, and the audiences they saw before them. The last speaker alluded to the difference between the speeches delivered by the hon. Member for Cork in Ireland and in that House. Now, he did not speak in respect to outrages, for he did not accuse the hon. Member of having stimulated outrage; but those who in Ireland heard the hon. Member excusing the present agitation, and advocating the expulsion of the landlord class, would scarcely have recognized him the other night addressing in dulcet tones the Members below the Gangway, and endeavouring to show that the whole question related solely to a matter of £5,000,000 or so rent a-year. The credulity of Moses in effecting his famous transaction as to the gross of green spectacles would be required to believe that.

MR. PARNELL: If the hon. Member—[" Order, Order!"]—I do not know——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Downpatrick is in possession of the House; but, of course, if he chooses to give way, it is in his discretion. If, however, the hon. Member for Downpatrick does not choose to give way, he is entitled to proceed with his speech.

MR. PARNELL again rose amid cries of "Order!"

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Downpatrick is in possession of the House, and is entitled to proceed to the end of his address without interruption. If the hon. Member for the City of Cork desires to make any explanation regarding the statements of the hon. Member for Downpatrick, he will be in Order in doing so at the conclusion of the address of the hon. Member now in possession of the House.

MR. MULHOLLAND said, that if he was wrong in stating that the speech to which he had referred had for its object to persuade the House that the whole question was one as to about £5,000,000 of rent a-year, he must apologize to the hon. Member; but, so far as he recollected the speech, that certainly was the impression it left on his mind. However, he would not pursue the matter further. Well, if the system that he alluded to of acting in many parts was to be successful, there ought certainly to be more concert between the players; and he would read a few extracts from a speech delivered by Mr. Davitt at the time the hon. Member for Cork City was assuring the House that the Land League and the tenants were perfectly willing to accept Griffith's valuation as a fair basis of rent. Mr. Davitt was haranguing the farmers of the County Down, and scouting the idea that they ought to accept Griffith's valuation. He said that Griffith's valuation was a rack-rent in Ulster—that they themselves should be the judges of the rent they should pay. He appealed to them to know what the rent should be; and when there were cries of "Five shillings an acre," he offered no word of contradiction. Mr. Davitt added—and, lest he should misrepresent him in any way, he would read the words Mr. Davitt used—

> "What would be the basis of a fair rent in Ireland? If you consider Griffith's valuation fair in Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, I say Griffith's valuation is a rack-rent in Ulster, and that the sturdy tenant farmers of the North of Ireland should show their opposition to any such basis for a so-called rent."

That was to say, that if rents were in that part of Ireland low now, their lowness should not be taken as a reason why they should not be reduced. He went on—

> "I deny that any tribunal can be appointed in Ireland by the English House of Commons, which is crowded by English and Irish landlords, which could define what a fair rent is—such a rent as could be accepted as fair by the Irish tenant farmers."

Griffith's valuation could not, therefore, be regarded by the tenant farmers of Ulster as a fair rent; they were themselves to be the judges of the rent they should pay; and a chief element in the calculation was, apparently, to be the dissatisfaction of the landlord. Mr. Davitt further said that even if the rent were so settled now it would only be a temporary settlement, to be followed by a subsequent reduction, probably in a short time. He said—

> "If the rent so fixed to-day should be considered a fair rent by the tribunal to be appointed under the Land Act, how do we know that the struggling farmers will be able 12 months hence, or five years hence, to pay it?"

The object of that was clear. It was to prevent any settlement being a final one. Mr. Davitt said with respect to the forthcoming Land Bill—

> "I say that the Land League has compelled them to do this, has wrung from them this miserable concession, whatever it is, to-day; and whether it is good to the Irish people or not, all that is good in it must be credited to the action of the Irish National Land League."

He hoped that Her Majesty's Government would see how useless and vain it would be to make any concession in the hope of conciliating the leaders of the Land League. In fact, they could never be conciliated, because if they were to admit that they were satisfied it would be equal to the extinction of their trade. There was one extract he should like, before he concluded, to read to hon. Members opposite, who appeared to show some symptoms of sympathy occasionally with the Land League. It ran thus—

> "Of course, society and its code declared that your superfluous earnings would be better spent in providing luxuries for the landlord class than in purchasing health and substantial food for your children; but the people of Ireland have resolved to the contrary, and have made up their minds that they will continue this agitation until, having produced wealth, they will be allowed the privilege of enjoying that wealth, as is the case of every other civilized country in the world. This system of land monopoly and rack-renting that has obtained in Ireland in the past is the fundamental injustice from which every other injustice follows, and is a reason why the producer of wealth is condemned to poverty while the non-producer of wealth can live in luxury, while the miserable cabin is erected on one side of the palace."

That was an attempt to set the poor against the rich by a comparison of the inequality in their position, and a suggestion to them to take from the rich because they were rich. It was simply Communism. The contrast between the cabin and the palace might be found in London—perhaps even in Birmingham as well as in London—and it was not in Ireland alone that the non-producer obtained a share of the produce. The fact was, that the agitation and the principle advocated in Ireland were a mixture of revolution and Communism. Some of the leaders of the agitation, perhaps, desired political change for its own sake; but the majority desired political change merely to subvert the structure of society, and all of them looked to the Land Question as being merely a prelude to something more. The Land Question was taken up merely to secure a following. It was found that the people of Ireland did not care much for Home Rule; but it was believed they would appreciate a change to be brought about by the Land League, which would enable them to share £5,000,000 or so a-year, with a prospect that that sum might be afterwards increased to £15,000,000. The only other question he would suggest to the House was this—Was there any prospect that this condition of affairs could now be remedied without granting to Her Majesty's Government additional powers? The Prime Minister, at the Guildhall, on the 9th of November, said that he was only waiting for the necessity for such additional powers to be demonstrated. He could not help thinking that if the right hon. Gentleman had lived in Ireland he would have had that demonstration long ago. Certainly those who lived in Ireland had no doubt on the subject. It appeared to them surprising that the peculiar character of the conspiracy should have been disregarded so long. But now it was the duty of them all to forget the past in the present, and to join in doing whatever might be required to do away with such an intolerable condition of affairs. He was sure that the Conservative Party would give their united assistance to Her Majesty's Government in passing whatever measures they might think necessary. What they had a right to ask was that what would be proposed would be adequate and effectual; and he was glad to say that they had in the speech of the noble Marquess the other night a guarantee that that would be the case. They were in the midst of a great crisis—one of the turning points in the history of a nation where two courses offered, and where upon the choice made depended the destiny of the country. He did not believe it was too much to say that upon the vigour shown now by Her Majesty's Government depended the peace, the happiness, and the prosperity, not only of Ireland, but of Great Britain—perhaps of the whole Empire.

Mr. SEXTON said, he quite agreed that they had now reached a period in connection with Ireland when two courses diverged, and upon the course the Government now took would depend the future credit of Liberalism in Ireland, and would depend, he believed, for many a year the peace and prosperity of that country. The question at issue was whether the great bulk of the Irish people—the tenant farmers and the labourers of Ireland—should be enabled to carry a reform of the law to maintain themselves in comfort in their own country? If, instead of proceeding to enact remedial measures at a time when the people were suffering intensely, they proceeded to limit the liberties of the people—if they began at the wrong end of the question—they would enter upon the wrong one of the two courses which were before them, and they would set out on a course every path upon which would remove them further and further from wise government and true statesmanship. He would not follow the quotations which had just been made from the speeches of Mr. Davitt. Mr. Davitt was a man competent to defend himself against any attack made on his arguments in that House or elsewhere. The remarks of Mr. Davitt with regard to Griffith's valuation were delivered at an Ulster meeting; and it was well known to every man who had studied, even in a casual way, the merits of the Land Question in Ireland, that Griffith's valuation in Ulster did not stand on the same basis which it occupied in the other Provinces of Ireland, and that it could be indubitably shown that Griffith's valuation in many instances meant rack-renting. Some hon. Gentlemen had, in the course of the debate, thought it necessary and desirable to indulge in a method of reference to his hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell) which was unusual in the House. His demeanour, his tone, and even his very garb, had been made the subject of more or less humour and sarcastic observations in the House. It had been said by the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gibson) that his hon. Friend addressed the House "in bated breath and whispering humbleness." He did not know what metaphorical or literal meaning was intended by that phrase; but his experience taught him that "bated breath," a very moderate tone of voice, might be sufficient to fill the House of Commons, but it would not be sufficient to find its way to the ears of 20,000 people gathered in a field in Ireland. The arguments of his hon. Friend, when carefully examined, would be found to have lost nothing by his moderation, or manner, or by the gravity or collectedness of the tone in which he had addressed himself to this Assembly. The Irish people believed that his hon. Friend had much of the nature and much of the capacity of statesmanship, and that no occasion ever occurred to which he could not rise. He (Mr. Sexton) wondered if the right hon. and learned Gentleman in addressing an Orange meeting in Belfast—or, to refer to a more eminent instance, if the illustrious man who was at the head of the Government, in addressing a mass meeting in the county of Mid Lothian—used the same tone, and appealed to the same considerations, that he relied on in that House. He had heard with regret and pain the speech of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), who was supposed to represent whatever was fair and manly, democratic and progressive, in the people of England. It might have been hoped that so experienced a Parliamentarian and politician, before proceeding to fling so horrifying an imputation against a people as that contained in his reference to the blood of the ill-fated Lord Mountmorres, would have taken the same care to ascertain the truth of his statement that he would have taken if the matter were one dealing only with private life and the character of an individual. The hon. Member for Westmeath had testified, with regard to it, that those who cut away the congealed blood of that unfortunate nobleman were not Irish peasantry, but British soldiers on furlough, and not in uniform; and Mr. Mills, artist, Dublin, had been named as a witness, while no name was given in support of contrary statements. The debate, however, had not been entirely without its cheering incidents. He heard with pleasure and gratitude the speech of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. A. Arnold). It was not to-day, or yesterday, that the hon. Member for Salford had proved his sympathy in the cause of the sufferings of the Irish people, and his earnest desire to defend the cause of human liberty and progress. It was with more than ordinary pleasure that he listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh), and for the reason that he declared his intention to vote against the Government, not only because of his own honest conviction on the subject of popular liberty, but because he had received a special mandate from his constituency to vote with the Irish Members on this occasion. That was a proof, if proof were needed, of the strong feeling which prevailed in England that rents could not be collected in Ireland if they could not reasonably be paid. He (Mr. Sexton) complained of the many attempts made in England to incite opposition to the demand now made by the Irish people. He held in his hand one of the illustrated and satirical papers which were published in London, and which did so much to frame public opinion. This paper contained a cartoon which exhibited Mr. Bull setting on a bulldog, wearing a collar inscribed "Martial law," upon a number of rats, whose backs bore initials supposed to indicate Irish Members. The bulldog of martial law had between his teeth a rat, marked "P——l," designating, he thought, very clearly his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Martial law, too, had one of his jaws upon a rat, marked "B——r," designating, of course, his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). Another rat, marked "F——n," intended to designate the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Finigan), was making a furious attempt to climb a wall and escape. Another rat, marked "D——n," to designate the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), was supposed to be lying dead; while the identity of a rat marked "S——n" was doubtful, it lying between himself and the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. T. D. Sullivan). Such productions might have their comic aspect; but the scoundrel who devised the cartoon, and the base instrument who executed it, knew that it would act as an incentive to public opinion in England in a way which would be fatal to the free discussion of this question. This cartoon would, perhaps, be the only argument on the question which would reach the eyes of many of the readers of this paper. [*Cries of* "Name!"] The name of the paper was the appropriate one of *Moonshine.* Although the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) struck all round in his speech, still he came to the conclusion that the landlord system in Ireland could no longer be maintained, and, in the interest of the people, ought to be finally got rid of. He felt he should not be discharging his duty to the House if he did not refer to the speech of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry), and, in doing so, he could say that he was not only expressing his own views, but the views of those who sent him to Parliament. Since Parliament rose he had attended six meetings on this Land Question; and whatever he said might be accepted as the conclusions arrived at at those meetings. He could not, however, say quite the same of the hon. Member for Galway, for since the House rose last year that hon. Member had held no communication with his constituents in public meeting upon the subject. Whatever he said on this question might have some weight, because of his own influence and ability; but not because it expressed the sentiments of those who sent him to that House before the question of Land Reform reached its present state of development. He blamed the Irish Members for not having confidence in the Government of Her Majesty; but how did the Government seek to merit the confidence of the Irish Members? In the first place, they doubled the subsidy which the Conservative Government gave to the Irish landlords. The Irish tenants were in a state of bankruptcy, the Irish labourers were starving, and the Government of England adopted the very strange and illogical system of lending money, not to the people in need, but to those who had brought them to that condition. The next thing they did was to refuse to place a tenant farmer on the Land Commission appointed to inquire into the Land Question. Until other reasons were given for confidence, he thought they would be justified in withholding it. He was shocked to hear the hon. Member for Galway say that there were secret committees connected with the Land League. He might reply to that statement by appealing to the speech of the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland. The Land League was a public body, a public organization, and was public in every part of its proceedings. He could not commend the fairness of the hon. Member in thus referring to a body, the principal members of which had been brought within the purview of the judicial authorities of the country; nor could he admire the good taste with which he suggested to the Government the statutory means by which they might embarrass a patriotic movement. The right hon. and learned Members for the University of Dublin had taken a prominent part in this debate. Politically, those Gentlemen might be described as waiters on Providence, Providence taking the form of their own Party; and, no doubt, they felt that stronger and more positive form of gratitude, which had been well described as a lively sense of favours to come. The senior Member for the University (Mr. Plunket) had excited some amusement by referring to Jack Cade. Well, he would only say that the edifice of British freedom was a very composite structure that had been raised by men of very different sorts, and by some who might be described, in the slang of the day, as "queer characters;" and he was not sure that among them might not be included Jack Cade. The point was, that Jack Cade wished the people of England to follow him as King, and the right hon. and learned Member drew some parallel between Jack Cade and the League of the Irish people at the present time. Well, if affection and confidence constituted Kingship, his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork was practically King of Ireland before the land movement was started. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members opposite might laugh; but the fact still remained. His course of conduct, courageous and high-principled, had won for him affection such as was seldom given to Monarchs. But if they were to quote Shakspeare, why should they confine themselves to Jack Cade? Why should they not refer to an eminent Hebrew, to whom, for want of the knowledge of his prenomen, he must refer to as Shylock? Shylock would have his pound of flesh, he refused to be bought out, he conspired against the life of a citizen, and, in the end, his goods were confiscated. If the Irish landlords continued to play the part of Shylock, they might, in the pursuit of their tyrannous policy, find themselves treated as enemies of the public rights, and though not treated as harshly as Shylock was, they would, doubtless, be dealt with harshly enough to enable the Irish people to emancipate themselves from their grasp. A lady lawyer intervened on behalf of the defendant, and stated his case with an ability which reflected more lustre upon her Profession than some of the male lawyers did upon theirs in the House of Commons. With regard to the general subject, the speeches and silence of Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench had been equally painful. Five speeches had been delivered by Cabinet Members, and in every one of them was matter to which the Irish people might rightfully object. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), and the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain), had publicly committed themselves to what he considered an indubitably rational view in the present case. They said that the remedy of intolerable grievances should precede the use of force. He thought the House would be curious to know how they justified the silence by which they gave a tacit consent to the case of their Colleagues on the Land Question, which practically reversed the thesis which so short a time ago they had placed before the public. He desired to speak with the most profound respect of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. He believed Ireland had never a better, abler, or more high-minded friend; but he regretted that influence should have been brought to bear on him to induce him to sit silently by while a case opposite to that which he so short a time ago advocated was being enacted into law. The speech of the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland was merely an endless string of extracts, selected for a special purpose, and resembled more that part of the French Criminal Law—namely, the Act of Accusation—which all Englishmen so heartily condemned. But the speech of all others which would be read with pain and indignation in Ireland was that of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India. He was not surprised at the time; but he said that the tone of that speech would better fit him for a position of rule in India as it was a century ago than to take a part in discussions on such an era as the present was—our present ideas of respect for public liberty and the respect and consideration which were due to the Representatives of the Irish people. One day the noble Marquess, whose tone appeared so much to charm a part of the British democracy, might, perhaps, adorn "another place;" but so long as he maintained that tone in that House, he would embarrass the course of his Government. If the Government wished to rid themselves of obstacles arising from personal want of judgment in dealing with public affairs, he thought they would do well to come to the conclusion that the affairs of India and of Ireland put together were too much for the intellect of the noble Marquess, and that he had much better devote the whole of his powerful intelligence to the affairs of India while these debates continued. A word or two about some passages in the speech of the noble Marquess. The noble Marquess said that there was no proof that the Irish people, as it had been asserted, were accomplices in the state of crime which was now prevailing; and that it appeared to him it was hon. Members opposite who took the same view as the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell), who drew an indictment against a nation of whom 99 in 100 disapproved what was being done. A more extraordinary statement he never read in the speech of anyone in the position of a statesman or professing to be a trained and practical politician. How could it be alleged that his hon. Friends near him held the Irish people responsible? Were they not there to say that the people of Ireland had nothing to do with these crimes? But because of 2,500 crimes in a country of 5,500,000 people, the Government were endeavouring to destroy at a blow the liberties of those 5,500,000. For every outrage committed they proposed to place at the mercy of the servants of the State the liberties of between 2,000 and 3,000 people. What was that but making the whole body of the people responsible for crimes of which they had no knowledge? Who were the champions of the Irish people in that House but those who said that the ordinary law had been used incompetently, if not feebly, and that it ought to be put in force against the perpetrators of crime and not against the people? The noble Marquess said that the existence of crime in Ireland could not in any way be connected with the prevalence of distress or the harsh action of the landlords; and he developed that argument by saying that when there were many evictions in the first quarter of the year there were but few outrages, and that in the last quarter, when there were few evictions, there was the largest number of outrages. But Dr. Neilson Hancock, the official statistician of the Government in Ireland, in his Report for 1879, remarking upon the increase of crime for the year, said that the state of distress, as tested by the withdrawals from the savings banks, the increase of pauperism, and by the State measures which had become necessary, had no parallel unless they went back so far as 1847. Then Dr. Hancock said that the increase in crime between 1879 and previous years illustrated clearly the permanent relations between distress and crime. Dr. Hancock was directly opposed to the noble Marquess; and he invited the noble Marquess to study the Reports of the official statistician of the Irish Government as to whether the existence of crime could not in any way be connected with distress. The noble Marquess seemed to imagine that an outrage arising out of an eviction must necessarily occur in the same quarter as the eviction; but a moment's consideration ought to convince him that a poor evicted tenant was more likely to reach the stage of destitution in which the counsels of desperation and despair might have their sway three, or six, or nine, or twelve months after the eviction rather than within the same quarter as the eviction. How could the noble Marquess tell that the outrages in December were not in consequence of evictions in September, or even in March? It was impossible to separate the evictions of one quarter from the outrages of another; the whole sweep of evictions from year to year, and from decade to decade, bore relation to the whole sweep of outrages, and the two great facts could not be split into lengths and considered in relation to periods of three months. Besides, the winter months were the hardest on the Irish people; and had the noble Marquess considered the question of magistrates' warrants against the cottier tenants? He supposed they must be thankful for every small attention which the noble Marquess condescended to give to their affairs; but it would be more statesmanlike to make himself acquainted with at least the superficial details of the question before he proceeded to deliver himself with an air of infallibility upon it. The warrants against cottier tenants were alone sufficient to explain the increase in outrages. To avenge themselves on the Land League, the landlords had resorted to the unmanly and shameful expedient of dismissing their poor labourers, thus increasing the terrible total of distress, which might have produced a greater degree of crime. He must, however, do the noble Marquess the justice to say that upon the attitude of the Land League towards crime he had not been so unjust as other Members of Her Majesty's Government. For example, the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), whom he had always regarded as an accurate and thoughtful politician, had committed himself to the statement that the speakers at Land League meetings had not condemned outrages. The right hon. Gentleman must have read little on the subject. The noble Marquess referred to the matter in terms more accurate, though he used contradictory expressions. In one portion of his speech he said that agrarian outrages injured the cause of the land agitation, and then a little further he said he could not agree with him who said that agrarian outrages injured the cause of the Land League. The noble Marquess spoke with two voices, and it was difficult to say which he wished to present to the House as his deliberate opinion.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I certainly did not say that outrages injured the land agitation. I think the passage which the hon. Member has given must be a quotation from a speech of some member of the Land League, who said that outrages injured as well as discredited the agitation. I expressed my own opinion as exactly the opposite.

MR. SEXTON said, the noble Marquess said that crime benefitted the League. But if there were any men in Ireland whose interest it was to dissuade the people from crime it was his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City and the other members of the Land League. As a member of the Land League and one of its Executive Council, he might be permitted to say a few words as to the reasons which rendered the land movement necessary in Ireland. In the year before last they found the Irish people in a desperate position. They had passed through three bad years. They were left entirely without any money at their disposal. Their crops were extremely poor, and they had sunk themselves in debt to such an extent with the shopkeepers and traders that it was impossible to hope for any further credit. Moreover, they found the landlords of Ireland in large numbers pressing for exorbitant rents, and even for arrears of rent; and the time had come when, in the opinion of those to whom the Irish people looked for guidance, and in the opinion of the people themselves, they could no longer be held back from desperate courses unless some determined effort was made to give them redress by legislative action. The function of the Land League was to give them such a hope. The Land League was established, in the first instance, to bring down rack-rents which abounded in Ireland to such a fair level as would allow the tenant and his family a decent means of living; but the second object of the League was to bring about such a reform as would make tenants proprietors of their farms by a negotiation based upon a system of State purchase, which would give the landlords the fair and equitable value of their lands. It had been asserted that the Land League was not a spontaneous movement; but he defied anyone to point out in history a movement which was so thoroughly and passionately spontaneous as the Land League movement in Ireland. No sooner had the original organization come into existence than the most piteous appeals for help poured in from all quarters, and the leaders of the movement found themselves borne along on a wave of popular enthusiasm. The League, therefore, while it supplied the machinery of organization, in no way stimulated an artificial movement. He protested in the strongest manner against the system of criticism applied to the Land League by hon. Members in that House, a system which endeavoured to make the movement responsible for every outrage perpetrated in the country, no matter under what circumstances of secrecy. He attended about a score of land meetings in Ireland since the Prorogation of Parliament last year; and after a sincere examination of his memory he believed that at every one of those meetings he, in the strongest language he could command, warned the people against the immorality, against the folly, and against the futility of outrage, violence, or illegality of any kind whatever. He had never omitted to tell the people that the law of God, that the law of the land, and of every civilized country forbade acts of this description. He did this notwithstanding the observations which had been made on the subject by the landlord Press of Ireland—a Press as unscrupulous as any in the world. It was to be remembered, too, that most of those meetings had been presided over by Roman Catholic priests, who, as the moral teachers of the people, naturally and necessarily condemned the commission of crime. He believed most devoutly and solemnly that the outrages in Ireland had not been perpetrated as the result of speeches made by those who were in sympathy with the Land League. In common with other speakers he had told the people to help themselves; but what other counsel could he possibly have given them? After having seen the failure last Session of an infinitesimal measure of relief, he could not honestly have told them to expect much from the English Parliament. The Compensation for Disturbance Bill had been opposed by the territorial Whigs, who sat behind the Government, but were ready at the first opportunity to desert them; and it had been thrown out with arrogance and scorn, and without the semblance of decent discussion, by the powers that inhabited "another place." Other Bills, also intended to benefit the Irish people, had been rejected; and how, in the face of those facts, could he have told his hearers to confidently await rapid and effectual reforms from a Government that allowed the wishes of its great majority to be completely frustrated? Instead of countenancing delusions of that sort he had told them to rely upon themselves, by which he meant that if they could not pay their rents they should consult together and offer as much as they could reasonably afford. [*A laugh.*] The advice might seem comic to hon. Members; but what else could he have said to the people when eviction stared them in the face? The landlords were demanding rents which it was impossible for the people to pay. The people offered as much as they could pay, but the landlords did not choose to accept that offer; and then the League counselled the people to stand by one another, and to sustain any tenant who might be evicted for non-payment of an impossible rent. But they did not counsel the people to resistance to the law. They simply advised that they should assist such tenants as had been unjustly evicted. They further advised the people not to take any farm which had been the scene of such unjust eviction. Such advice was absolutely necessary to the urgency of the case. The power which the landlords had used arose, in many cases, from the fierce competition for the land. The people were thrown upon the soil as their sole means of subsistence, thrown upon it by a series of shameful enactments. Whenever and however a farm became vacant, no matter under what terms, the landlords found it an easy matter to obtain a tenant on any terms they might choose to dictate. It was impossible to maintain the movement in Ireland unless they advised the people to stand together and put an end to that competition, which made the landlord an irresponsible despot. But they never in all their counsels counselled violence or illegality; and it was a calumny against the Land League to say that they had advised the people to enter upon a course which they clearly saw would be futile. The Government now proposed to abolish individual liberty, and to embarrass, if not to prevent, the exercise of the right of public meeting. Whenever coercion had been applied to Ireland it had had the effect of increasing, and not of reducing, the number of outrages. A Coercion Act was passed in 1833. The number of outrages committed in that year was 6,547, and two years later the number of outrages had increased to 6,645. In 1836, indeed, the number fell; but the decrease, he contended, was owing, not to coercion, but to the final abolition of the system of tithes, which had so long exasperated the people. The moral to be drawn from that was that crime could only be diminished by remedying promptly, speedily, and radically, the evils under which the people laboured. The Viceroyalty of Lord Mulgrave, between 1835 and 1843, was the only period since the Union in which the Executive had been content to make a serious attempt to rely upon the ordinary law, and the evidence as to that period was that crime decreased yearly, and that the proportion of convictions to committals, and of committals to offences, constantly increased, a proof that offenders no longer to the same degree attracted the sympathy of the population. In 1843 an Arms Act was passed; in 1847 a Crimes and Outrages Act was passed; and in 1848 the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended. Did crime diminish under the influence of those measures? Far from it. It was at this time that Sir Robert Peel and Earl Grey were so energetic in proposing repressive measures; but he believed it was this conduct which finally resulted in their being hurled from power; for the great masses of the English people hated coercive measures as much as the Irish. But at that time the wishes of the people were not always considered, and were only felt when the public feeling was manifestly very strong. Well, in 1849-50, there were three coercive measures in force—namely, the Arms Act, the Crimes and Outrages Act, and the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. As each additional coercive measure came into force crime increased proportionately. In 1847 the number of agrarian outrages reported by the police amounted to 620. The Crime and Outrages Act, which was in force that year, gave the Lord Lieutenant power to proclaim districts, to levy taxes, and to endow the police with authority to effect an intrusion into the privacy of dwellings by domiciliary visits. In 1848 the number of agrarian outrages had increased from 620 to 975, and in 1850 the number reached 1,362. In 1851 the number decreased again, because the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act was allowed to pass away. The effects of distress and repression had also thinned the population and increased emigration. Committals for various classes of outrages against persons and property were as follows:—In 1846, 13,201; in 1847, 24,000; in 1848, 29,000; and in 1849, when the three descriptions of Coercive Acts were in operation, 31,800; in 1850, when coercion was somewhat relaxed, they fell to 23,000. Could there be evidence more conclusive that coercion tended to stimulate rather than repress crime? Between distress and crime, also, as the experience of that period showed, there was a continual relation, the number of committals rising and falling with the number of persons obtaining relief. From 1866 to 1869 the Habeas Corpus Act was again suspended, and the number of agrarian outrages within that period steadily increased. In 1866 the number was 87; in 1867, 123; in 1868, 160; in 1869, 767; and in 1870, when the pressure was removed, but while the people still nursed resentment against the law, 1,329. In 1871 the beneficial influence of remedial measures appeared, and agrarian outrages fell to 360. The larger class of indictable offences showed during that period a similar increase. Another test was applied by looking at the whole class of indictable offences. They numbered 9,082 in 1866, 9,260 in 1867; there was a decrease in 1868; in 1869 the number was 9,178; in 1870, 9,517, or more after three years' suspension of the Habeas Corpus than in the year before; and in 1871, 8,155. The moral to be drawn from the history of the last 50 years in Ireland was that these coercive measures were unworthy the age of the world in which they were living. If the present Government did not know better than to continue the old policy of oppression, the effect would be the repetition of the old catalogue of increased disturbance and violence. He had shown that all classes of crime, agrarian, indictable, and non-indictable, increased under coercion; that whenever there had been a great increase of crime it was immediately after a resort to coercion, and that whenever there had been a great decrease it had been after a resort to remedial measures. He had shown that the true course for the Government was not to set forth on the path of coercion, but upon the liberal, enlightened, and progressive path of respect for public liberty, in travelling on which they could rely, not only on the support of the Irish people at large, but on the support of the more educated classes of Englishmen and of the enlightened democracy of England. He had some thought of referring to the evidence which the Government had produced in the shape of three or four Returns of crime; but he should not proceed to enlarge upon that point, as he should have future opportunities of doing so. He would simply say that to rely upon those Returns which the Government had placed upon the Table was a thing which he, for one, could not consent to do. He had had some experience of police protection, and his experience led him to look upon those Returns with suspicion. For instance, there were three cases of police protection returned for Sligo. In one of those cases a man who had been a teacher in a school in Ireland was returning, no doubt, in a somewhat hilarious condition from a festive meeting of an Orange lodge, and saw a young man walking peaceably along the road. Thinking the young man was about to attack him, though no assault was committed or attempted, the teacher drew a pistol, took aim, and fired, seriously wounding the young man. The teacher was tried; but whether the jury thought he was not responsible for his action, or for some other reason, they acquitted him. Since then the teacher had been under police protection. The midnight roysterer and law-breaker had had devoted to himself the services of four men of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and was maintained in his position by no less a person than the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Sligo as a standing sore to the locality. He supposed this worthy now figured in the Returns of the Government as one of the persons for whom Parliament was asked to take away the rights and liberties of the Irish people. Another of the cases was that of a landlord who had emptied the house of a poor man driven to the wall by hard times. Two of the evicted tenant's daughters crept back to the house out of which they had been turned at night; but the landlord came back to the house, and, finding the girls there, seized one of them by the hair of the head and dragged her with violence out of the place. He said that until the whole list was scrutinized, until they knew how many cases proceeded from threatening letters, until they were able to investigate those cases one by one, they must decline to say there was any moral, reasonable, or proper ground for interference with the liberties of the people. In considering the number of evictions and their causes, the Government had great reason to be thankful to the Land League. During the three quarters ended March, June, and September last year, the number of persons rendered homeless in Ireland by eviction was 1,417—persons who were not merely evicted, but refused admission, and could not go back as tenants—not even as caretakers. In the December quarter of last year, owing to the operations of the Land League, there were only 388 evictions; and this great decrease, saving many lives, was due to that splendid organization. The Land League, by its peaceful operations, had effected this. [*Laughter.*] Yes; the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite could not restrain his mirthful scorn; he did not consider it beneath his scorn——

Major O'BEIRNE said, he had not shown his scorn at that, but at the inaccuracy of some of the statements previously made.

Mr. SEXTON said, the time the hon. and gallant Member had chosen for his mirthful scorn conveyed to his mind a different impression. Though the Government spoke of the law being paralyzed by the state of affairs, he maintained that but for the peaceful attitude of the Land League the Government would have found themselves unable to make the constabulary and the section of the military under their command sufficient for the execution of the processes of the law which the landlords might have called upon them to execute. He trusted that the Government would adopt the true course of resorting to remedial instead of coercive measures. In adopting the latter, they were yielding to the influence of that class which had been always opposed to the amelioration of the condition of the people. They were yielding to the stimulation and promises of support which they ought to be ashamed to receive—the promises which came from their political opponents, who knew that a resort to coercion now on the part of a Liberal Radical Administration would hasten the day when the Conservatives would re-cross the floor of the House and resume the reins of power. They were yielding to the men who sat behind them, and who represented those ideas most repugnant to liberty and progress. They were yielding to fear of those who sat in "another place," and who last year treated them with contempt and scorn. These were influences which they might expect a great Government to resist; and it would be a matter of grief, and perhaps of despair, to many people in Ireland to find so great an intellect and so great a moral nature as that of the Prime Minister wrought upon to such an extent as this, and for such an end as this, under the influence of those sordid principles and those base motives which guided and governed stragglers and the hangers-on of Party. He did not propose to address the House at greater length. He was bound to thank the House for the courteous manner in which it had heard him. Certainly, as far as he was concerned, that Assembly was an Assembly of Gentlemen. He would conclude by expressing his belief that the Government would alienate for ever the Irish people if they adopted coercion. If they took that course, in the face of the evidence which they had of its futility, they would not only alienate the Irish people, but they would expose themselves to that contempt and that scorn which were illustrated and foreshadowed by Cavour, the great master of Italian statesmanship, when he said any man could govern in a state of siege.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN supported the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for the City of Cork, because he sincerely and honestly believed that coercion was not wanted in Ireland. What was wanted to make the Irish tenants contented and happy was a good, sound Land Bill, and a measure which would satisfy the just demands of the people, expressed as those demands had been in almost every district throughout the country. Public meetings, lawfully held, had been largely attended, and the wishes of the people had been unmistakably expressed; and now it was proposed, by coercive measures, to deny the right of public meeting. He recollected how, in 1867, the people rose in an agony of despair to try and effect a settlement of their grievances by force, that rising being put down; then throughout the public Press in England they were called upon to bring their grievances before the House, and so find a remedy. Now, in the present instance, when they had acted within the limits of the Constitution, holding their public meetings, they met with the same measures of coercion their fathers met with before them. They simply asked for security in their holdings. What good would coercion effect? Not a Parliament had sat since the time of the unfortunate Union in which Coercion Acts had not been passed for Ireland by that House, and what was the result? The Irish peeple were now as disaffected towards the laws imposed on them by this country as they were in 1641 and in 1798. The attention of the House had been drawn to the case of a landlord, who was in such distress that he had been obliged to give up the education of his daughters; but did the House forget that in 1847-8-9, hundreds and thousands were expelled by the landlords, and allowed to starve and die in the ditches? The hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham) and the junior Member for the County of Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had stated that at the meetings of the Land League the people had been told not to pay any rent to the landlords. Now, having himself attended 20 of those meetings during the Recess, he emphatically declared that he had never, at any one of them, heard any man advise the tenants not to pay fair rents; but they had been advised not to pay rack-rents, which it was impossible for them to pay. At one of the last meetings which he attended, and which was held about six weeks ago in the County of Limerick, the very first resolution that was passed was one indignantly repelling the calumnious accusation that the tenants desired to repudiate their just debts, and also declaring that just rents involved the same strict obligation as any other contracts. At those meetings he had attended he had not been ashamed or afraid to denounce, in the strongest language possible, any crime which was committed. He told his audiences that although they had many enemies, yet the greatest against them was the man who encouraged or committed crime. He knew their cause was just, and that they would ultimately get a settlement of it; and the man who committed crime in their name would only do them the greatest possible injury. He had heard a great deal from time to time of threatening letters, and he agreed with the remark that the man who sent a threatening letter was either a coward or a scoundrel. After all, they were only ink and paper. There was no more convenient place in which to write such letters than the office of the agent or the bailiff. His county had obtained some notriety in regard to threatening letters, but many of these letters were evidently written by men of education. It was, in fact, well-known that the letters received by Mr. Justice Fitzgerald and Mr. Baron Dowse were not letters written by illiterate men, because they were filled up with French quotations, and it was not likely that such was the class of men from whom they would expect midnight mauraders.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. O'SULLIVAN, continuing, said, he was not in the House on Tuesday evening last, when an attack was made on the county of Limerick by the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but he could say, without fear of contradiction, that for the last 20 months he could not bring to mind a single crime of high magnitude or violence. He was, therefore, very much surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman make the attack which he did. He had, however, forgotten there was one outrage. He was sitting in his office one evening, when he distinctly heard two shots fired. The matter caused some consternation; but ultimately it turned out that the shots had been fired by a young man, who was in the habit of firing one shot at the end of the old year and another at the beginning of the new year, and it was construed into an attempt to shoot two men who had taken shelter in the market-place. He appealed to the Prime Minister not to take the false step of bringing in coercion. Let him resign sooner than tarnish his hands with this dirty work. Let him pass a good Land Bill, and the Irish people would settle down happy and contented. If a Coercion Bill was passed it would be abused, and great irritation would be caused all over the country. He advised the Prime Minister to retire, and leave coercion to those who had always imposed it on Ireland—the Tory Party.

Mr. ARMITAGE said, that, as a new Member, he had been disinclined hitherto to take a more prominent part in the Business of the House than to give a silent vote in favour of such measures as commended themselves to his judgment. But the question now under discussion greatly interested him, and although he was aware that three out of the five hon. Members who represented the joint constituency of Salford and Manchester had already spoken, and although it might appear that there was at present a want of harmony between the opinions already expressed by his esteemed Colleague and those which he desired to present to the House, he begged the indulgence which he knew was always generously accorded to anyone like himself, who was somewhat inexperienced in the customs of debate. The fact that the present Parliament contained so large a majority of Members earnestly desirous to legislate for the relief of Irish grievances was a certain indication that the same desires were felt by the great mass of the people of this country. He, for one, most heartily sympathized with those desires. He represented a constituency numbering over 23,000 electors, and had been all his life closely identified with the neighbouring constituency of Manchester, which had more than 60,000 electors, and he could state confidently that the disposition of the people of that populous district was most friendly towards the Irish people, and greatly in favour of speedy, well-matured, and useful legislation in respect of the affairs of that country. The people there were only solicitous that their Representatives in Parliament would now have the opportunity which they had long desired of furthering such legislation as should permanently improve the condition of the country; and they were hopeful that the measures to be submitted to Parliament by the Government would not be offered with any stinting hand. Moreover, they felt that, notwithstanding the disturbing and somewhat exciting events which had transpired in Ireland during the last few months, there was no reason why Parliament should be deterred from the course that they had taken with the view of calmly and dispassionately enacting some wise and useful legislation for that country. While Government had intimated that they presently intended to submit to the consideration of Parliament measures with a view to legislation in Ireland, they also stated, in almost the same breath, that they found it necessary to ask the House for something more than the ordinary powers for the purpose of the defence and protection of the people of Ireland. That such a necessity had arisen he was fully satisfied, not only by the evidence on the highest authority which had already been offered to them, and of which they were told abundance more was forthcoming, but by much evidence which supplemented and confirmed the rest, and which had come within his own personal experience. It was useless for hon. Members, who were ostensibly the advocates in that House of Irish interests, to attempt to make light of and to extenuate the importance of that evidence. Having given this question his most careful and unbiased consideration, he had come to the conclusion that it was his duty to vote with the Government on this occasion. Certainly there had not been much said in the Queen's Speech to indicate to them the extent or the nature of the reforms which the Government proposed to bring forward. In the little that was said hon. Members were guided as to what they expected would come of it by the confidence or the distrust which they felt in the good faith of the Government. To some hon. Members it appeared likely that the measures of coercion were to be strong, while the reforms promised were likely to be very weak. He regarded the present Government with the profoundest respect and confidence, believing that it was a reason for great satisfaction that, at the present time, they found a combination of men forming an Administration rare, powerful, and more willing than any he had known in our past history to deal with this important question. He felt as great an aversion as anyone could possibly feel for any measure which was calculated to restrict what was called the liberty of the people. He thought, however, that the measures to be brought forward by the Government were likely to restrict, not the liberty, but only the license, of a small, but active, section of the people. He had the greatest confidence in giving extraordinary powers to the Government, because he believed that in their hands the measure would be administered with due moderation and justice, and with as little likelihood as possible of causing hardship to those who would be affected by it. He believed that the measures of the Government, both for the improvement of the Land Laws and for the protection of the people, would be wisely designed, and would prove a terror to evildoers only, while they would be useful and acceptable to those who did well.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that during the last Elections the Irish people had been assured from all quarters, and especially by expectant Ministers, that the only section of the English community which would consider the claims of Ireland with justice or moderation was the Liberal Party. The ordinary progress of Parliamentary procedure was not speedy enough for this so-called Ministry; but they must suspend all the Business of Parliament until a coercive measure for Ireland had been passed into law. What answer had the Irish Members to give to their constituents after telling them to trust to Parliament for the redress of their grievances? They had no answer to give now. It was a perfect farce to expect justice at the hands of the British Parliament, unless there was some force outside of that House and the Empire that would pay some attention to the demands of the people of Ireland. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite said "Oh, oh!" but he would refer them to the history of their own country and that of Ireland. They knew that the first great occasion in which Ireland obtained redress from the British Parliament was in 1782, when she furnished 1,000 sailors, by whose aid Lord Rodney was able to achieve a victory over France in the West Indies. When England required the assistance of Ireland in any emergency, then would the demands of Ireland be attended to; but if they had no call for them, then they could afford to let them die by thousands and emigrate to America by tens and hundreds of thousands. Their sense of justice seemed to be remarkably dull, unless there was something very exceptional to ask of the Irish people. Now, when they turned to the Speech from the Throne for an explanation, what did they find? They found that, as Ministers had often said, it was the first duty of a Government to secure the safety of life and property; but that was precisely what they—the Irish Members—said. It was undoubtedly the duty of a Government, and every Government, to secure the safety of life and property; but the whole gist of their contention was that while the present Land Laws existed, and while the present relations between landlord and tenant existed in Ireland, they never could have anything like security for life and property. These relations had never admitted either the one or the other, and never would. Look at 40 years ago, or even less, in the time of the Famine. As the Prime Minister himself said, the sentence of eviction, ruthlessly carried out as it was then, was a sentence of starvation and a sentence of death. The sentence of eviction existed still, as it did then; but in the very half-year in which the Prime Minister made use of that truthful description there were reported to the police evictions which affected 6,131 persons against whom this very sentence of starvation was pronounced. But was this sentence of eviction merely a sentence of starvation or death? No; it was a sentence of confiscation too. For they must not look at the relations between landlord and tenant in England as being identical with Ireland. In England the landlord, as a rule, furnished four-fifths of the total capital engaged in the land, in the shape of building, fencing, drainage, and roads, and one-fifth was furnished by the tenant. In Ireland the landlord furnished the land, and nothing but the land. It was the tenant who drained, who fenced, it was the tenant who paid for the maintenance of the old roads and the formation of new ones. But whereas the landlord in England exacted in return for that which he furnished for the tenant only an average of one-third of the total produce of the land, in Ireland, as a rule, he extorted from the starving tenantry two-thirds of the total produce of the land. These statements were borne out by the Reports of the Council of the Institute of Surveyors. In support of his case he might also cite an English authority who had for 40 years discharged the duties of a land-agent in Ireland. Mr. Wiggins said that in the South of Ireland the rent exacted was often nearly the whole value of the principal saleable produce of the farm, and that even those who were reckoned reasonable landlords would calculate the value of what could be sold off a farm, and, after allowing for public burdens payable out of the produce, would exact the remainder as rent. By an Act passed in the reign of Queen Anne it was enacted that when an ordinary Protestant landlord let a farm to an Irish tenant, he should exact a rack-rent of not less than two-thirds of the total produce of the farm, and that was still the average rental of farms in Ireland. An English landlord would no more think of attempting to exact such rent than of trying to pick his tenant's pocket. But the Irish landlords had contrived, by two very skilful manœuvres, to delude the public of this country as to their real position. In the first place, they had pushed to the front as representative men those few bright exceptions from the general class, and the English people had no idea whatsoever that when they were listening to the panegyrics passed on certain Irish landlords, they were really hearing the praises of men who stood in bright contrast to the great bulk of the Irish landlord class. Secondly, the Irish landlords had by personal influence induced the landlords of this country to identify their cause with their own, although there could not be a greater calumny on the English landlords than to attempt to identify them with those of Ireland. Cases of the cruellest hardship existed under the present system, and he had had under his own notice cases in which landlords had warned their tenants that if they gave shelter to evicted families they must run the risk of being evicted themselves. To prove how great had been the inhumanity formerly shown to Irish tenants, he begged to refer to the Pastoral of Bishop Nulty, Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath. In that Pastoral the Bishop described how he had seen 700 human beings evicted from their homes in one day, on an estate where there was not a shilling of rent due except in one case. The Bishop's Pastoral went on to say that the bailiffs engaged in these evictions recoiled from two houses in which members of the occupants' families were ill of scarlet fever. They implored the agent to spare the houses, but he was inexorable. He ordered winnowing sheets to be placed over the beds on which the patients—who were, happily, unconscious—lay, and then the cabins were carefully unroofed. The Bishop next day administered the last rites of the Church to three of these patients. His Lordship described the misery of the men, women, and children who were driven from their homes, and went on to say—

> "The landed proprietors, in a circle all round and for many miles in every direction, warned their tenants with threats of direst vengeance, against extending to these unhappy people the hospitality and shelter of their roofs."

Would any English landlord be a party to such a proceeding? But he might be told that the case to which Dr. Nulty referred occurred many years ago. Well, he would mention what he had himself witnessed in Kerry within the last six months. A poor man who found himself at the mercy of his landlord was offered two alternatives, either to face the world—an impossibility for him, as he was without means—or to take 10 acres of marsh land at £1 an acre, being 10 times its value. He was compelled to close with the cruel offer. By the ready assistance of his friends he drained the land, fenced it, set up a house upon it, and made it a good farm. For 23 years he paid the exorbitant rent; but three bad years, 1877, 1878, and 1879, came, and he fell into arrear and was evicted. A neighbour gave shelter to the evicted tenant, his wife, and five children; but next day, the "driver"—which was a very good name for agent in Kerry—came and told the neighbour that he too would be evicted if he continued to shelter the poor people. The man and his family returned to the farm, and for two nights obtained shelter in the house the man had built; but the agent hearing of this, sent a number of men and had the house pulled down. He (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) saw the evicted tenant and his wife and children sitting near the gable of the ruined cabin endeavouring to obtain a meal consisting of potatoes they had gathered on the ground their industry had converted into a farm. Again, he asked, would any English landlord act in such a way? The truth was, that a sentence of eviction was a sentence of confiscation and of starvation, and the landlords had the power of enforcing the raising of rents under the threat of eviction. Protection for the tenant there was none, for the Bright Clauses only afforded a semblance of protection. The tenant might struggle on and on for years; but the gradual raising of rent at last became crushing, and he sank lower and lower, his rent fell into arrear, and he became at the mercy of the oppressor. He forfeited in this way all the benefits of the Land Act; and, as he had before observed, the only channels open to him were the emigrant ship or the workhouse. To call those laws which enabled extortion to be practised was to profane a sacred name. It was to be remembered that most of those who were now sucking the very lifeblood out of Ireland in the shape of extortionate rack-rents were absentees. Of the 20,000,000 of acres in Ireland 11,000,000 acres were owned by absentees, and the natural consequesces were traceable in the diminution of the population and of their means. The population was 5,750,000 after the Famine, and he doubted whether it would be 5,000,000 at the next Census. The last Agricultural Returns showed a falling-off in the number of cattle, horses, sheep, pigs, and fowls, and of acres under cultivation. No wonder there were discontent, misery, and distress; no wonder the Irish people were putting their backs against the walls and saying that they would not stand it any longer. It was admitted by the English Press, by Members of Parliament, and the Government, that something must be done; but what was it to be? A great deal of nonsense was talked about English capital in Ireland. They did not want a penny of it. Capital was defined to be accumulated labour, and Ireland had plenty of hoarded labour if only the iniquitous Land Laws did not render it unavailable. There was one landlord, a personal friend of most Members of the Ministry, who drew from the West of Ireland a rental counted by tens of thousands, and, like many others, he was an absentee, and employed nobody. If he borrowed money from the Board of Works at 1 per cent, he charged the tenants 5 per cent for the use of it, and he increased the rent, whenever an opportunity presented itself, for any improvements which a tenant had been rash enough to make. Thus he paralyzed industry, and made improvement a folly. The tenant refused to employ labour to his own ultimate loss. There must be security for the tenant-farmer, and then that hoarded labour, which was now unavailable capital, would at once become available, which would not require to be supplemented from the English store. The Irish Members were now justified in refusing to make any proposals, considering the way in which their measures had been treated during the last few years. Not one in thirty of the measures brought forward for the benefit of Ireland was passed; and the Irish Members who attempted the task of introducing a Bill to the notice of the House rendered themselves a laughing-stock on all sides. It was clear that the whole evil consisted of this—that by the threat of eviction the Irish landlord could extort what rent he chose from the perfectly helpless tenant, and the remedy was to take away the power of eviction. The land agitation would never cease until that power was taken away, and the condition of things was restored under which the landlord's interest might be acquired on certain terms by the tenant. To ascertain the landlord's claim there must be valuation of some kind; and whether it was one for the whole of Ireland, or one by local tribunals, was a mere question of detail. The landlord's rent-charge could be redeemed on the same plan as the tithe or rent-charge was being redeemed, either by a Commission or by Land Banks. Coercive legislation was to be based on the alleged increase of crimes of an agrarian character; but Members of the Government carefully avoided speaking of the total amount of criminality, which was less in Ireland than in England. They were told that the offences in Ireand were such that it was impossible the Government could disregard them. But the Judicial Statistics of 1878 and 1879 showed that England was preeminent in crime as compared with Ireland. There was no country in the world more deeply implicated in crimes of every kind than England. As regarded some crime, scarcely spoken of elsewhere, England was the black spot on the face of the globe. Even in regard to the houghing of cattle, which had excited the grave animadversion of the Chief Secretary, there were 74 cases in England to 42 in Ireland. When connected with agrarian crime, there were extenuating circumstances in such outrages, and hon. Members, instead of calling for coercive legislation, should treat them with a view to the removal of the causes which had produced them. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) said, a few years ago, that as long as the population of the country was prevented from possessing the land by legal enactments and chicanery, so long would outrages continue. He called, therefore, upon the right hon. Gentleman to put his principles into practice. With regard to the statement that after all this movement of the Land League was nothing more than a movement of a veiled rebellion, he said it was nothing of the kind, and he was quite as likely to be as well informed on the point as the Secretary of State with all his emissaries, acknowledged and unacknowledged. From his own personal knowledge, he declared that there could not be a more unfounded charge than that which he heard put forward by three Members of that House, on separate evenings, as regarded the Land League agitation. He would draw the attention of the House to one very simple but important fact. Every Member was perfectly well aware that the English Army was to a great extent dependent for its recruiting upon the Irish population of the United Kingdom. Everyone knew that the Irish soldiers were sent to do the heaviest and the hardest, the most dangerous work of the British Army. What had they in Ireland? They had the police, which they did not trust. They had so ruled them and so managed them that they could not trust them, and it would be against humanity and human nature if they could. He knew they did not trust them, and he believed they had very good reason for not trusting them. Some time ago he happened to ask a constabulary officer in Ireland whether any ammunition had been served out to them, and he replied, "Yes; but, begorra, it's not on my own countrymen I would like to be using it." He felt sure, and he hoped that a similar sentiment largely pervaded the constabulary in Ireland. Not trusting to the constabulary, they had drafted into Ireland a military force stronger than they had ever brought together even at Aldershot. That force was exclusively composed—and the English newspapers exulted over it—of English and Scotch soldiers. He was very glad of that, for he held that each of these 25,000 men, so far as they were honest, was amongst the best apostles they could have of the doctrines of the Land League. Knowing, as they did, the condition of their own country, when they returned from Ireland they would disseminate among the poorer classes of their countrymen correct information as to the real state and condition of the Irish people, and the circumstances under which they existed. The question of recruiting was the tenderest point on which the Irish people could touch England. During the last 12 months the right hon. Gentleman had obtained between 3,000 and 4,000 soldiers from Ireland. That did not represent the proportion of Irishmen in the 19,000 or 20,000 recruits, the remainder of the 4,000 or 5,000 required to make up the proportion was obtained from the centres of Irish population in England. Now, the Irish in these centres were as amenable to the impulses of national feeling as anybody in Ireland, and if anything like sedition or rebellion was intended, nothing would have been easier than for them to paralyze the whole military system of England. "Boycotting" was a very efficient system, and if Irish women came and told the recruiting sergeant that not a single Irish recruit should be had, there would be some reason to accuse them of sedition or veiled rebellion. He would not detain the House any longer, simply because he believed there was no use in appealing to hon. Members. They had made up their minds to coerce Ireland. The Government was stronger than the Irish Members, and would coerce. But before they passed a Coercion Bill, Irish Members would have a word to say, inasmuch as their countrymen had done them the honour to allow them to stand in the breach. Speaking for himself, if he could find one single man to stand by him, he would oppose to the uttermost and with the greatest zeal every measure of coercion brought forward by Her Majesty's Government.

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN said, that when he entered the House he had not the slightest intention to take any part in the debate or utter a single word. But he was present when his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) made a statement of a very painful character as to something that had occurred about the time of Lord Mountmorres's murder. That statement was denied by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Now, he (Mr. Hussey Vivian) was in a position and felt called upon to confirm every word of the statement of the hon. Member for Swansea. He had the same source of information from which his hon. Friend quoted. An intimate friend, who was present on the occasion, had informed him precisely of what had occurred. He had another friend present who also informed him precisely of what happened; and, therefore, he could hardly withhold his confirmation of the statement made by the hon. Member for Swansea. What occurred was this. There were a considerable number of men returning from a Land League meeting along the road on which Lord Mountmorres was murdered. These men, for the most part, passed by the pool of blood which lay upon the road; but about five or six of them linked their arms together, and, in a defiant manner, seeing strangers present, marched along the road, and two of them walked through the blood. His informant saw the people upon their way. His informant saw the blood upon their shoes. [*Cries of* "Name!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] He would not give the name. In the condition of terrorism which now prevailed in Ireland, he did not consider that he was called upon to give the name. He gave the statement upon his honour. Had the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), like another Frankenstein, raised a hideous monster of which he was now afraid, and of whose ghoul-like deeds he was ashamed? If not, why did he so vehemently deny the facts stated by the hon. Member for Swansea?

MR. PARNELL: Because it is a gross falsehood. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member has applied that observation to any Member of this House he is out of Order. If the hon. Member says that a statement made by another hon. Member is a gross falsehood, I must call upon him to withdraw the expression.

MR. PARNELL: I am not aware, Sir, that I applied the word to any Member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I must have an assurance from the hon. Member that he did not apply that word to any Member of this House.

MR. PARNELL: When I am charged with having applied the word to any Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to give you the assurance which you ask for. [*Cries of* "Order!"] I submit, Mr. Speaker, that until some Member of this House specifically charges me with an offence against Order, I am not called upon to give any such assurance. [*Renewed cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member decline to give to the Chair that assurance which the Chair has thought it its duty to demand?

MR. PARNELL: I applied the epithet "falsehood" to the statement which was made by the anonymous informant of the hon. Member for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian), that my countrymen waded through the blood of the murdered Lord Mountmorres.

MR. SPEAKER motioned to MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN to proceed.

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN, by the leave of the House, repeated the statement he had made, and said, he left the House to judge between him and the hon. Member for the City of Cork. He had given the House his honour that he received that account from an English gentleman, an old and valued friend, he would now say an officer in the British Army. Whether the hon. Member was within his right in availing himself of a technicality to avoid the direct withdrawal of the allegation of falsehood applied to a statement so substantiated —whether he was pursuing a right and honourable course, he would leave to the good sense of the House. He thought it was possible that the hon. Member had not been well informed as to what occurred; but the hon. Member could take it from him that what he stated now did most distinctly occur. Now, it was his wish to ask hon. Members opposite what was to be the outcome of the course they were pursuing? He approached this question from a point of view entirely favourable towards Ireland. He had voted, he believed, in every division in favour of the Land Bill of 1870, and he voted last year for the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. Therefore, he approached the discussion with a friendly feeling towards Ireland. They had debated this Amendment at great length—seven nights—and in the course of it they had debated the Coercion Bill and the Land Bill. It was quite possible—he would not suggest the contrary—that, under the grave circumstances of the moment, it was proper to debate this Motion at considerable length; but what was the course to be pursued when they had voted the Address? Were there to be interminable discussions on the Coercion Bill? No one could have a greater horror than he had of imposing a Coercion Bill. Those feelings were shared by all on his side of the House, and he did not believe that the Party opposite were in favour of governing Ireland by coercion. But coercion was forced upon the Government by the action of certain persons in Ireland—by the action of the Land League. ["No, no!"] However unwilling they might be, it was forced upon them by such a state of terrorism and social misrule as left no other course open than to pass a Coercion Bill, and that Coercion Bill would be passed before the House came to the Land Bill. He was in favour of doing the strictest justice to Ireland. He had no prejudice, and was desirous of meeting the case in the fairest manner. He knew the unfortunate condition of land tenure in Ireland, which was wholly different from that of England. He took considerable pains last year, before he voted for the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, to make himself acquainted with those conditions. But he would point out to hon. Members from Ireland that if they put the House to the trouble of interminable debates on the Coercion Bill, they would postpone the consideration of the Land Bill. The House was determined to pass the Coercion Bill, so inevitable was it in the condition of Ireland. No doubt, hon. Members might use the Forms of the House to a considerable extent to delay that Bill; but the time would come—[*Cries of* "Question!" *and* "Order, order!"] He was an older Member of the House than any of the Home Rule Members; and he would tell them that neither the House nor the country would stand the Business of the House being obstructed by any body of men. Some remedy would be found, and found tolerably quickly. ["Question!"] He believed he was talking to the Question, though some hon. Members might not like what he said. Obstruction would fall through——

Mr. PARNELL: I rise to Order. [*Cries of* "Order!"] May I ask you, Sir, whether the hon. Member is entitled on the Question before the House, which is the Question of the Amendment I had the honour to move—whether the hon. Member is entitled to charge us with Obstruction about another Bill which is not yet before the House, and the course which he thinks the House ought to adopt in the event of a certain course of Obstruction being followed by the Irish Members in reference to that Bill? [*Cries of* "Order!"] I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is an extremely inconvenient course, and one which is not at all calculated to facilitate the progress of Public Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) desires to raise a point of Order; but it seems to me that he is now expressing an opinion. I am bound to state that it is quite correct, as the hon. Member has stated, that the Coercion Bill is not now before the House. At the same time, the Amendment of the hon. Member himself distinctly raises the question of coercion; and it appears to me, therefore, that the observations of the hon. Member for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian) upon that matter are in Order. But I would submit to the hon. Member for Glamorganshire that it is most desirable that an hon. Member should not, in debate, address himself to any particular section of the House, but to the Chair.

The O'DONOGHUE: I wish to have your opinion, Sir, on a point of Order. The point, and I will put it very briefly, is this—Is the hon. Member for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian) in Order in imputing to, and charging a body of Members in this House with, an intention to obstruct? That is what the hon. Gentleman really did; and I would ask you, Sir, if the hon. Member was in Order?

MR. SPEAKER: I have already stated, in answer to the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), that the hon. Member in possession of the House did not appear to me to be out of Order.

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN continued. He explained that he had been alluding to an observation made by the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor), who spoke last, that as long as he remained a Member of the House he would obstruct any measure which had a coercive tendency.

MR. PARNELL: He said resist.

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN understood the hon. Member to use the word "obstruct;" but "obstruction" and "resistance" were much the same. His desire was to facilitate the passing of those measures that were necessary for the maintenance of order in Ireland, and for its future tranquillity. Those remedial measures might be postponed to a late period if the course that he had indicated as possible were pursued. The hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) had said that as long as one man stood by him he would oppose to the utmost every measure of coercion. He hoped that the hon. Member would not act in that suicidal manner; but that he and those who acted with him would allow the Bill to pass with no more than the necessary discussion. By taking the course proposed, the hon. Member would delay what he (Mr. Hussey Vivian) hoped would be a thorough-going measure of Land Reform for Ireland. He could assure Irish Members that if they did not assist the Government now to pass their Land Bill, there would hardly be another Government in this country more likely to do justice to Ireland than the present Administration.

MR. GRAY said, the hon. Member for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian) commenced his speech by informing the House that he had no intention of addressing it at any length He (Mr. Gray) took it that most hon. Members would regret that he did not adhere to his original intention. The hon. Gentleman, as far as he (Mr. Gray) could follow his observations, did not contribute very materially to elucidate the question before the House. He made a very odious charge against the body of Irish Members who sat on that side of the House, and substantiated it by the statement that he heard it from a friend. They did not want to doubt his honour at all—they did not doubt his assertion that he heard the statement—but they took the liberty of doubting the authenticity of that hearsay evidence. The unpleasant incident which the hon. Member provoked by that allusion might very well have been dispensed with, and the House might have been saved the necessity of listening to disorderly observations with reference to the conduct of Members of that House upon a measure not before them; and he thought the time had been wasted, not exclusively by Members sitting on that side of the House. He should endeavour, at that hour, to occupy as little of the time of the House as possible; and he desired to commence by disclaiming individually all sympathy with the attacks which had been made personally, both inside that House and outside it, upon the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He (Mr. Gray) had no sympathy with them. He thought the right hon. Gentleman made a self-sacrifice in assuming the position which he did assume. He believed that, although mistaken, the right hon. Gentleman went to Ireland with an honest intention of doing his best; and he did not think, on the whole, that the right hon. Gentleman met with that reception which he was entitled to. He (Mr. Gray) said that with the more freedom, because he anticipated that for the future he and the right hon. Gentleman would find themselves in opposite Lobbies. As there were a good many Members of the late Liberal Administration now sitting on the Treasury Benches, he would take the liberty of reminding them that if the present condition of Ireland was not all that they would desire, they had themselves to take a considerable amount of the responsibility for that condition of affairs. He did not wish to go back into the records of past misgovernment in Ireland. He only desired to go back to the year 1870; and he wished to remind right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who were now Members of the Government that in 1870 they had an opportunity of settling the Land Question on a final and satisfactory basis, and that they deliberately threw away that opportunity. The opinion of Ireland and of all leading Irishmen in 1870 was declared with unanimity and with distinctness as to the policy which should be adopted on the Land Question. Every representative body in the country, all the Irish Members sitting for Liberal constituencies, declared that the only final and satisfactory settlement of the Land Question should be upon the basis of fixity of tenure, fair rents, and free sale. The Government deliberately ignored Irish opinion upon that occasion. They framed a Bill which no Irishman had ever asked for, which no body of Irishmen ever sympathized with, and they forced that Bill through the House against the protests of Ireland. It was quite true that on the second reading but a very small minority divided against the Bill—only, he believed, 11 hon. Members—but it was proved that the minority of 11 had more reason upon their side than the majority who carried the Land Bill; but that minority of 11 represented the distinctly declared opinion of the whole country upon the question, both by public meetings, by Petition, and by any other means by which it was open to the country to declare its conviction. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would probably remember that not only in 1870 did his Government scout that settlement, but that even such epithets as Communists and robbers, which were now applied to hon. Members sitting on that side of the House, were then applied to the minority of 11. He remembered the thing perfectly well, though he was not then a Member of the House—such was their objection to the very name fixity of tenure, that when that remedy was repudiated by the then Government, a section of the Irish Members asked that a permissive Parliamentary form of fixity of tenure might be adopted, and that the Government refused to permit even the permissive clauses to be introduced into the Bill. He apprehended that the very course which was adopted in 1870 was now about to be adopted by the same Government in 1881. They would probably frame a Bill upon their own lines without any regard to Irish opinion on the subject; and in another ten years, or perhaps a shorter period, they would discover their mistake quite as completely as they had now discovered the mistake they made in 1870, and they would then have greater difficulty in putting it right. That was what he apprehended, and it was for that reason that he referred to what occurred in 1870. Not only in 1870 had hon. Gentlemen sitting on those Benches as Members of the present Government to reproach themselves with their failure of foresight, but since 1870 they had pursued an identical course. When the late Mr. Butt introduced his Land Bill in the House most of the Members of the present Government would not now consider the Bill an extravagant one. Where were the Members of the present Government? Were they not invariably, or almost invariably, found voting against the second reading of the Bill? He did not blame Members sitting on that side of the House; but he did say that Members of the Liberal Party who had voted against or tacitly opposed all the attempts of the Irish Party since 1874 to bring about a peaceful, Constitutional, and reasonable settlement of the Land Question had distinctly themselves to blame for the result which had now come upon them. It was only when the country despaired of the Constitutional action of the late Mr. Butt, and saw that his arguments, urged with a force and cogency which he (Mr. Gray) was afraid no Member of the Party now could pretend to, was utterly disregarded in the House, that the Irish people arrived in despair at the conclusion that there was no use in argument, and that they must adopt some other course. The action of Parliament drove them to despair, and they were now blamed for adopting the only weapons to their hands. Upon every Irish question since 1874 they had had to face either the apathy or the active hostility, not merely of the Members of the Governing Body in the House, but of the Leaders also who sat on the Opposition Benches. Take the Franchise Question. How many times did the Leaders of the Liberal Party oppose the assimilation of the Irish to the English franchise? How many voted against it? The Leader of that Party refused, again and again, to permit a Whip to be issued in favour of it. It was only in the last two Sessions that it was adopted, when they found Parliament was coming to an end, and a Dissolution pending, that they gave their support to the proposal, and adopted the equalization of the franchise. They should not forget that kind of thing—Irishmen did not forget it. If they had wished to prevent the exasperation of the Irish people, they should have long before met the reasonable and moderate proposals which had been urged in that place, again and again, in the most temperate manner in a different spirit. Possibly Ireland was never in such a grave condition for the last quarter of a century, possibly not since the Union; and the Members of the Liberal Party were far more responsible for the state of affairs than the Members of the Conservative Party, because they had nothing to expect from the Conservatives, and while they had much to expect from the Liberals they got nothing. They remembered the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year, and the declaration that was made by the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the subject. He (Mr. Gray) did not remember the right hon. Gentleman's precise words; but, practically, he said that he could not be responsible for the condition of affairs in Ireland if that Bill was not passed. The right hon. Gentleman anticipated very serious results; in fact, he foresaw the very things which were now occurring as the inevitable result of the policy pursued by the House of Lords. It was inevitable that they would have some disturbance; it was inevitable that the Irish people would be driven to adopt whatever means came to their hands, and which they thought best to bring about a reform of the intolerable condition of affairs under which they existed. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson), in his eloquent speech the other night in favour of a policy of coercion, alluded to the case of the tenantry of Colonel King-Harman, and their refusal to pay more than Griffith's valuation. Now, the great bulk of Colonel King-Harman's tenants last year were kept alive upon Indian meal. He (Mr. Gray) happened to be Chairman of the Dublin Mansion House Relief Committee, and Colonel King-Harman was a member of that Committee. The gallant gentleman was also one of the chief advisers in the Duchess of Marlborough's Committee, and was a member of the other Committees. He (Mr. Gray) had not been able to ascertain, but he intended to ascertain, the exact amount of charity which was dispensed to the tenants of Colonel King-Harman. He had, however, telegraphed to Boyle, and the reply he got was—

> "The town of Boyle and almost the whole parish are on the property referred to. The number of farmers relieved was 681, including 370 small tenants. Total from all relief sources, £1,478, with about £400 worth of seed potatoes."

These poor tenants were kept alive upon Indian meal, supplied to them by the charity of the world—by American charity, by Australian charity, Indian charity, Chinese charity. With regard to the extraordinary course taken by the English Press and some public men respecting crime and outrage in Ireland, he did not propose to go over the statistics, which had been already ably dealt with. Even if the Government statistics were absolutely true, they contained no sufficient reason for coercion. All great and popular agitations were accompanied with more or less of crime. The English Reform Bill agitation, the Corn Laws agitation, the Trades Union agitation, were all accompanied by crime of a far more serious character than those which had characterized the Land League agitation. ["No, no!"] "No, no!" said an hon. Member; but he (Mr. Gray) did not remember an instance in which any body of Irish tenantry had assembled and threatened to burn down the landlord and his family. That was what occurred in a mere trade dispute in England, where there was no danger of starvation, and no danger of sentence of death. Yet the men coolly assembled in their hundreds and threatened to burn down the owner of the factory and his wife and family. That was the case at Blackburn. That a considerable amount of crime and disturbance existed in Ireland he did not want to deny; but, in all sincerity, he declared that he believed that if the Land League organization had not existed the crime would have been ten-fold what it had been. ["Oh, oh!"] On his honour he believed that, and was quite certain of it. He would relate an instance in which the public mind was deceived. A statement had been made that the hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham) had been obliged to leave the country. That statement was made by an Irish Conservative paper, *The Dublin Daily Express*, and copied into the English papers; and when the hon. Member wrote to *The Daily Express*, saying there was no foundation for the statement, that paper, which was interested in keeping up the alarm, would not insert the contradiction, and consequently the hon. Member was obliged to request another Irish paper to publish his contradiction. He must apologize for having accidentally named the hon. Gentleman, who was a Member of that House. Again, a statement appeared in *The Times*, to the effect that the hon. Member for Galway County (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had been obliged to leave the country; and he (Mr. Gray) believed he was not mistaken in saying that the hon. Member had written to *The Times* to say there was no foundation for the report. Now, really he was not exaggerating when he said that three-fourths of these cases were exaggerated, and one-half had no foundation whatever. [*Laughter.*] If it was not permissible for an Irish Member to make an Irish bull, he did not know to whom it was permissible. Some person was kind enough yesterday to forward him a copy of a newspaper, which, though a newspaper man, he had never had the pleasure of reading before. It was *The Protestant*. It was not very well printed; but at the end there was this—"Please excuse the typography; our printers are only 11 or 12 years old." It was printed at Carough Orphanage, Naas, by Protestant orphan boys. This ought to be a very Christian publication. He would take the liberty of referring to what it said in reference to the Prime Minister. He (Mr. Gray) was sorry the right hon. Gentleman was not in his place to hear it; but he would send him a copy. It was really very interesting. The passage contained in it to which he referred described the right hon. Gentleman as a robber and a murderer, and represented the country as in the hands of a wild, shrieking array of banditti, with a small band of resolute men, with women and children in the centre, waiting for death. That was the kind of literature that had got up a certain state of alarm, about which they who lived in Ireland knew but very little until they came over to England. It was then they knew the desperate condition of affairs in which the country was placed. The whole object of this exaggeration was simply to get up an alarm in England, and so facilitate the passing of a Coercion Bill. He felt considerable difficulty in trespassing on the time of the House, and, therefore, he would not say anything more on that subject; but there was one other matter to which he would wish to refer. If they were determined to introduce a Coercion Bill, of what nature, from their own standpoint, must that Coercion Bill be in order to be effective? Hon. Members would bear him out in saying that the whole attack during the debate which had taken place had not been based on statistics of outrages, but that it had been a direct attack upon the Irish National Land League. The outrages had only been a side issue; the sole object of the attack had been the attack on the Land League; and, therefore, the Coercion Bill was bound to be ineffective unless it crushed the Land League. That was what they had to face. What Coercion Bill would do that? To attack the National Land League directly would not produce the remotest effect. They had tried that in the Emancipation Act with reference to the Catholic Association, which was suppressed by name, but which was immediately resuscitated under another name. What kind of coercion did they intend to introduce to be effective? Regulations for the taking away of arms, for the prevention of conspiracy, would not be effective in securing the dissolution of the League. They would have to go very much further than even the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland or any Member of the Government was prepared to go, if they wished their coercion to be effective from their own standpoint. They would have to go to this extent, if they did anything—to put an end to public meetings and to resort to martial law. Nothing short of that, in his opinion, would do anything beyond driving moderate men, who had not up to this identified themselves with the movement into becoming members of the Land League, as a protest against the policy of coercion. He wished to tell the House of a conversation he had with a Catholic Bishop within the last fortnight, when discussing, as everybody was then discussing, the possibility of coercion, and its probable effect. That rev. gentleman had never identified himself with the Land League—he was not one of those whom some Members of the

Government had in their mind. He was quite an inoffensive Bishop, who had, up to that time, abstained from any connection with the Land League. He (Mr. Gray) asked the Bishop what would occur in the event of something like the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, or coercive legislation which might cause numbers of Irishmen to be arrested. The reply was—"What will happen, so far as I am concerned, is this—the day the first man is arrested under a Coercion Act, that day, or as soon after as I have an opportunity, I shall publicly advise my people to pay no more rents at all until that man is released." That conversation, he could assure the House on his honour, actually took place, and that Bishop meant what he said. What would they do with him? Arrest him? [*Cries of* "Name!"] It was not customary to give names now; and he was only following the example of a very eminent authority in declining to do so. How would the Government fight the whole people if they identified themselves with this movement, as he believed they would, in consequence of the application of coercion? If the Government passed a Land Bill, not such a measure as an extreme section of the people would ask for, but a reasonable Bill, they would put an end to the formidable features of the agitation; but if they preceded the message of peace, as they were determined to do, with a Coercion Act, they would force men as a protest into the arms of the Land League. He (Mr. Gray) had all his interests bound up in Ireland, being concerned in its peace as well as its wellbeing; and he confessed that he looked forward with the greatest apprehension and the greatest fear to the results of their approaching legislation. With the feeling that had been shown by the Members of the House, no doubt the Government would succeed in passing any Bill which they desired; but it would be for the Irish people to calmly consider their proposals. He failed to comprehend the policy of the Government. If it were a Conservative policy he would understand it. He would say that they desired to exasperate the people so as to enable the Government to get out of any legislation on the Land Question at all. But this was a Government who had announced their determination to deal with the question. Members of that Government had, again and again, logically traced all the evils of the country to the land system, and had, again and again, shown that coercion had always failed; and the position of the Government was to him incomprehensible. There were a good many other things which he should have wished to say had time been permitted; but he did not feel that he should be justified in trespassing much longer on the time of the House. But he should like to state that the Rev. Mr. Newell had written to him from Ennistymon with reference to the exaggerations which were so common in the London Press, and which had imbued the mind of England with the notion that Ireland was in a state of anarchy. That gentleman stated that the Special Correspondent of *The Standard* had written a letter to that paper maligning the people of the locality and himself. The rev. gentleman stated that that part of the country was most peaceable, and that no outrage on man or beast had occurred, and yet the people were represented as a lot of assassins; that the people were very indignant, and had asked him to take steps to get the fallacy exposed. Now, this was a very common case. A good many allusions had been made in the course of the debate to Mr. Davitt; and an attack upon him was made one or two nights ago by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), which he (Mr. Gray) was bound to characterize as one of the most cowardly he had ever known. The Government had at last discovered that Mr. Davitt was a very able man, and they had indicated that they considered he was a very formidable man. Certainly, he was a very able man, and he would be a very formidable man after the Government had passed their Coercion Bill. It appeared that the Government considered that Mr. Davitt had certain revolutionary objects in view. He (Mr. Gray) was not in Mr. Davitt's secrets, and he knew nothing about that; but, no doubt, he had very extreme objects in view, which, however, as far as he (Mr. Gray) could see, he proposed to promote by Constitutional means. Therefore, he was perfectly justified in the course he was taking. The Tories thanked the Government for introducing a Coercion Bill. They were now the best friends of the Government, ready to stand by them in any and every emergency. What did Mr. Davitt, whom the Government thought to be their enemy, think of them? From his speeches it might be gathered what the effect would be on the mind of the extreme section in Ireland. At Tralee, last Sunday, Mr. Davitt said that when they looked at the action of the so-called Liberal Government—he (Mr. Gray) was sorry that that expression "so-called" was now spreading throughout Ireland —when they saw the so-called Constitutional rights of the people trampled on, the only conclusion they could come to was that Constitutional Government in Ireland was committing suicide; and, having come to that conclusion, he saw no reason why the Land League should do anything to take the razor out of the hand of the would-be suicide in order to cut its own throat. The Government had expressed their opinion as to the ability of Mr. Davitt. There was his estimate of what they were doing. For himself, he (Mr. Gray) would only say that, having the deepest possible sympathy with the great Liberal Party, and feeling the greatest possible pain in being conscientiously forced into a position of hostility towards it, he regretted most deeply the course they were now taking. He believed that if a Land Bill had been introduced, and that if the Chief Secretary for Ireland, or any leading Member of the Government, had, during the autumn, done what had been done on all previous occasions when the Government contemplated great Constitutional changes, and had declared beforehand their determination, they would have done a great deal to allay excitement in Ireland, and prevent agitation. The Government had themselves to thank, both for their conduct when in Opposition, and for their imperfect action when previously in Office. At the present moment it appeared that either they did not know their own mind, or, knowing it, they kept silence, for which there was no justification in the circumstances. He believed that if they introduced a Coercion Bill for Ireland, they would find that events would go too fast for them; and it would not then be in the power of the Land League to keep the country in check. All the talk about "armed rebellion" was pure, unmitigated nonsense. The introduction of large forces of military into the country was utterly unnecessary; but he was convinced that serious outrages, and numerous outrages, would follow upon the passing of a Coercion Bill. He said, also, that he made this declaration as a conscientious belief, which he felt bound to express, that the outrages would not be confined to Ireland; and that the Government would have to face a condition of affairs in England which would tax their resources to the utmost. He sincerely trusted, from his heart, that he was mistaken. No man had less sympathy with outrages than he had; but, believing what he did, he should feel most culpable if he did not declare that belief. He regretted the absence of any definite announcement from Government as to the nature of the Land Bill. He believed that, if they wanted to settle the question thoroughly, they must not only give the Irish people the reality of protection from eviction, protection from increase of rent, and the right of free sale, but they must also give the appearance of it. He dreaded some attempt to cobble the Land Act of 1870, and to get round the difficulty without facing it. They must have the appearance of a new departure; they must have a measure that would strike the imaginations of the people; and he feared that the declaration of the Premier in 1870, when he spoke so forcibly against fixity of tenure, might actuate him, and lead him to give the reality of fixity of tenure without the name. If he did that, one-half of the good that the Act would do would be gone at the outset. If they did not pass a measure which would strike landlord and tenant alike as being a new departure in legislation, they would make a great mistake. He believed the Irish people would accept fixity of tenure at fair rents, some people as a permanent settlement of the question, and others as a step in the right direction; but this must be the name of it, and there must be no cobbling, as he had said, of the Act of 1870; otherwise, they would simply put a plaster on the sore and leave the wound unhealed.

Mr. WILLIS said, he would have been content to have given a silent vote in favour of Her Majesty's Government had it not been for the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell). To him it was sufficiently painful to have to vote for granting these additional powers to Her Majesty's Government, especially after he had so often voted with the Irish Members last Session. The reason he intended to support the Government was this—that he was not, in doing so, voting for coercion; he was voting to give Her Majesty's Government additional powers to free the people in Ireland from the bondage of a power which now rivalled, and, unless some steps be taken, would soon endanger, the authority and existence of Parliament in Ireland. The policy of the Government was not one of coercion but of liberation; therefore, rightly or wrongly, he declined to follow any inquiry into the number of agrarian outrages; but if he thought those outrages were isolated acts arising from misconduct, or the manifestation of a rising against injustice, he should be slow to suspend the Constitution, or to vote for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. It appeared, however, that in Ireland neither the feebleness of sex and age, nor the sanctity of home, could avail to protect the people from the terrorism that was being exercised; and it was absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the honour of Great Britain that the power of the Land League, which was eating out the authority of Parliament, should be suppressed and put down. That organization was illegal in its conception; illegal in the methods it adopted; illegal in the objects at which it aimed; and the suppression of every land meeting in Ireland, he maintained, would not strike the slightest blow at the right of public meeting. A meeting, however large it might be, which was called for the purpose of informing Parliament of the nature of its duty, and to guide it in the performance of its duty, was perfectly legal; but a meeting held for the purpose of redressing grievances without the consent of Parliament, and effecting changes which it was within the competency of Parliament to effect, was an act of sedition, and trod closely upon a still more grave offence. A person was guilty of sedition who incited people to take other than legal courses to alter what the Government had in charge. These were not his views, but that of Erskine, an authority whom most hon. Members would respect; and Erskine further said that he who wished to avoid sedition must not incite individuals to withdraw from their subjection to the law. It was a remarkable fact that not a single Petition had been drawn up at any of these meetings for presentation to that House, which had only been referred to with contempt and derision. He desired hon. Members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House to bear in mind that unless this Land League were suppressed, and measures taken by the Government for that purpose, they never would be asked to consider a Land Bill for Ireland. The crime of the Land League was this—that they had, according to their own statements, in a large part of Ireland redressed the grievances of the tenants—["Hear, hear!"]—without the sanction of Parliament. He was surprised that a statement like that made by a Member in the British House of Commons should be cheered, for the statement meant that, without the consent of Parliament, an organization had been created that had passed laws, both civil and penal, as if it were an Assembly authorized by Parliament to change the laws of Ireland. It was boasted that the area of that organization was daily widening, and that soon what was the law of the League would be the law of the greater portion of Ireland. It would be a disgrace to any Government that allowed such an organization to continue. There were hundreds of persons who could no longer claim the law of Her Majesty's Courts, but were subject against their wills to a merciless and cruel power. Might he read the law of the Land League?—

> "Whereas rents in Ireland are often unjust, be it enacted that it shall be lawful for any tenant who thinks his rent is unjust to appoint an arbitrator and to call upon his landlord to appoint another, which said arbitrators shall determine what is a fair rent to be paid. If the landlord shall fail to appoint such arbitrator, it shall be lawful for the tenant to offer to the landlord such a sum as the tenant considers he can be fairly called upon to pay and to ask for a clear receipt. If the landlord refuse to take such sum and to give such receipt, it shall be lawful for the tenant to withhold payment altogether until such time as the landlord offers to accept the same; but, until such offer on the part of the landlord, it shall be lawful for the tenant to remain in undisturbed possession of the land without paying any rent, all writs, processes, and decrees of Her Majesty's Courts notwithstanding."

MR. BIGGAR: I rise to Order. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER motioned to MR. WILLIS to proceed.

Mr. BIGGAR: I rise to Order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. Member for Cavan rises to address the Chair upon a point of Order he is entirely out of Order.

Mr. BIGGAR: I rise to a point of Order. The point of Order I wish to raise is this—I wish to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to interrupt the hon. and learned Member for Colchester.

Mr. WILLIS continued. He must ask permission to tell the House when that law was proclaimed.

Mr. BIGGAR: What law?

Mr. WILLIS said, that what he had read was as much law in parts of Ireland as if it was on the Statute Book, and obeyed more completely than measures that Parliament passed. On the 12th of October, 1879, there was a meeting at Navan; 20,000 persons were present. There were flags and banners with these mottoes—"Tenant right against landlord might;" "Down with landlords;" "Reduce rents." The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) said—

> "The only course for the tenant farmers of Ireland is this—now that they are in possession of their farms to see that they remain in possession. Go to the landlord; if he disagrees with your estimate of what a fair rent should be, ask him to appoint one man, and say that you will appoint another, and they will settle it between them. If he refuses the arrangement, offer him what you consider you can fairly be called upon to pay, and ask him for a clear receipt. If he refuses to give you a clear receipt, put the money in your pocket and hold it till he comes to his senses."

That was received by the people, whom he (Mr. Willis) did not blame, with deafening cheers. The hon. Member for the City of Cork, on the same occasion, went on to say—

> "If the tenants on each property join together and do this, the cause of the tenant farmers in Ireland is won. No landlord can prevail against you. Do not fear that they will be allowed to evict you and drive you from the country *en masse*, as they did in 1847, when they had the famine on their side and the starving people to deal with. They have a strong people to deal with to-day, who are fast becoming resolute and determined to act unitedly together in order to save themselves and keep themselves on the land."

At that part of the speech there were shouts of "Down with them!" and "Shoot them!" Then the hon. Member had, on other occasions, said—

> "It is the duty of the Irish tenant farmers to combine among themselves and to ask for a reduction of rent; and if they get no reduction where reduction is necessary, then I say it is the duty of the tenant to pay no rent until he gets it; and if they continue to act in that way, and if, being refused a just and reasonable reduction, they keep a firm grip of the homesteads, no power can prevail against hundreds and thousands of the tenant farmers of this country."

Now, that object was utterly illegal; and, after the delivery of that seditious speech, the hon. Member for the City of Cork might, under the powers properly exercisable by the Executive, have been arrested for the very utterance of those words. The hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) had delivered a speech to much the same effect, advising the tenants to make agreements among themselves as to what it would be fair to pay, or what they were able to pay, and that no man should go behind his neighbour and break away from that agreement; that they should offer the landlord that sum, and if he refused it they should pay nothing until he came to his senses. Was that law being obeyed? It was a serious thing for the Members of that House, from whatever part of the Kingdom they came, to find that such a law as he had read was being actually enforced upon unwilling persons. To show how it was being obeyed, let him read another extract. Within the last two months the hon. Member for Tipperary made another speech, in which he said—

> "We have now in the South seen landlord after landlord come down and take the reduced rents which we advised the people to offer them, and thank them for them, and go home again civilly."

And the hon. Member boasted that the Land League had not only stopped the hand of the evictor, but that it had undone the evictor's work, and eviction decrees had been delayed through fear of the Land League and its followers. A stronger proof of the domination of the Land League could not be given. An hon. Gentleman had told the House that the action of the Land League had reduced the number of evictions. Now, he (Mr. Willis) confessed that he heard with regret that the evictions were few; not because he would not be the first to relieve those who were suffering, and were unjustly evicted, but because he was attached to Her Majesty's Courts and to

Her Majesty's authority, and because he was unwilling to see them openly defied and set at naught. It was as if men by force of arms had taken possession of a large district in Ireland, and, by a cordon of fortified places, prevented the operation of the law within that district. He maintained that the Land League was an illegal organization; and his last words addressed to the Irish Members were that every measure of justice should be given to Ireland through the British Parliament, but nothing without it.

MR. CHILDERS: Mr. Speaker, I think that I ought to apologize to the House for addressing it at the present hour; but I do so in consequence of the inability to wind up the debate of my right hon. Friend at the head of the Government (Mr. Gladstone), who intended to take part in the debate towards its close. I am sure, however, that in the very few words I am about to say—and I shall speak as shortly as possible—I shall have the indulgence of the House. It appears to me that the time has now passed either for Party recriminations, or the bandying about of statistics, or the recital of doggrel, or for any of the other processes which have lengthened out this debate. I will simply ask the House to consider what is the exact question before it. The question is the adoption of an Address which re-echoes the words of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, and which thanks Her Majesty for having placed before us certain information, with a view of telling us the measures which will be submitted to us for intrusting her with additional powers for the protection of life and property. The House proposes to inform Her Majesty that our careful consideration will be given to the subjects which Her Majesty has recommended to our attention. To these words the hon. Member for the City of Cork takes no exception whatever; but we are asked at the same time—in the same breath—to pass an Amendment, informing Her Majesty that we decline to entertain the very proposals to which we have promised our careful consideration. Sir, probably the hon. Member who proposes this Amendment, and his Friends, do not see the utter inconsistency of the course they propose to take. But I would ask the House—I would ask those who, sitting on these Benches, may hesitate whether they shall support the Amendment or not—this simple question. Are they prepared, by this Amendment, to preclude the Government from stating to Parliament what the present condition of Ireland is; what the evils of that condition are; and in what way we propose to meet those evils, because that is the simple purport of this Amendment? Can anyone doubt that the present state of Ireland, at any rate, demands that inquiry? We do not, by the Address to Her Majesty, conclude anything; but we do admit, in that Address, that the present state of Ireland demands inquiry; demands that Her Majesty's Ministry, who are responsible for advising Her Majesty as to proper legislation for Ireland in its present necessity, should be allowed to state their proposals, and then that the House should have an opportunity of considering the measures which we shall place before them. The hon. Member for Cork City certainly made a very ingenious speech, in which he endeavoured to show that there was nothing particularly wrong in the state of Ireland. It is quite enough for me to say only this, in reference to that part of his speech in which he said that evictions and outrages had advanced *pari passu*, that the whole of that statement, and the figures which the hon. Member gave, have been entirely disproved in the debate. There can be no question whatever—whatever arguments may have been used to show either that one species or another species of crime has advanced or diminished in equal or unequal proportions—that the present state of Ireland as to agrarian crime is of the most serious character, and one which demands the careful consideration of Parliament. The hon. Member for Cork City really went very far afield in alluding to a matter which related to myself. The hon. Member asked a question of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant about the prosecution of certain gentlemen at Tralee, and he gave what he apparently considers a reason why these gentlemen should not be prosecuted—namely, that one or two of them had presented to me an address in the month of September, and must, therefore, have been quite blameless in these transactions. Now, Sir, what was the fact? In September last, when I was at Tralee, the tainted breath of the Land League had not passed over the county of Kerry. At that time, gentlemen connected both with the town of Tralee and with other parts of the county of Kerry came forward to present an address to me, as a Member of Her Majesty's Government, and, with expressions of goodwill towards that Government and myself personally, asked me to make certain inquiries into their general and local wants. But who does not know that long before it was any question of coercive measures the action of the Land League had terrified moderate men to that extent that the friendliness exhibited towards me was no longer safe? It is absurd to make the goodwill exhibited in September any apology for the violence excited in December. On this subject I may now, perhaps, be allowed to allude to another matter somewhat personal to myself. The right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson)—I am not sure whether he is in his place now—a few weeks ago made a very violent attack upon me under these circumstances. He stated that while Lord Mountmorres was lying dead in his own house, and while the news of his murder was ringing in every capital in Europe, he having been murdered on the 25th of September, I, on the 28th of September, made a speech to these gentlemen at Tralee in which I took no notice whatever of that murder, and made no attempt to reprobate it. I am sure, Sir, that I shall have the indulgence of the House if I say one word in reply to a charge of so odious a character. Lord Mountmorres was murdered on the night of Saturday, the 25th of September. I spoke at Tralee early on the morning of Monday, the 27th of September. The first news of the murder of Lord Mountmorres was contained in a very few lines in the papers of that morning—Monday morning. When I left the house where I was staying to meet the Tralee deputation I had not heard a word of the murder, though a rumour of it reached me a few minutes before I spoke. [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: What about Killarney in the afternoon?] At Killarney, on my way back, some gentlemen met me; but we had not received the Dublin papers, and I should have been most unwise to speak of it as an agrarian outrage on, virtually, no information. Perhaps, Sir, I may now refer to a matter on which the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) laid much stress in the speech which he has delivered this evening. The hon. Member for Queen's County, trying to minimize the character of the present agitation, said it could not be very serious, because there had been no difficulty in recruiting soldiers in Ireland.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I be allowed to explain. What I said was, that the present movement in Ireland did not partake in any way of veiled rebellion or sedition.

MR. CHILDERS: Just so; he thought the action of the Irish soldiers justified him in minimizing the character of the movement. All that I have to say in reply to the hon. Member is, that there never has been a time, whatever might have been the state of Ireland, in which the Irish soldiery have not been loyal to this country; and no stress, therefore, ought to be laid upon the fact that Irish soldiers now are as loyal as Irish soldiers were as an argument to prove the innocency of the policy of the Land League. There is one point of view to which I do not think any hon. Member has addressed himself in connection with this large question. We have heard a great deal from some hon. Gentlemen as to the way in which the operations of the Land League are viewed in Ireland, and we have heard much as to their appreciation in other parts of the United Kingdom. Is it fair to ask how they are viewed in other parts of the world? I happen to have a very large correspondence with gentlemen in several other liberally-governed countries—in France and the United States, for instance—among those who belong almost exclusively to the Liberal Party. I say, and this will be confirmed by those who read French, or American, or German papers, except the Fenian Press of America, or the Communist Press of Paris, that there is a unanimous expression of opinion that the present state of things in Ireland does require further provision for the protection of life and property; and I am bound to admit that, in many cases, there is an expression of surprise that legislative action has not been taken. Sir, I will read only one extract from one of the most able publications in France—a publication in which very moderate opinions are expressed, but which, I believe, expresses correctly the sentiments of the French people on this subject. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for the current month there is this passage—

> "The Land League has acquired in a few months a power such as nothing can resist. Everywhere its orders are obeyed. It surrounds its whole population with a network of revolt and insurrection. Security of person, right of property, business transactions, all are in a state of suspense. What is to be done in such a state of things?"

An hon. MEMBER: Who is the author?

MR. CHILDERS: M. de Mazade. Now, I believe that these words, or words like them, do represent the general opinion, not of countries autocratically governed, but of the Liberal countries of Europe, and of the United States of America; and if, with the knowlege that that is the general opinion of the world, we absolutely refuse, as the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork would lead us to refuse, to entertain the question and to ask Parliament to take action, after the evils which afflict Ireland shall have been put before the House by my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, the civilized world will agree that we have not done our duty. For my own part, I can only say—and I am sure that I am speaking also for my Colleagues and many Members of the Liberal Party—that there is no pleasure whatever in being connected, either directly or indirectly, with exceptional legislation for Ireland. The House will forgive me if I allude for a moment to my own opinions. For some years past I have taken, as many hon. Members may know, no little interest in the affairs of Ireland; and I only say that I wish to God I had had the opportunity and means of taking a more lively interest in that country earlier. The fact has already been alluded to that during last autumn I went for some little while to study for myself the state of Ireland. I visited the most distressed parts of Ireland, and I did what I could to obtain information for myself; and this I will say—and I say it from the bottom of my heart—that I only wish, when I first entered the House, that I had devoted more time to the study of the affairs of Ireland, and to an endeavour to do what I could to assist in placing them in a more satisfactory condition than that in which I find them. There is no nobler ambition for any English public man than that of devoting himself to this great and important question. We do a great deal in this House to endeavour to make happy England more happy. But I would that I could have done more than I have to endeavour to make unhappy Ireland less unhappy. I have seen myself in the West of Ireland such a state of things as, to my mind, renders it impossible for any man of feeling not to use his best endeavours to raise the condition of the Irish people, to set right their grievances, and especially to place the tenure of land upon a more satisfactory footing. There are few hon. Members in this House who have not studied some time or other in their lives the burning letters of Swift, written now 150 years ago, in which he describes the condition of Ireland, the ignorance and misery which prevailed in his day, the almost barbarism which existed in certain parts of the country. While Ireland has, no doubt, made great advances since then, England has made far greater; and the Irish Question is relatively, therefore, weightier and more urgent. Sir, I consider that it is a great libel on the Irish people to say that they are turbulent, inferior, ungenerous, or illiberal—a people whom it is impossible to govern or to improve. I do not believe in that doctrine. On the contrary, I believe most fully that the people of Ireland are a generous people — a simple people — [*Laughter from the Home Rule Members.*]—Yes; I repeat, a simple people; and although they may be easily led away, in certain circumstances, by agitators, yet if they are met in a proper spirit, and if the Government, on the one hand, takes care to repress what is injurious to them, and gives them good laws, they are as capable of rising in the scale of civilization as any race in the world. For these reasons, I hold it to be the duty—and I hope the House will feel that it is the duty—of Parliament to do its utmost to reform the laws of Ireland, and to give her good government; and this Her Majesty's Advisers have told Parliament, in the Gracious Speech from the Throne, that they are prepared to do. But, at the same time, I hope that in taking that course, and in doing our duty to Ireland, we shall do our best not to tolerate revolution, and not to allow Ireland to be swayed by a self-imposed and self-asserting tyranny.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he felt he should only express the sentiments of his Colleagues by returning to the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down his heartfelt thanks for the statement of his conviction that, with care and attention, the Irish people might, in course of time, cease to be savages.

Mr. CHILDERS: Allow me to state that I said exactly the reverse. I said the Irish people were not savages.

Mr. O'DONNELL was not disposed to take hold of any slip of the tongue on the part of the right hon. Gentleman. The embarrassments of a Liberal Government engaged in a policy of coercion must be very disturbing to the best regulated mind. The right hon. Gentleman, however, had made statements of more importance. Amongst the rest, he informed the House that the general opinion of the civilized world was on the side of the view taken by Her Majesty's Government as to the condition of Ireland. He observed that he quoted some anonymous passages out of that nondescript periodical the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, perhaps written by a citizen who owed something to Her Majesty's Government for a reception in this country which he might not have received elsewhere. But the right hon. Gentleman took very good care not to quote the emphatic condemnation passed on the conduct of the Government by the great Parliament of the Republic of the United States. But he and his Colleagues could appeal from the anonymous scribblers of the Gambettist Press to the opinion of their kinsmen and allies beyond the Atlantic. He thought there was little in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman that required a particular answer on the part of the Irish Members, the nearest approach to an argument advanced by him being that the passing of the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork would prevent Her Majesty's Government dealing with the case of Ireland. But he (Mr. O'Donnell) understood that the passing of that Amendment would only declare that the opinion of the House that coercion previous to the introduction of remedial measures was not the way to improve the condition of the Irish people. However, it had been justly pointed out that hon. Members from Ireland would have a great many opportunities of examining at length into the conduct of Her Majesty's Government; and he had no doubt that many such opportunities would present themselves, although it was well, at that stage, to remark that there were already some things upon which opinion could be at once passed. In the first place, he did not think it unwise to ask the House to remember what was the nature of the evidence on which it had been asked to approve a policy of coercion towards Ireland. This evidence, he thought, could be fairly summed up by saying that the information had been contributed by the London edition of *The Dublin Orange Express*, while the other portion of the evidence pressed on the Liberal Party was that supplied by the personal experience and knowledge acquired by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. Before proceeding further, he was only doing his duty in congratulating that right hon. Gentleman on what all sound Constitutionalists must consider the happy change which had come over him during the last two months. He had still ringing in his ears the burning declaration of the right hon. Gentleman against Irish landlords, and his appeal from the House of Lords, who rejected the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. He doubted not that he felt himself to deserve the applause which had greeted him during the last few days, even though his conduct might deepen still further the feelings that existed against the institutions of the country, and excite still more an unhappy people against the laws. What was the information at the disposal of the Chief Secretary, and the opportunities which he possessed for arriving at a knowledge of Irish affairs? Was it not clear, to use an expression now become familiar, that there had been no more complete instance of the Boycotting system than that to which the right hon. Gentleman had been exposed? From the moment of his arrival in Ireland to the present day he had been as purely thrown upon the resources of Dublin Castle as Captain Boycott himself—in his beleaguered farm. He did not particularly blame the right hon. Gentleman for ignorance of Irish affairs, for in that respect he was no more ignorant than the average of Irish rulers; the only difference between the right hon. Gentleman and others being that he seemed to be utterly unaware of the smallness of his information upon Irish subjects, while his Predecessor never made the slightest affectation of having any acquaintance with them. However, it was notorious that the ignorance of the right hon. Gentleman had been the common jest in all circles in Dublin for weeks and months past. Nor had this ignorance of Irish affairs been jested upon by any class of persons more than by the Conservative Party, which calmly enjoyed the predicament in which the right hon. Gentleman was placed. Without any disrespect to the right hon. Gentleman, he trusted he might repeat a story which illustrated the peculiarities of his position. A Member of the Conservative Party, speaking to another official in Dublin, asked what was thought of the new Chief Secretary, and the answer was one of high approbation of the qualities which he was already showing. It was remarked that this was strange, considering the liberal professions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford; but the reply was—

> "At the great agricultural exhibition, held last year or the year before in London, there was an old woman from Rouen, with a machine for getting chickens ready for market; she just put the bird into the machine; there was a metal tube inserted into the bill, and the primary process of nuturing was begun by turning a handle."

The Conservatives at the Castle were turning the handle all day, in the case of the right hon. Gentleman, who had been utterly helpless in the hands of the men who surrounded him in Dublin. He had been in contact only with the permanent staff of Toryism in Ireland. The Liberal Party should take into consideration the fact that there was no Liberal permanent staff in Ireland; the staff at the Castle was Tory and reactionary from the highest to the lowest, and English Members going to Ireland had no other source of information with regard to Irish affairs. He would go so far as to think that the good intentions of the right hon. Gentleman might, under the circumstances of the situation, have called for kindlier treatment on his first experience of Office in Ireland; indeed, he thought it a misfortune to both Parties that the sharp differences between him and the bulk of the Irish Party unhappily took place at such an early stage. He was of opinion that the right hon. Gentleman was disposed to hear both sides of the question, though he must qualify the statement by saying that he brought to the task views as to Irish nature and characteristics which would have repelled those whom he consulted. But, as a matter of fact, the Irish Party cut him, and "Boycotted" him, and from that time he had been thrown entirely upon the resources of Toryism. Hon. Members might respect the Chief Secretary in his private and public character as much as they pleased; but they could not shut their eyes to the fact that it was almost impossible to conceive a situation in which a man could receive less information with regard to popular impulses or rights and wrongs in Ireland than an Englishman condemned to take it from the inspirations of the Tory staff. He would now draw attention to the statement which had been pressed very often and very offensively on the Irish Party in the course of the debate—the alleged superiority of England in the matter of crime and its detection as compared with Ireland. He found, for instance, that the Solicitor General for Ireland, when an interruption from the Irish Bench reminded him of the paucity of outrages in Ireland as compared with England, replied that "in England murder was detected." The return of the number of coroner's inquests held in England and Wales during 1879, which he presumed to be a normal year, and one in which the passions of the people were not unusually excited, showed that verdicts of murder were returned in 153 cases, 78 of which were against females, the remaining 75 being against men. During the same year only 13 men were executed, from which it appeared that there was an enormous discrepancy between the crimes and the number of punishments inflicted. But that was not the only conclusion to be drawn from this formal return of verdicts of coroners' juries in England and Wales for a normal English and Welsh year. During the same period 272 persons died from injuries of which the causes were described as unknown; and he asked the House what would be the comment passed by the united Press of England and Wales if some scores and hundreds of coroners' juries in Ireland could be quoted as returning a proportionate number of verdicts for deaths by injuries, "causes unknown?" What a bloody picture would, under those circumstances, be displayed by the fervent imagination of Ministers, of the condition of affairs in Ireland! He had intended to refer to the speech of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India, to which he had listened. He had the pleasure of reading the unanimous approval passed on the justice of its views and the closeness of its reasonings by all the morning papers; and he certainly, for his own part, came to the conclusion that there was no immediate fear of the measure suggested last year by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, when in an improper temper with the aristocratic institutions of the country, when he was witness of the present respect expressed by all Radicals for the utterances of the noble Lord. But the most remarkable statement of that speech was, that it had not been proved that the existing state of things was in any way connected with the state of distress or the action of landlords in Ireland, a statement which he thought fairly gave the measure of the noble Lord's Irish legislative capacity. Nevertheless, the noble Lord admitted that within the first three months of last year, while the full force of famine and distress was still upon the country, the Irish landlords had evicted 554 families, representing 3,000 persons, and that these evictions had been thoroughly carried out in 235 cases. But it was quite unnecessary to deal further with the noble Lord's speech, or with the accusations of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, after the reply which had been provoked from his hon. Friend the Member for the County of Sligo (Mr. Sexton). They were asked to give their support to a policy of coercion before the application of remedial measures to the Irish tenant. He wished the House to consider this fact. Was it not true that at that moment there were thousands and thousands of Irish tenants, the vast majority of whom, although some, perhaps, were culpable, were entirely and necessarily unable to pay the existing rents? It was admitted by the foremost men of the Liberal Party that Ireland was overrated at the present moment; but there were not only the ordinary overrates, they had also arrears from past years of eviction and distress. There was also this fact before them—that the landlords of Ireland were frenzied with the fear of change; that those landlords had reason to believe, if any credence were to be placed in the professions of the Liberal Party, that this was their last chance of eviction, and of clearing the soil of Ireland of what they pleased to call the superfluous tenantry. Was it not certain that numbers of the landlord class—a class which was not only socially opposed to the interests, but politically opposed to the Irish people, and the direst enemy of the Liberal Party—would take advantage of the opportunity for the suppression of combination among the tenants, in order to carry out those evictions by hundreds of thousands, which they might never be able to carry out again. Whether they were Irish or English, Liberal or Conservative, the fact that landlords were approaching their last chance must be regarded as self-evident, for if the promises of the Liberal Party were carried out, they would never more have the opportunity of evicting the Irish farmers. Knowing, as they did, that those landlords succeeded in rendering the Land Act of 1870 worse than a nullity, that they showed no consideration for the tenants, but took care of their own interests only, there could be no doubt that they would consider that they were making the best terms with the tenants by getting rid of as many as possible from the face of the land. Suppose that they succeeded in putting down the trades unionism of Irish farmers, why should not an attempt be made to put down the trades unionism of 40,000 English miners who were at that moment exerting themselves in opposition to the capitalists in the North. If Government broke down the lawful combinations of the Irish tenantry, it would leave them at the mercy of landlords and agents during the next few months; and for how many more months would not the Second Party and the Fourth Party keep the Government at their work? The destruction of that combination would be a provocation, uttered in the very extremity of servile stupidity, to civil war and insurrection. The summons was now being given to the Irish tenantry to abandon the paths of open agitation by Constitutional means, such as trades unionism, and to take refuge in the last desperate resort of hunted and miserable men. The Land League was said to be guilty of and responsible for the outrages which had been committed, although from every platform outrage had been condemned and deprecated. He was opposed to many members of the Land League; but, notwithstanding, he was assured that they were right in making the stand they had made on that occasion. He himself had not been laid under the slightest risk by reason of his action with regard to the League. There was no man more independent than he was. He had nothing to gain by remaining in that Parliament. Even if he were to give up the advocacy of the Transvaal Republic ten times over he should never obtain a place on the Treasury Bench. It was impossible that the Land Leaguers could have any object in violating the laws. The views of that League had been always against every kind of outrage, for the simple reasons of practical politics as well as those of morality and justice. It would be stupid in the highest degree for the Irish tenantry to rush into lawlessness and crime when they had nothing to do but to refuse to take the farm, rendered vacant by unjust eviction, in order to bring the richest landlord in due time to the feet of the people. If, notwithstanding, some Members of the Government persisted in throwing on the Land League the blame for the outrages that League had condemned, what blame and responsibility was not to be thrown on the Government itself? If in reply to what had been urged by them, a prohibition were issued against a lawful combination, and permission were given to the landlord class, who were hungry after arrears and desperate at the prospect of reform, to evict by hundreds of thousands, what an amount of moral and legal responsibility would not be justly due to the Government that left the Irish tenantry no resource but that fearful one which he recoiled from naming. If a single Land League orator had approved, in the slightest degree, of any murder that had been committed in Ireland in consequence of the teachings of the Land League it would have been different; but, as matters stood, the hand of the Government which forbade lawful combination and invited to wholesale eviction would be redder than the hand of Lady Macbeth. He begged to remind hon. Members opposite that on the present occasion he stood in a somewhat more advantageous position than a good many of his hon. Colleagues of the Irish Party. He never professed any exaggerated belief in the enlightened declarations of the Liberal Party when in Opposition. He remembered with satisfaction on that occasion that he made appeals to the present Leader of the Government and his Colleagues on behalf of the Bulgarians and half-a-dozen other nationalities a great deal further away from London than any part of Ireland. Who did not believe in official Liberalism? He observed with the most intense satisfaction that a great number of the Liberal Party had come down that night to support a policy of coercion for Ireland. Heaven speed every vote which would strike home another nail in the coffin of Liberal hypocrisy. Let England and Scotland, the sisters of Ireland, such sisters as Goneril and Regan were to Cordelia, enjoy the riches and honour of Liberalism from the hour in which the Government pledged themselves to give priority over remedial measures to measures of coercion for Ireland, after the right hon. Gentleman who headed the Government had refused to listen to that plea on behalf of Turkey—namely, that they would first put down the Bulgarian insurrection, and then introduce Bulgarian reforms. From that hour he would say the Liberal Government would have completed and consummated the blackest act of apostacy from its own professions that was ever perpetrated by any Liberal Party, and Irish Liberalism and Whiggery would be dead and damned politically for ever.

MR. BROADHURST said, he merely rose to say that the burning of buildings near Blackburn, in Lancashire, referred to by the hon. Gentleman the late Lord Mayor of Dublin (Mr. Gray) was not due to trades unionism in any way. It was rather the result of a want of combination and discipline among an undisciplined mob. He was sure that the hon. Gentleman himself would thank him (Mr. Broadhurst) for correcting him, and that he would be glad not to be the medium of casting a slur upon a body of trades unionists in Lancashire who were amongst the most honourable and law-abiding of Her Majesty's subjects.

MR. GRAY denied having stated that trades unionism was responsible for the outrage referred to by the hon. Member. It was no more responsible than the Land League was responsible for the murders that had been committed in Ireland.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 57; Noes 435: Majority 378.

AYES.

Arnold, A.
Barry, J.
Bellingham, A. H.
Biggar, J. G.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, J. (Manchester)
Brooks, M.
Burt, T.
Byrne, G. M.
Callan, P.
Collings, J.
Colthurst, Col. D. la T.
Commins, A.
Corbet, W. J.
Cowen, J.
Daly, J.
Dawson, C.
Dillon, J.
Gabbett, D. F.
Gill, H. J.
Gray, E. D.
Healy, T. M.
Henry, M.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Leamy, E.
Lyons, R. D.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Coan, J. C.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
Martin, P.
Marum, E. M.
Meldon, C. H.
Metge, R. H.
Molloy, B. C.
Moore, A.
Nelson, I.
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Conor, D. M.
O'Donnell, F. H.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Gorman Mahon, Col. The
O'Kelly, J.
O'Shaughnessy, R.
O'Shea, W. H.
O'Sullivan, W. H.
Parnell, C. S.
Power, J. O'C.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, W.
Smithwick, J. F.
Smyth, P. J.
Sullivan, T. D.
Synan, E. J.
Thompson, T. C.

TELLERS.

Nolan, Major J. P.
Power, R.

NOES.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Agar - Robartes, hon. T. C.
Ainsworth, D.
Alexander, Colonel C.
Allen, H. G.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Amory, Sir J. H.
Anderson, G.
Archdale, W. H.
Armitage, B.
Armitstead, G.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baldwin, E.
Balfour, A. J.
Balfour, Sir G.
Balfour, J. B.
Balfour, J. S.
Barclay, J. W.
Baring, Viscount
Barnes, A.
Barran, J.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, A.
Bass, H.
Bateson, Sir T.
Baxter, rt. hon. W. E.
Beach, rt. hon. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bentinck, rt. hon. G. C.
Biddell, W.
Biddulph, M.
Birkbeck, E.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Bolton, J. C.
Boord, T. W.
Borlase, W. C.
Bourke, right hon. R.
Brand, H. R.
Brassey, H. A.
Brassey, T.
Brett, R. B.
Bright, rt. hon. J.
Brinton, J.
Broadhurst, H.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Brooke, Lord
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, rt. hon. Lord C.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Bruce, hon. T.
Bryce, J.
Brymer, W. E.
Burnaby, General E. S.
Butt, C. P.
Buxton, Sir R. J.
Caine, W. S.
Cameron, C.
Cameron, D.
Campbell, J. A.
Campbell, R. F. F.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Carbutt, E. H.
Carington, hon. R.
Carington, hon. Col. W. H. P.
Cartwright, W. C.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton, R. K.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chambers, Sir T.
Chaplin, H.
Cheetham, J. F.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Chitty, J. W.
Christie, W. L.
Churchill, Lord R.
Clarke, E.
Clarke, J. C.
Cobbold, T. C.
Coddington, W.
Cohen, A.
Cole, Viscount
Corbett, J.
Corry, J. P.
Cotes, C. C.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Courtauld, G.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowan, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Craig, W. Y.
Crichton, Viscount
Cropper, J.
Cross, J. K.
Cross, rt. hn. Sir R. A.
Crum, A.
Cubitt, rt. hon. G.
Cunliffe, Sir R. A.
Currie, D.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davey, H.
Davies, R.
Davies, W.
Dawnay, Col. hn. L. P.
De Ferrieres, Baron
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dixon-Hartland, F. D.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Donaldson-Hudson, C.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Duckham, T.
Duff, rt. hon. M. E. G.
Duff, R. W.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Adm. hon. F.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, G. W.
Ennis, Sir J.
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, A. O.
Fairbairn, Sir A.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fawcett, rt. hon. H.
Feilden, Major-General R. J.
Fellowes, W. H.
Ferguson, R.
Ffolkes, Sir W. H. B.
Filmer, Sir E.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Fitzpatrick, hn. B. E. B.
Fitzwilliam, hon. C. W. W.
Fitzwilliam, hn. H. W.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Flower, C.
Floyer, J.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Folkestone, Viscount
Forester, C. T. W.
Forster, Sir C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fort, R.
Fowler, H. H.
Fowler, R. N.
Fowler, W.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Freshfield, C. K.
Fry, L.
Fry, T.
Gardner, R. Richardson-
Garnier, J. C.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gladstone, W. H.
Glyn, hon. S. C.
Goldney, Sir G.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Gorst, J. E.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grafton, F. W.
Grant, A.
Grant, D.
Grantham, W.
Greer, T.
Gregory, G. B.
Grenfell, W. H.
Grey, A. H. G.
Guest, M. J.
Gurdon, R. T.
Halsey, T. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, I. T.

Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, J. G. C.
Harcourt, E. W.
Harcourt, rt. hon. Sir W. G. V. V.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Hartington, Marq. of
Harvey, Sir R. B.
Hastings, G. W.
Havelock-Allan, Sir H.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, F.
Heneage, E.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon, E.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Hill, Lord A. W.
Hill, A. S.
Hill, T. R.
Holker, Sir J.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Holland, S.
Hollond, J. R.
Holms, J.
Home, Capt. D. M.
Hope, rt. hn. A. J. B. B.
Hopwood, C. H.
Howard, E. S.
Howard, J.
Hughes, W. B.
Hutchinson, J. D.
Illingworth, A.
Inderwick, F. A.
Jackson, Sir H. M.
Jackson, W. L.
James, C.
James, Sir H.
Jardine, R.
Jenkins, D. J.
Johnson, E.
Johnson, W. M.
Joicey, Colonel J.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Kingscote, Col. R. N. F.
Kinnear, J.
Laing, S.
Lambton, hon. F. W.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Laycock, R.
Leake, R.
Leatham, E. A.
Leatham, W. H.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lee, H.
Lee, Major V.
Leeman, J. J.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Legh, W. J.
Leigh, hon. G. H. C.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Levett, T. J.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lloyd, M.
Loder, R.
Long, W. H.
Mackintosh, C. F.
Macliver, P. S.
Macnaghten, E.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Arthur, W.
M'Clure, Sir T.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
M'Intyre, Æ. J.
M'Lagan, P.
M'Laren, C. B. B.
M'Laren, D.
M'Minnies, J. G.
Magniac, C.
Maitland, W. F.
Makins, Colonel
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Mappin, F. T.
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Marjoribanks, E.
Marriott, W. T.
Martin, R. B.
Mason, H.
Massey, rt. hon. W. N.
Master, T. W. C.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Maxwell, J. H. M.
Mellor, J. W.
Milbank, F. A.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Monk, C. J.
Moreton, Lord
Morgan, hon. F.
Morgan, rt. hn. G. O.
Morley, A.
Morley, S.
Moss, R.
Mowbray, rt. hn. Sir J. R.
Mulholland, J.
Mundella, rt. hon. A. J.
Murray, C. J.
Musgrave, Sir R. C.
Newdegate, C. N.
Nicholson, W.
Nicholson, W. N.
Noel, E.
Northcote, H. S.
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
Norwood, C. M.
Onslow, D.
Otway, A.
Paget, R. H.
Paget, T. T.
Palmer, C. M.
Palmer, G.
Palmer, J. H.
Parker, C. S.
Patrick, R. W. C.
Pease, A.
Pease, J. W.
Peddie, J. D.
Peek, Sir H.
Pemberton, E. L.
Pennington, F.
Percy, Earl
Phipps, C. N. P.
Playfair, rt. hon. L.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Portman, hn. W. H. B.
Potter, T. B.
Powell, W.
Powell, W. R. H.
Price, Sir R. G.
Pugh, L. P.
Puleston, J. H.
Pulley, J.
Ralli, P.
Ramsay, J.
Ramsden, Sir J.
Rankin, J.
Rathbone, W.
Reed, Sir C.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Reid, R. T.
Rendel, S.
Rendlesham, Lord
Repton, G. W.
Richard, H.
Richardson, T.
Ritchie, C. T.
Roberts, J.
Robertson, H.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Rogers, J. E. T.
Rolls, J. A.
Ross, A. H.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Round, J.
Russell, G. W. E.
Russell, Lord A.
Russell, Sir C.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
St. Aubyn, W. M.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H.
Sandon, Viscount
Schreiber, C.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scott, M. D.
Seely, C. (Lincoln)
Seely, C. (Nottingham)
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Sheridan, H. B.
Shield, H.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Slagg, J.
Smith, A.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Spencer, hon. C. R.
Stafford, Marquess of
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Stanley, hon. E. L.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stanton, W. J.
Stewart, J.
Story-Maskelyne, M. H.
Summers, W.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Taylor, rt. hn. Col. T. E.
Tennant, C.
Thornhill, T.
Tillett, J. H.
Tollemache, hon. W. F.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Tottenham, A. L.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, G. O.
Verney, Sir H.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Wallace, Sir R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S.
Walrond, Col. W. H.
Walter, J.
Warburton, P. E.
Warton, C. N.
Watney, J.
Waugh, E.
Webster, Dr. J.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Welby-Gregory, Sir W.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
Whitley, E.
Whitworth, B.
Wiggin, H.
Williams, S. C. E.
Williamson, S.
Willis, W.
Wills, W. H.
Wilson, Sir M.
Winn, R.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolff, Sir H. D.
Woodall, W.
Woolff, S.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.

TELLERS.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Kensington, Lord

Original Question again proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for the Most Gracious Speech which Her Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*,)—put, and *agreed to*.

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

AGRARIAN OFFENCES (IRELAND).

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

MR. SEXTON moved for a Return of Agrarian Offences specially reported by the Royal Irish Constabulary as having been committed in Ireland during the week up to the 7th day of January instant. He said it was not necessary for him to use many words in order to show the desirability of the Return being granted at the earliest possible moment. The proposals of the Government in favour of coercion were based, in a large degree, on the alleged increase of crime.

MR. SPEAKER: The Motion being opposed, the hon. Member is not in Order.

MR. SEXTON: Then I will renew the Motion on Monday.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

MR. MUNDELLA moved for leave to bring in a "Bill to revise the constitution of Endowed Schools and Hospitals in Scotland." He stated that the Bill was drawn on substantially the same lines as the Bill of last year.

MR. HEALY: I object, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that Notice was given yesterday.

MR. MUNDELLA: Notice has been on the Paper for a week.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice having been on the Paper for a week, the hon. Member (Mr. Healy) is not in Order in objecting to the Motion.

MR. MUNDELLA: I am quite sure the hon. Member would not wish to obstruct the introduction of a Scotch Bill.

MR. HEALY: I do object.

MR. MUNDELLA: I was about to say that we have made a few Amendments to the Bill of last year. The object is first to facilitate the machinery of the Bill, and, in the next place, to make quite clear the intentions of the Government on some points which were misapprehended. No change has been made as to the class to be benefited by the Bill, or as to the localities which are already benefited by the endowments. It is not intended to delocalize the endowments. It is also proposed to extend secondary education, for which there are further provisions; and it is proposed to enlarge the number of the Commissioners, in order to give a more representative character to the Commission; and, further, that municipal representation, which has hitherto largely prevailed in certain Scotch endowments, shall be adequately maintained. I hope the Bill in its present state will commend itself to the general satisfaction of the House, and to the favour of Scotch Members. It will link the elementary and endowed schools with the Universities, and practically provide that secondary education which is so much required.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY agreed that the Bill would form a link between the elementary schools and the Universities; but he would have been glad if the right hon. Gentleman had been more explicit as to the future Governing Bodies of the various charities. Objection was taken to the Bill of last year, on the question of their constitution; and he hoped the Government would propose to appoint to the Governing Bodies members either of municipal bodies or of educational boards in Scotland. This would be the surest guarantee the people of Scotland could have; and if the Bill were of that character it should have his cordial support. Under the last Bill there was reason to apprehend that these educational endowments would be placed in the hands of bodies who did not represent the feelings of the people of Scotland on education, and that there would be a tendency to perpetuate that kind of education which was now given in the Universities, but which was not in accordance with the wants and wishes of the public in Scotland. If this Bill was really to be a popular measure, the Government might rely upon his support, and also, he believed, on the support of the other Scotch Members and of the people of Scotland.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to revise the constitution of Endowed Schools and Hospitals in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MUNDELLA, Mr. GRANT DUFF, and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [BILL 61.]

OUTRAGES (IRELAND).

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not know what the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland proposed to do in reference to a Return he desired to move for respecting outrages in Ireland other than agrarian; but he did not propose to move for it that night unless the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to give it. He was anxious that the Government should have time to consider the point; but he had looked into the matter since the conversation he had had with the right hon. Gentleman yesterday, and he had come to the conclusion that the Returns could be prepared in the Office, and that there would be no necessity to refer to the local constabulary. He believed the Return could be prepared by the Irish Executive; and he did not want to do anything which would render recourse to the constabulary necessary. He merely wished for as much information as could be compiled by clerks in the Office from Returns already given, or from information in possession of the central constabulary authorities in Dublin.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That there be laid before this House, a Return in continuation of Return [C. 2756], classifying the Outrages other than Agrarian Outrages enumerated in said Return, in the same way as Agrarian Outrages are classified in said Return."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

MR. W. E. FORSTER: It is not very easy to give the hon. Member these particulars.

MR. PARNELL: I merely move for the Return as a matter of form, and will not press the Motion.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I do not think it will be very easy to give a Return in these terms exactly. The hon. Member, from Returns already given, can see that for the convenience of the House I made a division of the different kinds of outrages. I wished also to distinguish between threatening letters and other outrages; but such a distinction of crime generally would be unmeaning. The whole number of outrages since 1844 in Ireland is given, and I do not see how I can meet the wish of the hon. Member. I have no desire to avoid giving information, and I shall be very glad to do so so far as the constabulary can give it. They are very much overworked at present, and I do not see how I can give this Return; because, as the hon. Member is quite aware, distinctions are made about the agrarian outrages which do not exist in the case of other outrages.

MR. PARNELL: Can you give a Return classifying the other outrages?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: If the hon. Member will tell me what classification he wants, I will look into the matter; and, if I can do so, I shall be very glad to give the information.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he might give the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland fair warning that he and several other Members were extremely dissatisfied with his Return; and, as the case of the Government was founded on this Return, they meant to sift the matter to the bottom. He did not charge the right hon. Gentleman with desiring to keep any information back; but they would be in a better position to see whether that charge could be made against him when they saw what reply he gave to a question to be put to him next week. But he might give the right hon. Gentleman fair warning that the sooner he made up his mind to give the most detailed information possible — or such as might fairly be demanded, respecting every one of the cases included in the Return—the better. In looking up this question of crime in Ireland some months ago, he came across a Return in the British Museum far more exhaustive than any he had yet seen. He had not been able to find that Return in the Library of the House; but in it—its date, he thought, was 1844 or 1845—there were full details of at least all the homicides, and, if he was not mistaken, all the murders. Now, it was perfectly plain that the case of the Government depended, not merely on so many crimes having been committed, but on these having been of an agrarian character. But whether they were of an agrarian character or not, the House could not decide until they had all the information before them. He found under the head of "Murder," eight agrarian murders—that was the complete number given for the entire year. Now, he should be ready to argue that a certain proportion if not all of the murders were distinctly treated as agrarian murders; and he would beg the right hon. Gentleman—[*Interruption.*]—he was only endeavouring to draw his attention to the points which he should have to raise—to consider that the word "agrarian" was an exceedingly ambiguous word; and one of the points he should direct attention to was the exact meaning of the adjective "agrarian." The point raised by several writers on agrarian outrages was how far crime which was committed in a country, and by persons dwelling in that country, was to be regarded as crime connected with the tenure of land and with the agricultural labouring population. It was plain that crime committed by agricultural labourers, or in consequence of the relations of labour in the country, was not the same class of agrarian crime as that consequent on the relations between landlord and tenant. That was a more important distinction than might appear at first sight. His attention was called to it by an eminent Irish statistician, who had written several essays on the subject; and he wished to give the right hon. Gentleman fair warning that what he and his hon. Friends would demand would be, that every one of these 5,609 crimes should be given in detail, so that they might be able to discuss this question. He had already intimated his intention to demand particulars with regard to the several heads of crime. For instance, when he found in the Report, "Firing at persons," he should require to know—he meant, he should request the right hon. Gentleman to inform him—who were the persons fired at, where it took place, and what was the evidence upon which the statement was made that firing took place at all—[*Laughter*]—because, in support of this demand that would be advanced by his hon. Friends and himself, he would point out to the right hon. Gentleman whose hilarity was so excited that this whole case of crime depended on the hearsay evidence of police-constables.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD wished to know whether the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was in Order in referring to matters which had no bearing, as far as he could see, on the Question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say I think the observations of the hon. Member have some bearing on the Question.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR, continuing, said, he was speaking, as the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair had decided, in reference to the demand for Returns in regard to agrarian crimes. He was speaking with regard to the question of outrages in Ireland He was endeavouring to raise a distinction between agrarian and other crimes, and he begged to be allowed to proceed. The importance of the inquiries, he suggested, was this. In the first place, these were not cases of outrages committed, but of outrages reported to have been committed; and the question whether they were committed or not was comparatively open—it was a question not yet decided. At present these reports were not proved; they were only proof of crimes having been reported by policemen. Therefore, the whole case of these Returns was a case of hearsay evidence by the police; and it would be absolutely essential to a fair discussion of the Returns by the House that they should have an opportunity of examining the statements made by the police, in order to judge how far the evidence placed before that body was trustworthy, and how far it was untrustworthy. Secondly, the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) demanded not only that a distinction should be drawn between ordinary and agrarian crime, but that the circumstances of each one of the 5,609 reported crimes should be laid before the House. He did not mean to say that the Irish Members would require an exhaustive history of each of these cases. They had no desire to be unreasonable in their demands; but they certainly would demand such an account as would explain the character of the crimes that had been reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now speaking to a subsequent Return, proposed to be moved for by the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and, in doing so, he is out of Order.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR was sorry if he had travelled beyond the Return now before the House. He had not intended to infringe the Rules of the House, and he should speak upon these matters when the next Return was moved. His only reason for going beyond the present Return was that he might save the necessity of prolonging the discussion which it might be necessary to raise on Monday next. He bowed to the rulng of the Chair, and would only say this, finally, that a demand for particulars with regard to these outrages was justified by the fact not merely of the hearsay character of the evidence, but by this additional fact—that it was upon such hearsay evidence that the Government were now asking the House of Commons to suspend the liberties of the Irish people. Such a vital proposition ought not, he thought, to be adopted until they had the most complete evidence before them of the facts upon which it was based. His own opinion was that the commonest thief would not be put upon his trial, or, if he was, he would certainly never be convicted, upon such miserable evidence as these alleged outrages.

Mr. PARNELL intimated that he would withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

OFFENCES OTHER THAN AGRARIAN (IRELAND).

POSTPONEMENT OF MOTION.

Mr. PARNELL, who had a Motion on the Paper for a

> "Return in continuation of Return No. 3, showing the number of Offences other than Agrarian reported to the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, between the 1st day of January 1880 and the 30th day of November 1880, and summarised by provinces and counties, as in Return No. 3,"

said, he did not think it would be necessary to move for the Return, as he understood the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland to say that he intended to place it on the Table.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Yes.

Mr. PARNELL: Will the Return be given in counties?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Yes; I intend that there shall be a Return for the several counties.

PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES (NUMBER OF ELECTORS).

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE moved—

> "An Address for Return showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in force."

In moving for this Return, he wished to repeat what he had already stated on a previous occasion, that he quite agreed with the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) that it was desirable to have accurate Returns of the population of the various boroughs. The difficulty of obtaining an accurate Return of these populations at the present time was that there had been no Census Return for 10 years, and there would be none until June next. What he wished to promise now in reference to that matter was that as soon as the Census Returns were complete, a Return, similar to one previously moved for by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) should be given, showing the population as well as the number of electors on the register. With that explanation, he begged to make the Motion he had placed on the Paper.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in force."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Mr. ONSLOW wished to make a suggestion to his hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—namely, that in the different boroughs in England the Return should specify the freemen, as distinct from the ordinary voter. He could never understand why; but it was the fact that the freemen were also placed upon the register, and their names returned twice over. The consequence of this practice was that the Return of the total number of electors, especially in boroughs, was very misleading. If his hon. Friend would include in the Return a statement of the duplicates, it would be of great assistance, not only to the Government, but to every Member of the House. He merely threw this out as a suggestion to his hon. Friend, who might add something to his Motion.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, there would be some difficulty in dealing with these duplicate Returns. In one year they were described, and it was afterwards found out that the Return was inaccurate.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire into the Contagious Diseases Acts, 1866—1869, their Administration, Operation, and Effect:"—Mr. Massey, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Colonel Alexander, Viscount Crichton, Mr. BURT, Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN, Mr. COBBOLD, General BURNABY, Sir HENRY WOLFF, Mr. ERNEST NOEL, Colonel DIGBY, Mr. WILLIAM FOWLER, and Mr. HOPWOOD:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

Ordered, That all Reports and Returns relating thereto be referred to the said Committee.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee, That they have power to receive Evidence which may be tendered concerning similar systems in British Colonies or in other Countries, and to report whether the said Contagious Diseases Acts should be maintained, amended, or repealed.—(*Mr. Secretary Childers.*)

LANDED PROPRIETORS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. P. J. SMYTH, Bill to facilitate the creation of a class of small Landed Proprietors in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. P. J. SMYTH, Mr. PATRICK MARTIN, Mr. FAY, and Mr. LITTON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 63.]

House adjourned at a quarter
before Two o'clock till
Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 17*th January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention * (15).

Third Reading—Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment * (9), and *passed*.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND)—THE GOVERNMENT BILLS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL FORTESCUE rose, in accordance to Notice, and asked, Whether Her Majesty's Government would not, for the sake of saving time in a case where every day was of importance, introduce into this House a Bill for the Better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland, which was stated more than a week ago by Her Majesty's Ministers to be urgently required, now that there seemed no immediate prospect of their being able to introduce that Bill into the House of Commons? The noble Earl said, in putting the Question of which he gave Notice on Friday, he had not consulted with anyone, but relied on his own nearly 40 years' experience in the two Houses of Parliament. He wished to explain why he had taken that course. Before October last it seemed to him, and many law-abiding subjects of the Queen in this country, and still more in Ireland, that it was high time for the Government to take, without delay of any sort, and at any cost, effectual steps for the maintenance of law and order, and for the protection of life, liberty, and property in Ireland. He accordingly seized the first opportunity for saying so, which was in a public speech at a public gathering in Devonshire, on the 5th of October last. Captain Shaw, the very efficient Chief of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, was wont to say that in putting out a fire the first five minutes were all important. They all knew that a can of water at first could extinguish a blaze which, if left to spread unchecked, might become a conflagration too powerful for man to arrest. The Government, however, unhappily as he (Earl Fortescue) thought then, and as he thought now, had taken a different view; and the Land League waxed bolder and bolder, and the law-abiding people became more hopeless and despairing, in the absence of any effective steps being taken by the Government to maintain the authority of the law. They remained more and more despairing, awaiting week after week the summoning of Parliament to arm the Executive with powers to do what the ordinary law in their hands had proved inadequate to effect. At last, the Government decided to summon Parliament three months later than he thought it ought to have been summoned, but about one month earlier than the usual meeting; and statements were made by Her Majesty's Government, both in the Speech from the Throne and in the speeches of the Ministers, that additional powers were absolutely and urgently required by the Executive in Ireland. Parliament met, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland duly gave Notice in the other House of two Bills for the Better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland, and another Peace Preservation Bill, which, he (Earl Fortescue) gathered, much resembled in its nature the old Arms Act with which they were familiar long ago. Ten days had now elapsed, and the Address had not yet been voted in the House of Commons, and several days more might elapse before the right hon. Gentleman could bring in even the first of these two Bills which were most urgently needed. He quite appreciated the reasons which rendered it originally desirable that a Bill of this nature should be introduced into the other House and submitted first to the elected Representatives of the people. Such certainly was, and, under less extraordinary circumstances, would have continued, in his opinion, to be the most desirable course. But the present circumstances were most extraordinary, for the debate on the Address to the Crown had been most unusually—not to say unprecedently—protracted, and afforded the worst augury for the progress of Business in the future through the other House of Parliament. He remembered years ago, when a Member of the other House, a Coercion Bill for Ireland, by the suspension of the Standing Orders, being carried through all its stages in one day, and the same course being taken in their Lordships' House. But then Obstruction had not been systematically adopted by any Party; and the then head of the Government was a statesman who, throughout his illustrious career, from his studious and diligent youth up to his honoured extreme old age, had consistently, through good and evil report, supported the great principles of civil and religious liberty, but yet when in Office as consistently always strove to repress outrage, intimidation, sedition, and organized resistance to the law. He had said that ten days had now elapsed, and that there was no immediate prospect of that much-needed measure being brought in. There were two courses open to the Government with regard to it—that which he had himself ventured to suggest, and that which he frankly admitted was originally, under the then circumstances of the case, the preferable proposal. In the House of Commons two Amendments remained to be discussed on the Address, and, judging from the oratorical flow as indicated by the adjournment of the debates, it was not improbable that the debate on each of those two Amendments might be a long one; and after the Address had been voted the Chief Secretary for Ireland would have to obtain leave for the introduction of his Bill or Bills—for that stage was indispensable in the other House. That would probably originate a prolonged discussion, after which would come the second reading, and complaints would probably be made, though not necessarily yielded to, if the second reading was pressed on forthwith, that adequate time had not been allowed for the consideration of the Bill after it was printed. From his experience he should say that the debate on the second reading would be a long one. Then followed the other stages, which were Committee, Report, and third reading, each of which would give another opportunity for protest and division. If the Government were to decide, under the present altered conditions, to introduce the Bill into their Lordships' House, there would be no need to ask for leave to bring it in. By the custom of that House, any Peer might present a Bill, to which a first reading was immediately afforded. Then, as the principle of arming the Executive with additional powers was affirmed in the Answer which their Lordships had given to the Address, he hardly doubted that the measure would receive a second reading on the day following its introduction. Then came the Committee; and if the House was equally satisfied with the principles and details of the measure, the Committee might be, as he had not unfrequently known it, negatived. If there was a Committee upon the Bill, and Amendments were made in it, of course the Report would have to be received the following day; but if no Amendments were made in it, by their Lordships' practice the Report was at once received. Then followed the third reading. So that within a week, at most, the Bill might be fully considered in all its stages, and passed regularly in accordance with the practice of that House, without any suspension of the Standing Orders. That, he ventured to think, was an important matter. It was undesirable—indeed, it was unfair—that that House should be considered as always eager to pass, at once, without inquiry or consideration, any coercive measure presented by any Government. Therefore, to avoid the imputation, they should not be asked to suspend their Standing Orders, and to pass a Bill of this kind without bestowing on it any inquiry or any consideration. But that was not all. If his noble Friend had presented it that evening, by Monday next, at the latest, it would have reached the other House by quite regular steps. The Bill would also be in a more advanced stage, because, in accordance with the uniform practice of the House of Commons, any Member of that House could claim consideration for any Bill sent down from their Lordships' House; and, unless by some very extraordinary departure from the ordinary practice, it would have a first reading without debate and be ready for second reading. The stage of asking leave for its introduction would be altogether avoided. He felt confident that some time would be saved, instead of wasted, by that course; while full and careful consideration of the measure would also be insured in their Lordships' House. In Ireland the position of affairs got worse and worse, and public and private information both showed that lawlessness, or rather what had been well described as a law not passed by Parliament and hostile to the authority of the Crown, was advancing day by day, and week by week, from parish to parish, and from estate to estate. The saving of a few days—and it would be possibly not a few—would, therefore, be a great gain. A measure of this kind, to which none of their Lordships could be reconciled, except on account of its absolute necessity, was particularly painful to those who, like himself, had from their youth up consistently supported the great principles of civil and religious liberty; and while they felt that it was indispensable that the provisions of the Bill should be adequate and effective, to him, at least, it was hardly less essential that they should entrench no more than was absolutely necessary on the liberty even of the disaffected. No one could pretend that that House, comprising, as it did, within its Members men of even higher legal eminence than any in the other House of Parliament, was not thoroughly competent to bestow watchful and efficient consideration upon the Bill. He did not believe that men of sincere convictions and practical common sense would object to a course which would accelerate the enactment of this sad but necessary measure, without in any respect diminishing, but rather the contrary, the opportunities of considering, amending, or even—a monstrous hypothesis—of rejecting the Bill in the House of Commons. He greatly feared that if the Bill was pressed through the other House first, when it came up to their Lordships' House they would be invited to suspend their Standing Orders, on the too just plea of urgency, to pass the Bill at a single Sitting. Against that course he most earnestly protested—first, on behalf of the people of Ireland, who had a right to claim from such a competent Assembly as that was acknowledged to be, the fullest consideration of such an important measure; and, secondly, for the credit and character of that House, which his noble Friend and Kinsman (Earl Granville) had repeatedly and sincerely declared his anxious desire to uphold. Even if the passing of such a Bill in that House would make their Lordships unpopular, which he did not believe would be the case, they ought to face that unpopularity. He knew it was said that their vote of last year on several measures had rendered them so. He did not agree with the majority of their Lordships on various of these measures; but with regard to by far the most important of them, on which he gave his vote along with the decided majority of Liberal Peers in this House—the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill—subsequent inquiry had convinced him more and more of the wisdom and justice of the course which an overwhelming majority of their Lordships took on the occasion; and for his reasons he would refer to a recent speech of the Postmaster General, who, during his brief tenure of Office, had already distinguished himself as much by his enlightened and beneficent administration, as he had for years previously by the fearless honesty and comprehensive grasp of his speeches. He did not believe that the confidence entertained by a great majority of the law-abiding people in this country, in the wisdom, and justice, and moderation of their Lordships, was at all shaken, or would be shaken, by the introduction of the Chief Secretary for Ireland's measure into this House. But if it were, these were not times in which such considerations ought to be allowed to prevail. Old Liberals and Sanitary Reformers had had occasion to face unpopularity in the course of their lives, and even to imperil more than once their cherished seats in the other House for the sake of important principles. And in the present emergency, when they had difficult and dangerous complications in the East of Europe, when they found arduous questions to be dealt with in our Indian Empire, when they had two wars waging with doubtful success in our South African possessions, and, above all, when they had in Ireland the state of things described in the Speech from the Throne, it was earnestly to be wished that all good citizens, and especially Members of both Houses of the Legislature, and, above all, responsible Ministers of the Crown, would rise above personal and Party considerations, into patriotism, and, at least until this crisis was past, keep a single eye to the glory, honour, and welfare of the British Empire.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, after the pleasant criticism, of which he is a master, to which my noble Relative (Earl Fortescue) subjected the past conduct of Her Majesty's Government, he went on in great detail to make suggestions to us as regards the mode of conducting Parliamentary legislation. The noble Earl rather piques himself on the fact that he made suggestions without having consulted with anyone else; but, without disparagement of either his authority or his experience, I think that if he had consulted some of his Friends, Members of this and the other House, these suggestions would have come with greater weight, if he could have told us that he brought them forward with a general concurrence on their part. This I am bound to say—namely, that when Her Majesty's Government arrived at the conclusion—a conclusion which to them or to any other Government under similar circumstances could not but be a painful one—that they would bring in a Bill to give them powers beyond those they already possessed, their duty was to consider in the most careful manner how they could bring in that legislation with the least delay, and in a manner which would be the most acceptable to the Parliament from which the powers were sought. Therefore I say that we should feel grateful to any Member of this House who made a suggestion which would have a practical effect towards that purpose. The reason why I cannot assent to the suggestion which has been made is that I think, practically, it will rather defeat instead of insuring the object which the noble Earl has in view. It has been announced in the Gracious Speech from the Throne that this legislation was to be introduced in "another place." Now, my noble Friend might have quoted certain precedents of Bills somewhat of this character having been introduced first in the House of Lords. He might have cited the case of a Bill of the character of one proposed to be introduced by Her Majesty's Government which was introduced in this House nearly 50 years ago, in 1833, by Lord Grey, when, at the same time, there was introduced in the other House, by Lord Althorp, a Bill to remove some grievances of which the Irish people complained. I am not sure that my noble Friend would approve that precedent, because I gather from what he said he would probably be of opinion that priority ought to be given to that legislation which is intended for the maintenance of law and order; but I may remind him that, in 1846, Lord St. Germans introduced a Coercion Bill into the House of Lords. That measure, when it had been passed by the House of Lords, went down to the House of Commons, and at the end of four months it was rejected. Now, my noble Friend has recommended the course he proposes for two reasons—first, because it will give your Lordships full time to consider the Bill, and, secondly, because it will save time. With regard to the first reason, I cannot agree with the noble Earl. Supposing that the Bill introduced by the Government appears to your Lordships to be infinitely too strong or too weak for the occasion, your Lordships are entitled to debate it and consider it in its different stages. But if, on the other hand, as the noble Earl seemed to anticipate, the propositions of the Bill, which have not yet been announced, are likely to be on the whole what your Lordships may think expedient, I should very much doubt whether your Lordships would refuse to give facilities which have been given on former occasions for passing such a Bill in this House. One thing I can answer for, and that is that Her Majesty's Government have not such a majority in this House as to be able to force your Lordships to take any course that might be opposed to your judgment. With regard to the shortening of time the noble Earl did not in the least indicate how, by first passing the Bill in your Lordships' House, it would diminish the time which the Bill would take when it got into the House of Commons. There has been a constant complaint of the Government not bringing in more Bills than they do in this House, and the answer we have heard from successive Governments is this—that whether rightly or wrongly, whether reasonably or merely owing to prejudice, the House of Commons, as a rule, does not look with so much favour upon Bills which come from the House of Lords as it does upon those which are introduced there originally. If that feeling does exist—and I have heard Minister after Minister declare that that is the case—this is exactly the kind of Bill that I think it is desirable should, in the first instance, be submitted to the other House of Parliament. Although I claim for your Lordships an equal wish and desire not to make any encroachment on the Constitutional rights of individuals in this country, except in such a case of exceptional difficulty as will justify it, I believe the only effect of introducing this Bill here, while I am not sure it would save a stage, would be to lengthen the time spent upon it instead of shortening it, and that is a point the noble Earl most justly considered as most precious under the circumstances. Therefore, while entirely agreeing with him that it is the duty of the Government to press on the measure as fast as they are able to do so, I do not think that we should be acting up to that principle if we were to give up the course we have proposed for ourselves, and adopt the particular suggestion made by the noble Earl.

The Earl of GALLOWAY said, he must take exception to the word coercion as applied to this Bill, a word which he considered the noble Earl (Earl Fortescue), who had brought this matter forward, was not justified in using.

Earl FORTESCUE: I do not think I applied that word to this measure, but to an old Coercive Bill years ago.

The Earl of GALLOWAY: If correctly reported in the newspapers tomorrow morning, my noble Friend will find that he made allusion to the coercive measures about to be brought in by Her Majesty's Government.

Earl FORTESCUE: Then it was unintentional.

The Earl of GALLOWAY said, it was a misnomer to speak of coercion as it was proposed to be applied to Ireland. First, the whole Conservative Party had supported the Government in the other House of Parliament. Secondly, all the Scotch Members, whether Conservative, Whig, or Radical, voted for the Government on the occasion of the late division, as they understood it was their intention to bring in a Bill to put an end to the state of tyranny and intimidation which at present prevailed in Ireland. Such a measure, instead of being called a coercion measure, should rather be called a measure for the suppression of that wholesale illegal coercion which had been for so long reigning rampant in the Hibernian part of Her Majesty's dominions.

The Earl of REDESDALE (Chairman of Committees) wished to say a few words as to the present position of Parliament and the country in this case. He did not think anything had been suggested that was really a remedy for the state in which they were; and, therefore, he would suggest what he thought was one. He thought that representative Government was upon its trial in what was going on in this country. Our House of Commons had been, as it was often quoted, really the model in regard to representative Government for a vast number of years, and it was the fountain from which a great number of Legislatures had sprung. But with the Obstruction which was now being carried on in "another place," the whole institution of representative Government was brought into danger. They really could not go on much longer in the way they were going in the other House without danger to the safety of the State. He should like to know how much time had been thrown away during the last two or three Sessions by Motions for adjournment. They could not say the country was safe when it was impossible, though the emergency was great, to pass a measure on a most important subject on account of the vexatious manner in which opposition to Business was carried on in the other House of Parliament. Now, how was that to be met? There was one thing that had been suggested—namely, the adoption of the *clôture*. In the first place, he would like to know how much time would be thrown away in the debates that would take place as to the manner in which that *clôture* ought to be carried out. Why, half the Session would be gone in discussions upon that subject, and Business would not be advanced by it. Moreover, he thought the introduction of the *clôture* into the House of Commons would be most objectionable, because, though it might be useful for a particular purpose in securing a little more rapid attention on certain occasions, it was in itself objectionable, and it would very often be used hereafter in a manner that would be prejudicial to proper liberty in the House of Commons. At the present moment an Irishman might very well say—"I am very sorry that I live under a representative Government. If I had lived under a despotism, I know my person and property would have been long ago protected against what is going on now from one end of the country to the other." How, then, was this question to be met? He held that the only course to be pursued with regard to Obstruction was to proceed against it by a Constitutional despotism. Constitutional despotism might seem an odd phrase; but he would tell them how he would propose to act on the present occasion. He should like to see to-morrow a Message from Her Majesty to both Houses of Parliament, stating what was the position of affairs in Ireland, and what was the insecurity to person and property that was felt there; that it was necessary a remedy should be sought for to prevent senseless and improper Obstruction in the other House of Parliament, and that, consequently, the only way in which proper protection could be given was by the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, a mode of proceeding that had been sanctioned by Parliament already on several occasions, under similar circumstances, and therefore would not be a novel introduction to meet a new case; that a Bill to that effect would be brought into both Houses; and if the introduction of such a measure was sanctioned by both Houses of Parliament, by a single vote by majorities of at least four or five to one, thereby showing that indemnity would be granted to Government acting upon it, when sanction to the measure had been so declared by the Sovereign and both Houses of Parliament. The only way in which they could meet Obstruction of this sort was to let them feel that it was utterly useless, and that the measure would be carried against them, whether they liked it or not. Such a measure—a despotic act of the Crown, with guards which would prevent it ever being used in an improper manner—would give protection to the law-abiding and honest people of Ireland; would give protection to them in the course of a comparatively few days. When the same message was sent to this House a similar Bill should be introduced, and Notice given that a vote would be taken upon it early on the morning of the day on which the other House had voted for its introduction. If such a course were adopted, indemnity for the course which the Government would have taken in acting on the above-mentioned votes would form part of the Act as passed by both Houses. Everybody must feel, from one end of the country to the other, that there was no protection in the case of the honest people of Ireland—both as to their lives and property, and they might have to wait for months under the ordinary process before any relief could be given. It was a state of affairs absolutely injurious to the principle of representative Government, and unless in some way remedied would be an incalculable injury to free Constitutional principles all over the world.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he could not agree in the wisdom or propriety of the course which had been suggested by his noble Friend (the Earl of Redesdale). In the first place, when they were in the presence of a situation such as that of Ireland, the gravity of which was universally acknowledged and understood, and of difficulties both of an extraordinary and serious character, it did not seem to him to be wise or prudent to denounce some possible remedies, without having before them a definite scheme in which these remedies were embodied, and which, if drawn up, might possibly embody them in a form which might provide against some of the inconveniences which in another form a remedy of the same nature might involve. Therefore, he heard with regret the first part of his noble Friend's speech, in which he denounced, as impracticable, a certain form of remedy, which he described by a foreign name, but which, for his (the Lord Chancellor's) part, until he saw the real proposition before him, he should think it unwise to prejudge. But then his noble Friend went on to say that the simple and proper course for the Government to pursue would be to advise Her Majesty to send down a special Message to Parliament, recommending, on the ground of the urgent character of the state of affairs in Ireland, that some despotic course should be pursued; and the course which his noble Friend suggested was that, upon a proposition emanating from the Crown, practically the same Bill should be introduced simultaneously into both Houses of Parliament; but he (the Lord Chancellor) had never yet heard of a Bill being proceeded with simultaneously in both Houses of Parliament.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, that the same Bill could be introduced at the same time into both Houses, and a vote taken upon it. The Bill to give effect to their Resolutions would proceed in the ordinary way from the Commons to this House.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, as he understood the noble Earl, he would have the Government, after one vote of each House, without waiting until the Bill became law, assume the powers which it would, if enacted, confer upon them. In the first place, he (the Lord Chancellor) greatly doubted whether such a course of action would have the slightest tendency to cure the evil of Obstruction in the place where Obstruction appeared to exist; for if anything in the world could seem to justify Obstruction, it would be the announcement of an intention not to wait for the course of law, but to act upon a mere vote of each House of Parliament —a vote in a manner illegal, unconstitutional, and unprecedented. He fully granted there might be cases in which it might be right to supersede the ordinary course of law, and trust to a vote of indemnity, which Parliament might afterwards give, ratifying what had been done. There were precedents for such things being done, and he was far from denying that particular circumstances might make it the duty of Government to take that course. But did his noble Friend mean to say that such a course had ever been taken in respect of such a measure as the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act? The Habeas Corpus Act was passed for this express purpose—that, if any man were taken into custody and deprived of his liberty without legal warrant, application might be immediately made to a Court of Law, and the duty of the Judge, under most heavy pecuniary penalties, was immediately to grant the *habeas corpus*, and if the person in custody was found to be detained without legal warrant, then, under the same heavy pecuniary penalties upon each individual Judge, the immediate order of the Court was to be given for his discharge. Did not his noble Friend see that, if powers of that sort were assumed, the Government would be involved at once in a Parliamentary contest with those who were resisting such an illegal and unconstitutional course of proceeding, and in a contest with the Courts of Law, and with every Judge of every Superior Court in the country where those things were done? It was to prevent the possibility of that particular course being taken that the Habeas Corpus Act was passed, and, in the absence of any precedent—for the case of actual insurrection would introduce military law—to set at naught the whole authority of all the Courts of Law, and assume absolute power over the liberty of the subject, appeared to him to be of all things in the world that most likely to increase the difficulties and the embarrassments with which they were now surrounded.

LORD INCHIQUIN said, that prompt action was the one thing necessary. If any of their Lordships had been in Ireland during the whole of the autumn as he had, they would have seen the absolute necessity for the granting of further powers to the Executive without any delay. The speeches made by Her Majesty's Ministers at the Guildhall on the 9th of November, and the various other speeches that had been delivered within the past few months, gave some confidence to the country as to the course which was likely to be taken; but they ought not to have been delivered unless there was some intention of acting upon them, for from that time onwards the agitation in Ireland went on increasing in a most alarming manner, and it was pointed out, by those who were acquainted with the state of the country, that the Government ought not to lose a moment of time in putting this agitation down with a strong hand; but day after day, week after week was allowed to pass during which the greatest possible anxiety prevailed amongst all classes of well-disposed people, and the greatest interest was excited to know what steps the Government were going to take to bring about a better state of affairs. Well, they waited in vain, and at last, he, as Lord Lieutenant of his county, felt it his duty to write a letter to the Government, pointing out the state of things and suggesting the course to be taken; but the only reply he had received to his representations was a simple acknowledgment of the receipt of his letter. About a fortnight afterwards, the county being then in a much worse condition, he thought it necessary to call the magistrates of his county together. It was a strong step, he admitted, and an unpopular one. Yet it was one he felt it necessary to take under the circumstances. Forty-five gentlemen attended; and the result was that their opinion confirmed, in a fuller degree than he had expected, the extreme lawlessness of the county. They passed resolutions which could not have been worded in stronger language, and which were all passed unanimously. There was another resolution brought forward on that occasion, which he put to the meeting, but which they declined to adopt. Quite enough had already been said to show the absolute necessity of taking prompt measures. For months past agitation had been going on in full vigour which had produced the most injurious results, not only in Ireland, but in this country. He did not approve of the course suggested by the noble Earl (Earl Fortescue) of bringing forward a Coercion Bill in their Lordships' House in the first instance; because, when asking for powers to put down such an agitation as that which disturbed the country, he thought the measures of the Government should first be introduced into the Representative Assembly in Parliament. The fact was the Government had gone on week after week and month after month doing absolutely nothing whatever, and they must have foreseen what would happen when the House of Commons met. They must have known that there would be Obstruction if coercion was contemplated, because the members of the Land League had declared such a measure should not be allowed to proceed. He mentioned these circumstances to convince the Government how necessary it was to get their Coercion Bill introduced as early as possible in order that it might be passed into law. What, in his opinion, the Government ought to have done long ago was to take the law into their own hands and act with firmness and decision, independently entirely of the feelings of the Irish Party in Parliament. They all knew what that Party in Parliament was. It was almost entirely composed of the members of the Land League. Therefore, the first thing was to have acted without calling Parliament together at all, and then afterwards asked for a Bill of Indemnity. All he could say was, if the Government allowed the present state of things to go on it would be most injurious; and the longer it was allowed to continue, from what he had seen and knew to be the case, they would find that more severe measures would be necessary to restore peace and order, and it might result in the proclamation of martial law over the whole country. In conclusion, he would impress upon the Government the necessity in whatever course they were about to adopt to pursue that course at once.

The Earl of DUNRAVEN desired to make a suggestion, although it was not entirely relevant to the Question of the noble Earl (Earl Fortescue). He should have been very glad if it had been possible to introduce the Bill for the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland into their Lordships' House; but after what the noble Earl the Leader of the Government had said—that it would only cause delay, instead of facilitating the passage of the measure through Parliament—he had nothing further to say; but there was another measure which would have to come before Parliament during the present Session, dealing with Ireland, and that was the Land Bill; and it occurred to him that the same objections which the noble Earl (Earl Granville) had urged against the introduction of the other Bill into that House would not apply to the bringing in of the Land Bill into that House; while, on the other hand, there were some reasons which would actually make it advantageous to introduce that measure into that House first. Many of their Lordships were large owners of property in Ireland, of which country they had great experience; and they would probably discuss such a proposal more equably if it originated with themselves than if it came up to them from "another place;" in addition to which it occurred to him that time might be saved by adopting the suggestion which he ventured to make. It was said there was a feeling against measures which originated in this House;

but he did not think there ought to be such a feeling in regard to a measure which might so deeply affect many of their Lordships who were Irish landowners. It would, in his opinion, be far better that the Land Bill should be discussed before it reached the more heated chamber of the Lower House. For his own part, he was of opinion that the Irish landlords had done their duty as well as any body of men had ever done their duty; and yet they had received a large amount of unmerited abuse, for he thought they had—certainly so far as those landlords sitting in their Lordships' House were concerned—acted in a fair and liberal spirit towards their tenants. Therefore, if any time could be saved by introducing the Land Bill into this House, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would find it in their power to bring it in. Every day, in fact every moment longer which was lost, was only causing deeper injury to the Irish people. It was not really a Coercion Bill which was wanted for Ireland. What was absolutely required was a Liberation Bill, a measure which would restore liberty of speech and action in that country. At present there was no liberty of speech, and no man dare say anything contrary to the views of the violent minority which at present ruled in Ireland, neither was there any liberty of action if the members of the Land League were paramount. Therefore, the sooner a measure of liberation was passed for the people of Ireland the better it would be. As, however, they had been told that it would not be advisable to bring such a measure into their Lordships' House in the first instance, he hoped that the point would not be further pressed; but the other suggestion which he had made that the Land Bill should be first introduced into that House he thought was deserving of the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and he hoped they would see their way to its adoption.

RIVERS CONSERVANCY AND FLOODS PREVENTION BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to make provision for the conservancy of Rivers, prevention of Floods, and other matters—Was *presented* by The LORD PRESIDENT; read 1ª. (No. 15.)

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 17*th January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL — *Ordered* — *First Reading*—Public Houses (Closing on Sunday)* [64].

QUESTIONS.

AGRARIAN CRIME (IRELAND).

MR. SEXTON gave Notice that tomorrow he would ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it was by the direction or at the request, or with the approval of the Government, that Notice of opposition by the hon. Member for Bath, Junior Lord of the Treasury, had been placed on the Paper to the Motion of the hon. Member for Sligo, for Returns from the Irish Constabulary with regard to agrarian crime in Ireland; whether the Government, while pressing for coercive measures against Ireland, had determined to withhold from the Irish Members and from the Irish people such information as would enable them to know with accuracy the increase or decrease of agrarian crime in Ireland from week to week; and, if the Government had come to that determination, on what ground they had done so?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I may answer that Question at once. It was with my approval that Notice of opposition was given. I stated on a former occasion that there was not really time to prepare a weekly Return; but that we would give monthly Returns. After having given that answer to the Question, and the reason for the answer, a weekly Return was moved for without Notice, and, therefore, I objected to it.

MR. PARNELL: Could not the right hon. Gentleman, to use a homely phrase, "split the difference," and give us fortnightly Returns?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I have no objection to give a Return for this fortnight.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—INSURRECTION OF THE BOERS.

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether any offer of mediation in Transvaal affairs, upon the understanding that the Boers shall at once lay down their arms, has been received by Her Majesty's Government from the Government of the Netherlands or any other friendly power?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, in answer to my hon. Friend, I have only to state that no communication in the nature of mediation or otherwise has been received by Her Majesty's Government from the Government of the Netherlands or any other Government on the subject.

MOROCCO—OUTRAGE AT TANGIERS.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any information has been received at the Foreign Office of an outrage reported to have lately taken place at Tangiers upon a Jewish woman named Zahra Toledano, who, according to the report, was dragged from her home on the Jewish Sabbath, and taken to prison without being informed of any charge against her, then to the public square of the town, and there stripped nearly naked and flogged by four men, afterwards taken back to prison, and eventually released because it turned out that she was not the person for whom the punishment had been intended; whether this proceeding was taken at the instance of the French Consul, upon the authority of a verbal message sent by him to the Governor by a soldier attached to the Legation, who watched the flogging and counted the strokes; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have inquired into the case; and, if substantiated, whether they will bring the conduct of the French Consul to the attention of the French Government, and take steps both with that Government and the Government of Morocco to obtain redress for the injured woman, and prevent, if possible, the recurrence of similar atrocity?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, this shocking story has been reported to Her Majesty's Government by Her Majesty's Minister at Tangiers, and the attention of the French Government has been called to the alleged action of the French Consular authorities. The reply of the French Government is awaited before any representation is made to the Moorish Government.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND).

MR. GRAY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that in certain recent cases the Lord Lieutenant has, in the case of the superannuation of officers coming under the provisions of "The Municipal Corporation Officers (Ireland) Superannuation Act, 1869," proposed to adopt the Civil Service scale of superannuation instead of that indicated in the special Act, thereby inflicting hardship on individuals, and provoking remonstrance from local authorities, whose discretion is interfered with and overridden; and, whether there is any prospect of the spirit of Clause 1 of the Act of 1869 being in future observed in such superannuations?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The Lord Lieutenant has issued a Circular relative to the superannuation scale of municipal corporation officers; but there is no desire to depart from the spirit of the Superannuation (Ireland) Act, 1869.

STATE OF IRELAND—AGRARIAN CRIME.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the following report of a case tried before Justice Fitzgerald at the Cork Winter Assizes, and reported in the papers of the 10th December:—

"A young fellow named Denis Keefe was charged with maliciously shooting at his uncle, John Keefe, with intent to wound. The offence was alleged to have occurred near Youghal, on the 17th of August last. John Keefe, the complainant, said he purchased at an execution sal part of the land belonging to prisoner's father, but he never had any dispute about it. On the morning in question, about six o'clock, he saw the prisoner on his (witness's) land. Witness asked him what brought him there, and the prisoner then discharged some sort of firearm at him. Witness did not know what it was—he only saw 'something yellow' in the boy's hand. (Laughter.) When he saw it he threw himself down on his hands and knees, and he then heard a report like a shot. He saw no smoke, smelt no powder, and did not hear a bullet whistle past him. (Laughter.) The prisoner ran away before witness got up from the ground. His Lordship said the boy might have had a pop-gun, and directed the jury to acquit him at once, which they accordingly did. Mr. Daniel Murphy (foreman):—The jury are surprised that the boy should have been kept in gaol since August on such a charge. It was a curious thing that the magistrates at Youghal could not dispose of the case without sending the poor boy to the assizes;"

if any of the magistrates who caused the boy to be kept in gaol for four months, instead of allowing bail, were landlords or land agents; if the Government approved of their action; and, if not, whether any notice has been taken of it; and, whether the charge against Keefe is one of the agrarian crimes referred to in the statistics just issued to Members of this House?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, my attention was not called to this matter until I saw the hon. Gentleman's Notice on the Paper, on reading which I asked for a Report of the case. It appears that Denis Keefe was charged with firing a shot at the complainant from a horse-pistol, and the complainant stated that he stooped and the shot went over his head. The accused was arrested on the 18th of August, and committed for trial by the Court of Petty Sessions on the 17th of October; but I have no information as to whether bail was applied for or not. As to whether the magistrates were landlords or their agents, I suppose they were landlords. I see no ground for reversing the decision of the magistrates. The charge against Keefe was at first included in the Returns of Agrarian Outrages; but, on the acquittal of the prisoner, it was sent down to be re-considered whether it was an agrarian outrage or not. It would not be included in that category, if it were shown not to be such.

Mr. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the report of the following case tried at the Cork Winter Assizes, and reported in the papers of December 16:—

"John Murphy, Mary Murphy, and James Murphy were indicted for having, on the 13th October last, with others, risen and assembled at Cullinabeg, near Killarney, and with arms, threats, and menaces attempted to compel a farmer named Thomas Boyle Talbot to quit his place of abode, and with having assaulted said dwelling-house. The jury having retired, his Lordship asked if it were a custody case? Mr. Morphy, Crown Solicitor for Kerry—Yes, my Lord. His Lordship—Has the woman been in custody all the time? Mr. Morphy—She has, my Lord. His Lordship—That was hardly right. What became of the children? Mr. Morphy—I believe they were taken charge of, my Lord. After a few minutes' absence, the jury returned into court with a verdict of acquittal on all counts. The Foreman—The jury consider, my Lord, that it was a great hardship to keep the poor woman in gaol all the time. His Lordship—The jury have observed, Mr. De Moleyns, that they consider it a great hardship to have the woman detained in custody from her family, and I must say I entirely concur in that observation;"

if any of the magistrates who sent the case for trial, refusing bail, were landlords or land agents; if the Government are aware that the female prisoner was confined of a still-born child in gaol; that while there she was obliged to nurse another child of tender years; that the entire adult members of her family being sent like her to prison, her children at home were left adrift; if the Government approve of the action of the magistrates in sending to prison, without bail, a woman in an advanced state of pregnancy on a charge of that character; if not, what notice has been taken of the matter; and, whether, if this case forms one of those on which the Police Return of agrarian offences are founded, the Government have any objection to produce the original Police Report to Dublin Castle upon it, so that this House may have an opportunity of testing the accuracy of the Police Reports and Statistics?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I have received a Report on this case from the Constabulary authorities, and from this it appears that John and Mary Murphy and their son were arrested on the 14th October on the charge mentioned, and were kept in custody until the Winter Assizes, when they were acquitted. The case was sent for trial by the resident magistrate. Whether he was a landlord or not I cannot say. It is not true that the female prisoner was confined whilst in prison, or that whilst there she was obliged to nurse a young child. The children of the female prisoner were taken care of by a neighbour. The case is included in the Return of Agrarian Crimes presented to Parliament. I must decline, as a matter of principle, to produce the original Police Report, as it is a confidential document. What follows is a short account of the occurrence:—At about 2 o'clock in the morning a party of 10 or 12 persons attacked a house from which a tenant had been evicted, forced open the doors with sledge-hammers, smashed the windows, and compelled the young men who were there as caretakers to swear they would not return. The caretakers were attacked with sticks, stripped of their clothes, and turned out of the house. The party then set fire to a hayrick of 19 tons, another of three tons, and these, with two tons of brushwood, were consumed. The caretakers had three guns, but were so panic-stricken that they could not use them, and the guns were carried off.

MR. HEALY said, that when in Court, he himself saw the woman with a young child in her arms.

MR. BARRY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the charge upon which Messrs. Healy, M.P. and Walsh were acquitted, forms one of the agrarian crimes in consequence of which the Government are about to apply for extraordinary powers in Ireland?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that the charge referred to was one of intimidating a farmer, but it was not included in the Return of Agrarian Outrages.

TREATY OF BERLIN, ARTICLE 24—GREECE AND TURKEY—CIRCULAR OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the document published by the "Pesther Lloyd," and mentioned in the Vienna letter of the "Times" of January 12th, is a correct summary of a Circular issued by the French Government to its representatives abroad; and, if so, whether this Circular correctly represents the opinions of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the Twenty-fourth Article of the Treaty of Berlin respecting mediation between Greece and Turkey; and, whether a Copy of the above Circular will be laid upon the Table of the House?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the opinion of Her Majesty's Government is contained in the Collective Note addressed to the Porte on the 25th August, and has undergone no change. The Circular referred to by my right hon. Friend is not a document which can be laid by itself; but it will, no doubt, be included at a later period in the Papers relating to the negotiations at present going on.

MR. BOURKE: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the latter portion of my Question.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: That is a Question really of debate, and cannot be dealt with by an answer; and I must leave it to my hon. Friend to say whether it is necessary to bring it before the House.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—POWERS OF IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.

MR. DAWSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What are the special powers, if any, possessed by resident magistrates in Ireland beyond those possessed by the unpaid magistrates in that Country?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: It is true, Sir, that resident magistrates in Ireland possess extra powers in comparison with those exercised by ordinary magistrates. It would take me too long to enumerate the special powers they possess; but there are a few general statutes which confer them, and there are also several Acts which give a stipendiary magistrate power to act where a non-stipendiary magistrate could not.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE PROHIBITED MEETINGS OF THE LAND LEAGUE.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the informations representing that a Land League demonstration was dangerous to public peace, in consequence of a counter-demonstration, were sworn before or taken by any of the magistrates who were engaged in organizing these counter-demonstrations; and, whether in any case the persons who swore these informations were bailiffs, stewards, agents, or, in any other way, employés of the magistrates who organised the counter-demonstration?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had to answer both of these Questions in the negative. There had been only two prohibitions of any meeting on the ground of counter-demonstrations — one at Brookborough and one at another place. As regarded the former, he had obtained all the facts, and could definitely state that no magistrates who had been engaged in organizing counter-demonstrations had been concerned in those informations. As to the other meeting, he found that he had made one mistake in the answer he had previously given. He had said that two meetings were prohibited; but he had since found that when the day came it appeared that no Orange demonstration was attempted to be held, and the promoters of the Land League meeting having had a conference with the resident magistrate their meeting was afterwards held.

Mr. LALOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If there is any truth in the statement made at a meeting of the Irish National Land League in Dublin yesterday, and which appears in the "Times" of this morning, from which it appears that eighteen arrests had lately been made within a few miles of Headford, in the county of Galway; the charge against the accused was that they had hunted on the ground of a local landlord, and the magistrates refused to take bail?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, it was true that 18 arrests were lately made in the district referred to. Those persons were charged with an unlawful assembly, and were committed for trial to the Quarter Sessions by the resident magistrate, who declined to take bail, from whence the case had been remitted to the Assizes, the County Chairman having also declined to take bail.

INLAND REVENUE ACT, 1880—DRAWBACK ON MALT.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the whole of the Drawback upon Malt payable under the Act of last Session has been paid; and, if so, whether the Excise receipts shown in the weekly revenue accounts may be taken, so far as the Drawback is concerned, as net receipts?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, in the sense of the Question of the noble Lord, the whole of the drawback on malt has been paid. I only make that qualification, because there are two or three trifling cases in which the accounts are still outstanding; but the whole of the drawback, except the slightest possible sum, has been paid. That being so, it is quite correct that the figures published may be taken as net receipts. That is strictly true; but it is also true that those figures do not afford by themselves a safe means of comparison with the revenue of the corresponding period of previous years, which I presume the noble Lord has in his view. And for this reason—one of the changes effected in the transition from the Malt Duties to the Beer Duty was that the mode of collection by the Excise was altered; and for the six-weekly rounds into which the year was formerly divided monthly rounds have been substituted. The consequence has been to bring a larger amount of receipt in respect of duty charged between 1st October and 31st December actually into the Exchequer for that period than there would have been under the old system of the Malt Duties. It might be of some interest to the House, and it is only just to the officers of the Inland Revenue, considering the great novelty of the matter with which they had to deal, if I were to point out to the House the singular correspondence between the estimate which they formed of the probable yield of the Beer Duty for the first three months, and the actual result, considering that it was entirely novel, and they had nothing but their general experience to guide them. The estimate framed by them in the month of August, 1880—that is, in the second month before the expiration of the Malt Duties—was, that for the months of October, November, and December there would be a revenue charged—not the whole of it actually received—amounting to £2,210,000. The amount actually charged, or the actual net produce, proved to be £2,198,000, or a difference of about 10s. per cent.

BRAZIL—CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Mr. ANDERSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Her Majesty's Government are yet able to announce any satisfactory settlement of the claims of British subjects against Brazil; and if the counter-claims which delay a settlement are all, or any of them, claims on Britain for the capture or destruction of slave ships?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, as my hon. Friend is aware, there are counter-claims brought by Brazil against Great Britain; and the claims and counter-claims have to be considered in connection with each other. Her Majesty's Government have been informed by Her Majesty's Minister at Rio that the Brazilian Government are at present actively engaged in the examination of the counter-claims; but they have as yet received no information as to what the nature of these claims will be.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROHIBITED MEETING IN WESTMEATH.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the Irish Executive prohibited the public meeting recently convened at Castletown-Geoghegan, county Westmeath, alleged to be solely for the purpose of establishing a branch of the Irish National Land League?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, the meeting was prohibited by Proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, on account of information laid before the Government to the effect tha tthe meeting was called for the purpose of denouncing and intimidating one of Her Majesty's subjects living in the neighbourhood.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROHIBITED MEETING IN GALWAY.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he can explain to the House the circumstances under which a land meeting announced to be held at Tully Cross-Roads, Connemara, County Galway, was suppressed by proclamation; whether the Government are in the habit of suppressing meetings on information on oath, no matter by whom made, to the effect that a meeting is convened for the purpose of denouncing certain persons, although the conveners of the meeting have no intention of denouncing anyone, and seek only to give public expression to their views on a public question in a legal and constitutional manner; and, whether any steps are taken by the proper authorities to ascertain the probable correctness of the informations in such cases? He begged to explain that he had received a letter from the Rev. P. M'Andrew, P.P., who was the organizer of the meeting, assuring him, in a letter which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary could see, that there was no intention whatever to denounce anyone in the district, or permit anyone else to do so.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, this meeting was prohibited by a Proclamation issued on the 4th of January. The Government had sworn information before them that there was reason to believe that the meeting was called to intimidate and denounce certain of Her Majesty's subjects residing in the neighbourhood. With respect to the last Question, I have to state that no meeting has been prohibited without a searching inquiry being instituted by the authorities. The hon. Member says that the clergyman who was to have presided was not likely to denounce anyone. I have no doubt that is true; but it does not follow that he could have controlled the meeting. I must state that the Government was specially bound to pay attention to the information it received, because only a short time before a Land League meeting was held close by, at which the Rev. Canon Fleming was denounced, and immediately afterwards a desperate attempt was made on his life.

AGRARIAN CRIME (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will lay upon the Table of the House the names of the persons fired at, and particulars as to date and places of the assaults on the Police, mentioned in the Return of Agrarian Outrages (No. 3) for 1880; and, also similar details as to aggravated assaults, assaults on bailiff and process servers, cutting or maiming the person, incendiary fires, with particulars as to the value of property destroyed; burglaries and robbery, with particulars as to the value of the property stolen; attacking houses; and firing into dwellings?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, if the hon. Member referred to Return No. 131, presented on the 16th March last year, he would find that in 1879 most of the particulars of the outrages were furnished. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) gave Notice on the 6th instant that he would present a Return up to October last, which would be in the hands of hon. Members very soon, and also those for November and December.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked, Whether there would be any objection to include in the Returns the particulars of the eight cases of murder reported in the year?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the Return would contain particulars similar to those in the Return for 1879.

PRINCE EDWARD'S ISLAND—THE LAND QUESTION.

Mr. GRAY asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he would lay upon the Table of the House some brief and clear statement of the principles on which the land question was settled in Prince Edward's Island, and of the results of that settlement upon the peace and prosperity of the island?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Sir, various Papers relating to the Land Question in Prince Edward's Island have already been laid on the Table of the House, and I propose shortly to lay some more, among which there will be a Report upon the subject from the Provincial Government of Prince Edward's Island. From these Papers I trust that the hon. Member may obtain the information which he desires.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE LOYAL BOERS.

Mr. COLLINS (for Mr. O'Shea) asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any applications have been made to the Government to grant some provision to the families of certain Boers who fell in the Zulu War, besides the family of the late Piet Uys; and, if so, whether the decision of the Government is likely to be speedily announced?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Yes, Sir, we have received such applications, and I believe the decision of the Government will be agreeable to the hon. Member and to the persons concerned.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—QUESTIONS—MOVING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will recommend the House to take some steps to prevent the continuance of a practice which has grown to be exceedingly inconvenient, namely, that of any Member at the time of Questions initiating a debate without notice, by simply stating at the commencement of his speech that he intends to conclude with a Motion, such Motion being understood to be the adjournment of the House, and after a speech of any length, having made the Motion, then another Member may in a speech, also of any length, second it, and the debate be continued by any number of Members, for any length of time, to the prevention of the progress of public business?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, the practice described in the Question of my hon. Friend has undoubtedly attracted the attention of the Government as well as, I believe, the attention of every Member of this House. There is a great and, I fear, a growing inconvenience in the abuse of that practice; and if I do not at this moment communicate any specific Answer with respect to the Question which has been put to me by my hon. Friend, it is because it may be the duty of the Government to take rather a wider view of the whole subject. I must defer all particulars until that view can be taken.

STATE OF IRELAND — THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE.

Mr. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When the visiting committee of Tralee Gaol first assembled since the arrest and imprisonment on the 5th of January of several members of the Tralee Land League; whether the cells in which the prisoners were first placed were without fires or any other means of warmth; whether, in accordance with the rules for local prisons in Ireland, sub-section 1, rule 22, the committee have permitted these prisoners to occupy a separate room or cell specially fitted for such prisoners, and furnished with suitable bedding and other articles in addition to or different from those furnished for ordinary cells; and, if so, when; whether they have been permitted to exercise with each other in accordance with sub-section 2, rule 22, which provides that untried prisoners shall be permitted to exercise with selected untried prisoners; and, if so, when they were first permitted to do so; whether they have been permitted to have at their own cost, in accordance with sub-section 3, rule 22, the use of private furniture and utensils suitable to their ordinary habits; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with sub-section 4, rule 22, they have been relieved from the performance of any unaccustomed tasks or offices; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with rule 23, the visiting committee have permitted the governor to modify the routine of the prison in regard to these prisoners, so as to dispense with practices which are clearly unnecessary in their cases; and, if so, when; whether, in accordance with rule 24, the visiting committee have permitted these prisoners to have supplied to them books, newspapers, or other means of occupation other than those furnished by the prison, and whether such books and newspapers have been supplied; and, when first supplied; and, whether, in accordance with rule 25, these prisoners have been permitted to supply their own food; and, if so, when was the permission given for the first time? Perhaps he would be permitted to give the reason why he put this Question. It was because it called attention to certain matters in connection with the Prisons' Act of 1877, which he had found had been violated in Ireland in cases where political prisoners or agrarian prisoners had been arrested. ["Order!"] As, he was sorry to say, they are likely to have a larger agrarian crop of prisoners than usual during the winter, he thought it right to call the Chief Secretary's attention to the subject of the treatment of the prisoners. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to issue a Circular. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is entering upon matter not before the House.

MR. PARNELL said, he was only anxious to say that he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to issue a Circular to Visiting Justices with regard to the treatment of prisoners.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, with regard to the explanation of the hon. Member, if he can point out any case in particular in which the provisions of the Prisons' Act has been violated, I shall have it inquired into. With reference to his Question, I have to say that I have before me particulars of the cases in Tralee. In every case the regulations have been observed. With reference to one of the hon. Member's Questions, it seems to have been put under an entire misapprehension. The cells were heated with hot-water pipes. The committal was on the 5th January. The prisoners were permitted to supply their own food on the same day, and all the other regulations were put in force the following day. The Government are satisfied that the prison authorities are trying to do their duty.

STATE OF IRELAND—LAND LEAGUE MEETINGS—DOMICILIARY VISITS.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If his attention has been called to a visit to a meeting of a Land League branch at Bruff; and if such domiciliary visits by the police are justified by any law at present existing?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Sir, I have inquired into this matter, and find that the facts are as follows:—The sub-inspector of the Constabulary at Bruff, County Limerick, ascertained that a Land League Court was to be held at Bruff on the 10th of January, for the purpose of investigating the case of a person named Leo, who took a farm from which a man named Whelan had been evicted in 1878. Leo has received several threatening letters, and for some time has been more or less under police protection. On the day before this Land League Court was to be held, the sub-inspector inquired from two prominent members of the Land League in that district whether there would be any objection to his attending, and was informed by them that there would be no objection. Accordingly, he and his head constable attended. I must add, that these assumed courts of the Land League are amongst the most illegal and formidable of their proceedings, and the police were, under the circumstances, justified in attending. The visit, therefore, was not of a domiciliary character.

STATE OF IRELAND—THREATENING LETTERS.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that, in the county of Longford, in the early part of November, a sub-inspector of constabulary received a letter by post informing him that a certain landowner, who is also a shopkeeper, was to be shot by his tenants on the following Thursday; whether the police insisted on specially protecting the supposed object of agrarian vengeance, although the gentleman concerned assured them the letter must be a hoax; whether he had not to apply to Dublin Castle in order to be released from police protection; whether it was not found out soon after that the threatening letter was written by a boy in the employment of the landlord, and was done as a hoax or a means of giving annoyance; and, whether, on the landlord attempting to prosecute the boy, the sub-inspector of police did not release the boy from custody, and prevent all further proceedings against him?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, the letter was to the effect that the landlord would be shot by the tenants, and on inquiry it was believed that the letter was not really a threatening letter. To be on the safe side, however—and in a case of protecting life it was desirable to be on the safe side—two policemen were sent to protect the landlord, and they remained with him until after the rent day. It was then discovered that the letter was a hoax. It was not true that the sub-inspector released the boy who wrote the letter from custody, or prevented further proceedings against him.

Mr. GRAY asked, Whether the threatening letter was included in the Return of Outrages presented to the House?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER could not say—he thought not. He might mention that undoubtedly there were a good many cases included in those Returns in which the police had no reason to take steps; but he might inform hon. Members that those were not the cases on which the Government were proceeding.

TURKEY—MACEDONIA.—THE ALBANIAN LEAGUE.

Mr. BRYCE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that Upper Macedonia is now in a state of complete anarchy, and what information he can give to the House regarding the condition of the Christian population in that province; and, whether he will lay upon the Table the Despatches relating to the state of Upper Macedonia received during the past twelve months from Mr. St. John, Her Majesty's Consul at Ragusa?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, Mr. St. John was withdrawn from Prisrend on the 1st of July, and his despatches up to that date have already been presented to Parliament in "Turkey, No. 19, 1880." Her Majesty's Consul General at Salonica states that, while brigandage and lawlessness are diminishing in the South of Macedonia, his correspondents report that very serious disorders are daily occurring in the vilayets of Monastir and Cossova, especially in the districts of Uskup, Malesh, and Kotchana, and in the vicinity of the Bulgarian frontier. Uskup and the surrounding districts are reported to be completely under the power of the Albanian League, and anarchy prevails there. We have had no special Reports on the condition of the Christian population since Mr. St. John left the country.

MERCHANT SHIPPING—THE STATUTES.

Mr. NORWOOD asked the President of the Board of Trade, When the Return of Statutes, &c. affecting Merchant Shipping, ordered by the House on the 30th August last, and laid upon the Table in dummy on the 3rd September, will be ready for circulation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in reply, said, that the Returns were now ready so far as the Board of Trade was directly concerned with them; but the Board was in communication with other Departments in order to make them complete.

HIGHWAYS AND LOCOMOTIVES ACT, 1878.

Colonel WALROND asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether Her Majesty's Government will appoint a Select Committee this Session to inquire into the working of "The Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878?"

Mr. DODSON, in reply, said, there had been a Committee appointed by the House of Lords last Session, and he believed that the Inquiry would be renewed and the Committee re-appointed. He might add that the Committee was moved for by an independent Peer, who, he had every reason to suppose, would himself move for the re-appointment of the Committee. If he failed to do so, no doubt the Government would do so.

STATE OF IRELAND—COUNTY OF DONEGAL.

MR. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has received resolutions from an indignation meeting at Carndonagh, county Donegal, asking for inquiry as to the peace of Innishowen, and protesting against the proclamation of the district; and, whether he will grant the inquiry or withdraw the proclamation.

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had received a copy of the resolutions. He had also received a number of communications in support of the proclamation. Information had been given of several outrages, and the question was carefully considered, as were also the representations of the local magistrates to the effect that an increase in the police force was absolutely necessary in the district. Under these circumstances the Government did not think it necessary to make an inquiry, nor did they think it would be right to withdraw the proclamation. But if the district became peaceable, they would be happy to do so.

MR. PARNELL asked if the magistrates who made the representations as to the condition of the district were landlords?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he supposed they were, but he could not give an exact answer.

THE JUDICATURE ACTS.

MR. NORWOOD asked Mr. Attorney General, If it be the intention of the Government, as stated in some public prints, to appoint a Commission of Judges, Barristers, and Solicitors, to inquire into the working of the Judicature Acts; and, if so, whether the Government will consider the desirability of adding to the Commission two or more laymen to represent the interests of the suitors?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in reply, said, it was not the intention of the Government to appoint such a Commission as that suggested in the Question. It had appeared, however, to the Lord Chancellor that the time had come when some offer should be made to diminish the costs of litigation. For that purpose it would be necessary to make an alteration in the procedure of the High Court, and an alteration of the rules and orders would have to be effected. The Lord Chancellor had thought it would be advantageous to the Public Service if a Committee of persons not as a body having any legal status were called into existence; and for that purpose he had requested certain Judges, two members of the Inner Bar, two members of the Outer Bar, and two solicitors, to meet and confer with him on the subject, with a view to assist by their advice and experience in framing the rules. The Lord Chancellor and Lord Coleridge, who would have charge of the Committee, would be glad to receive any suggestions on the subject from gentlemen who were not members of the Legal Profession.

NATIONAL SCHOOLS (IRELAND)—AGRICULTURE.

MR. R. POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been directed to the desirability of teaching the rudiments of agriculture in the National Schools in Ireland; and, if so, whether they are prepared to insert this as a class-subject in the same manner as they are prepared to do in England?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, the hon. Member must be under a misapprehension. Agriculture was already an obligatory subject in the 4th, 5th, and 6th Classes in rural National schools, and there were special result-payments for each boy passing an examination in that subject.

LAW OF BAIL AND SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION.

MR. HENDERSON asked Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland, If his attention has been called to the state of the Law of Bail in Scotland, and the desirability of its speedy amendment; and, whether it is his intention to introduce in the present Session of Parliament any measure dealing with the Sheriff Courts in Scotland in the direction of extending the limits of the Sheriffs Summary Jurisdiction in Civil Causes?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): Sir, in answer to the first part of the Question, I have to state that the Government are fully alive to the unsatisfactory condition of the existing Law of Bail in Scotland, and that it is their intention to introduce a measure for its amendment. By the second part of the hon. Member's Question, I understand that the hon. Member points at the extension of the provisions of the Debts Recovery Act of 1867 to money claims of all kinds. This proposal would require careful consideration, and probably inquiry, as to the experience which has been had of the working of the Act in the various Sheriff Courts; and in the present state of Public Business it seems unlikely that the Government will introduce a Bill on the subject during the present Session.

EGYPT (FINANCE).

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What is the present position of the Egyptian Liquidation and of the Financial Reforms; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have any further Papers on the subject which they can present to the House?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, no very recent Report on the progress of the execution of the Law of Liquidation has been received at the Foreign Office; but there is every reason to believe that the position of the Liquidation and of the Financial Reforms is satisfactory. Inquiry will be made as to what further Papers can be laid before the House.

CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES AT MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

MR. A. MORLEY asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill deals with the proceedings at municipal as well as Parliamentary elections; and, if not, whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a Bill to deal with corrupt and illegal practices at municipal elections?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (SIR HENRY JAMES) in reply, said, the Government was aware that corrupt practices prevailed at municipal elections, and also that it was most desirable to take some steps to check such practices. He had intended to deal with Parliamentary and municipal elections in one Bill; but he found that the incidents of the two kinds of elections were so different, that the attempt would only produce confusion. They had determined, therefore, first to introduce a Bill dealing with Parliamentary elections, and then another for municipal elections. That would also be economically the best course in point of time, as they would be guided in the second Bill by the experience gained in the first.

BRITISH MUSEUM—ADMISSION OF THE PUBLIC.

MR. D. GRANT asked the Right honourable the Member for the University of Cambridge, as one of the Trustees to the British Museum, Whether any steps have been taken towards lighting the main portions of our great National Collection, so as to allow it to remain open to the public until ten o'clock at night every week day throughout the year?

MR. WALPOLE, who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the Trustees had considered the subject of the hon. Member's Question; but that to carry out the hon. Member's suggestion would involve a great expense and a complete re-organization of the staff. There was, therefore, no intention to take such steps as the hon. Member mentioned.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—(IRELAND).

MR. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, at Kilfinane, county Limerick, in the case of the Crown *v.* McDonald, who was charged with taking forcible possession of a farm, McDonald was returned for trial at assizes, and bail refused; whether Mr. Kennedy, R.M., was the only magistrate on the bench; whether the Crown did not object to application for bail; and, whether he approves of this course?

MR. W .E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that it was true that M'Donald had been returned for trial to the Assizes, and that bail had been refused. It was also quite true that Mr. Kennedy, the resident magistrate, was the only magistrate on the Bench. The Crown Solicitor stated to him that it was a case in which bail should be refused, and he did refuse bail. The hon. Gentleman had asked him whether he (Mr. W. E. Forster) approved of the course that had been taken. He might say, in reply, that he did approve of it. The charge was, that M'Donald voluntarily surrendered his farm to the landlord, owing him one year's rent, the landlord giving him in addition the sum of £15. A caretaker was put into possession, and on the night of the 30th November, a body of men forced open the door, fired several shots, and forcible removed the caretaker and his family from the house, and reinstated M'Donald. When the police subsequently warned him to leave, he refused to do so, saying he would be afraid in consequence of the Land League. Outrages of this nature were of common occurrence, and he thought that, under the circumstances of the case, the resident magistrate acted rightly in refusing bail.

MR. PARNELL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, If he is aware that in cases of this kind, where a person is found in possession of a holding, and where he is afraid to leave because he is threatened with evil consequences, and refuses to leave on that account, whether the Government offer such person constabulary protection, or whether the constabulary would simply arrest him and bring him before a magistrate?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Certainly, the Government will give them protection.

MR. PARNELL: Could the right hon. Gentleman give an instance of where such protection was given?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am not aware of any case in which it has been asked for. If it was asked for, most certainly it would be given.

STATE OF IRELAND—REPRESENTATION BY FOREIGN POWERS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any representation has been made to Her Majesty's Government from the Republic of the United States of America, or of any other Foreign Power, as to the condition of many of the Irish people?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No, Sir, no such representation has been made to Her Majesty's Government.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware that the House of Representatives of Washington have passed a Resolution in the spirit of the Question of the hon. Member for Cavan?

No reply was given to this Question.

LAW AND POLICE—CASE OF THOMAS TITLEY.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will consider the propriety of recommending the release of Thomas Titley, Chemist, sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment, with hard labour, for selling certain drugs, inasmuch as the drugs bought of the prisoner by the police were neither required for nor used by any person whatever; and, whether it was not proved at the trial that no offence, save one of intention was actually committed, and that such intention was expressed by the reluctant assent of the prisoner to supply the drugs; also, whether the police engaged in the case will be prosecuted?

MR. COURTNEY, in reply, said, his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary was entirely satisfied with the sentence, and he had no intention of making any remission. The last Question, which was not upon the Paper, had been answered by his right hon. Friend last week.

CRIME—EXPLOSION AT SALFORD BARRACKS.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Secretary of State for War, If he can give any information with regard to the attempt to blow up the armoury in Salford Barracks, and whether any attempt has been made to destroy another barrack?

MR. CHILDERS: Sir, my hon. and gallant Friend gave me Notice of his Question a few minutes ago, far too late for me to obtain information on the subject from the Department over which I have the honour to preside. Perhaps he will allow me to say that we do not think it is for the public advantage to give information of an imperfect character in reply to Questions of this kind; and

I would appeal to Members of the House, who are disposed to ask similar Questions, whether any advantage is gained by their being put at the present time, seeing that Her Majesty's Government are aware of the circumstances in which we are, and are taking due precaution?

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, under the peculiar circumstances of the present Session, he will consider the desirability of postponing all further debate on the Address until after the enactment of new measures relating to Ireland, this course being in accordance with the undoubted right of the House to proceed with other Business before the conclusion of the debate in question?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I am not surprised at the hon. Baronet putting this Question, which I look upon as a sign of the embarrassment he feels at the little progress we are making with our Business. I can only say at present—and I give an answer only for the present—that we believed the most expedient course was to encourage the House, as far as we could, to persevere with the debate on the Address, which, I hope, has now nearly reached its termination.

STATE OF IRELAND—OUTRAGES IN CAVAN.

MR. BIGGAR begged to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland a Question of which he had not given him any Notice—namely, Whether his attention has been drawn to a declaration made by the magistrates of the County of Cavan with regard to alleged outrages, and a contradiction by the Most Rev. Dr. Conaty, whose diocese included the greater part of Cavan, in which he contradicted the statements of the magistrates and asked for an inquiry; and, whether the right hon. Gentleman is disposed to give an inquiry?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that, undoubtedly, representations had been made by the magistrates of Cavan, and counter-representations had been made by the Most Rev. Dr. Conaty, the Bishop of Cavan, and by several other persons; but the Government did not think it necessary to make any inquiry as regarded these representations.

IRELAND—THE STATE TRIALS.

MR. PARNELL asked the Solicitor General for Ireland a Question of which he had given him private Notice, Whether he had received information that in the case of the "Queen *v.* Parnell and Others," that evidence having been tendered of the evictions and rack-renting practised by landlords, and objected to by the Crown under the 19th count of the indictment, the Crown intended to enter a *nolle prosequi*, and abandon that count, in order to avoid the production of such evidence; and, also, whether that was not the principal count of the indictment?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON), in reply, said, that he had not received any information whatever on the subject, and the Notice of the hon. Member had only been handed to him as he was coming in; but he could certainly say that the 19th count in the information was not at all the principal count. It seemed to him that that class of evidence was foreign to the real issues before the jury; and if he had been in the position of his right hon. and learned Colleague the Attorney General for Ireland, he certainly should have entered a *nolle prosequi* on that count.

In reply to Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR,

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) explained that he had not said that that class of evidence was foreign to the trial, but foreign to the real issues raised by the information; and, therefore, that count might be dispensed with.

THE REBECCA RIOTS.

MR. LALOR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the statement which appears in the "Standard" of this morning be true—

> "That two of the witnesses who gave evidence at Knighton yesterday, which led to the conviction of the two Rebeccaites, Shepherd and Williams, were fired at at Lambiston parish after they had left the Court. Ten shots were discharged, one of the witnesses, named Adams, being hit in the thigh, but not seriously injured. No arrests were made;"

and, if this statement be true, whether the Government intend to take exceptional measures in that part of Wales?

MR. COURTNEY: Sir, inquiry has been made into this matter, and we find that the report is wholly baseless. It appears to belong to the class of manufactured outrages.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [EIGHTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY, in rising to move the following Amendment:—

> "And humbly to pray Her Majesty to refrain from using the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in enforcing ejectments for non-payment of rent in Ireland, until the measures proposed to be submitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament;"

said, he thought that every reasonable man in that House would see that he was warranted in calling their attention to the very important and practical question raised in his Amendment. He was glad to say that hitherto he had not observed in the House any manifestation of general indignation at the length of the debate. He had, indeed, received assurances from both Conservative and Liberal Members that, so far, there had been nothing unreasonable in the time taken up by Irish Members. There had been a certain amount of impatience manifested out-of-doors at the length at which Irish Members had already debated the Address, chiefly on the part of certain daily public instructors, who were every morning assuring them that they had only one duty to discharge, and that was to cut short their arguments of every kind, and allow the House to proceed as quickly as possible to the important task of imposing a Coercion Bill upon Ireland. This reminded him of a story which he had read of a Highland clansman who, having offended his lord, was ordered to be executed, and who was naturally anxious to postpone the carrying out of the sentence as long as possible. He was suddenly rebuked by his wife, who begged of him to make no further delay; but to go up to the gallows and be hanged at once to "please his Grace the Duke." The Irish Members were not so obliging in temper as that, nor disposed to hurry on the work of coercion in that House to please their Graces the Dukes. At the same time, even were there no question of coercion, this Amendment which he had to propose would be introduced, because it dealt with a most practical question concerning the condition of the people of Ireland, and the tranquillity of the country during the next few months. The motive of his Amendment was clear and simple. It was merely that the Crown should cease to use the power of employing an armed force—either military or constabulary—in the carrying out of evictions in Ireland. Almost all the force now used for such a purpose was, in the strict sense of the word, a purely military force. There was really no police force in Ireland, as people understood a police force in this country. They had no force merely concerned in the detection of offences and in the repression of such breaches of the peace as were common to all populations. They had a military body in a military dress, charged with strictly military duties. Every year the Irish police force was undergoing changes which made it more and more strictly a military body. He was somewhat surprised the other day in Dublin, upon the occasion of the opening of a trial in which several of his hon. Friends were concerned—a trial about the result of which he supposed the Irish Law Officers were already flushed with anticipations of triumph—he was somewhat surprised to see a body of horsemen appointed like some Continental soldiery, well mounted and well armed, with plumes waving in the wind, dashing up at rather a rapid pace against the crowd. He said to a friend of his—"Are Government bringing cavalry here already to use against the people?" His friend replied—"That is not a military force, but the Irish mounted constabulary." He (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) now proposed that this military force should not be employed in carrying out evictions while measures were still under consideration which must some day come before the House, and by means of which they hoped the whole system of eviction would be put an end to for ever. He did not think of asking the Government to introduce any measure on the subject, for he knew what the fate of such a measure, however small or simple, would be in "another place." They did not know how long the House might be engaged before coming to a discussion of that measure, nor how long both Parties, forgetting their traditional differences, might be in happy combination for the purpose of forging chains of coercion for Ireland—very likely not with the hand of a Vulcan, but rather with the hand of a tinker. While all that might be going on, the Irish Members were not bound to wait without asking the Government and the House to do something for the unfortunate Irish tenants who were certain, otherwise, to be evicted in the course of the coming months. An hon. Member said to him very complacently the other night, while speaking on this subject—"Oh, you have no evictions in Ireland; you have not had any for a length of time, and you are not likely to have any during the time to come." Let him first establish the fact that evictions had been frequent, painful, and shocking in Ireland during the past 12 months. That question, at all events, Her Majesty's Government had settled in the Return presented to the House. From that Return they found that during the last year, a period of distress and famine, 10,657 persons—men, women, and children—were evicted from their holdings in Ireland. Of that number about 1,000 persons were re-admitted as tenants, and nearly 5,000 were re-admitted as caretakers. No one knew better than the Prime Minister—for he had clearly explained it to the House last Session—the immense difference between the position of a man re-admitted as a caretaker, and a man in possession of a holding. A man re-admitted as a caretaker had lost every right whatever to the holding, and remained entirely and necessarily at the mercy of the landlord. He did not know whether any Return could give them an exact idea of how many of these 4,000 odd persons who were re-admitted as caretakers were still remaining in that position, or how many of them since that time had been sent adrift on the world. But there remained the fact that during an exceptional year, when the strongest claims existed—he would not say to the mercy, but to the justice of the landlords—more than 5,000 persons were turned out of their homes without being re-admitted either as tenants or caretakers. That, therefore, suggested that there were strong grounds for asking the Government to intervene in the coming months between the unjust landlords and the tenants. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India the other night made a very remarkable double-edged use of the figures laid before the House. Like the spear of Achilles, they seemed to wound at one end and heal at the other. He began by being very indignant, especially with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson), who had accused the Government of being responsible for all the bloodshed and outrages that had taken place in Ireland. He indignantly reminded the Members of the late Government that under their Tory rule in Ireland they had 10 murders in a year, while under the Liberal rule they had only seven. He (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) began to be hopeful, when he heard the noble Lord's indignant eloquence, that they were not going to have any coercion after all. But, having disposed of the late Government in that indignant manner, the noble Lord next proceeded to show, from the very same figures, how alarming was the condition of affairs in Ireland, and how imperative was the need of instant coercion. The late Prime Minister had written the most successful novel of the present day. He had heard—he did not know whether it was true or not—that another very successful novel had been written by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope). He was not surprised at the success of the experiment; the surprise would be if the son of the author of "Anastasius" did not write a successful novel. The Secretary of State for India had evidently in the House been trying to see what he could do in the way of a romantic description of Ireland at the present time; and he was apparently qualifying for one branch of the craft, which was called, in homely and popular phrase, "The penny dreadful." He drew an appalling picture of the state of Ireland; he depicted fearful outrages, crimes, and murders, going on at that moment all over the country; and he only saved himself from positive assertion, by the use of the word "perhaps;" by telling the House of all the terrible things that were, "perhaps," then occurring in Ireland. But he (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) would invite the noble Lord's attention to a further use of the word "perhaps" in relation to occurrences which, unfortunately, were only too common in Ireland at the present day. Perhaps, about the time the noble Lord was speaking, men, women, and children were being ruthlessly evicted in Ireland. Perhaps, about that time, women and children were being turned out under the cruel skies of this most inclement January, and left without house or home to shelter them. Perhaps, at that time, the ashes of numberless household fires were being scattered to the winds by the process of eviction. That was a use of the word "perhaps" which he should commend to the attention of the noble Lord when he was next considering the possible condition of things in Ireland——

MR. W. H. JAMES: I rise to Order. I wish to know if the hon. Member is in Order in alluding to a speech which the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) has delivered in a past debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is in Order. At the same time, I wish to point out that the Amendment of the hon. Member is of a very limited character, and that he will not be in Order in travelling over the whole of the former debate.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he had no intention to travel over the former debate. The noble Lord commented upon the figures that had been referred to, for the purpose of showing that crime and outrage in Ireland had no connection with the process of eviction. His (Mr. Justin M'Carthy's) argument was offered to the House for the purpose of showing that disturbance and disorder came mainly from the exercise of eviction. He would call the attention of the House to certain cases of disturbance which not even the noble Lord would say were unconnected with the process of eviction. The Irish Members did not deny the existence of disorder and disturbance in Ireland; but their case was that they arose altogether from the system of Land Laws that existed in Ireland, and more especially from the process of eviction; and they contended that if the process of eviction were stayed until remedial legislation was considered, there would be no disorder and disturbance in the country, and no occasion for Coercion Bills. He would call their attention to certain recent cases in which the disturbance was occasioned entirely by an attempt to enforce the right of eviction. At Claremorris, in Mayo, recently, one man was killed and another very seriously wounded, in a disturbance of that class, and the Coroner's Jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter against one policeman, whose name they knew; and against another, whose name was not known to them. Notwithstanding that, the Chief Secretary for Ireland bore his testimony to the fair and right-minded way in which the police force discharged their duty. On that occasion there was, undoubtedly, a very serious disturbance, in which one life was lost and others seriously endangered, and in that affray the police seem to have acted with a recklessness and rashness not usual to them. That affray—that little piece of civil war—which occasioned death to one unfortunate person, and probably mortal injury to more, arose because the armed force of power was used to put into operation a system of eviction, for which hardly any hon. Member in that House would stand up in justification, and which every man must admit should be abolished if any kind of tolerable Land Bill was to be brought before the House. He happened to observe by a report in the newspapers that the policeman against whom the verdict was found for manslaughter had since been allowed out on his own recognizances. He happened to see, also, in another portion of the same paper, a paragraph mentioning the fact that the Land League had voted the sum of £10 to the family of the man who was unfortunately killed in the affray. Perhaps that would be considered as an outrage committed by the Land League. What he asked by his Amendment was, that they should anticipate the state of things which was sure to arise from the exercise of this right of eviction, and withdraw the armed force of power from being used for the purpose. There was another case more recent still, in which a disturbance was caused that might have been serious by reason of the dread on the part of the people of the country that the same right of eviction was about to be enforced by the same military power. It occurred in the county which he had the honour of representing (Longford), where a branch of the Land League had been established for some time, and which, as regarded crime, from the 31st of January to the 30th of November last year, stood as follows:—Firing at the person, 1—he doubted whether it was really an agrarian crime, but, in any case, the man accused was promptly convicted—incendiary fires, 1 case awaiting trial, and 2 in which the offenders escaped; killing and maiming cattle, 1 man awaiting trial; threatening letters, 1 case awaiting trial, and 8 in which the writers were not discovered; resistance to the process of the law, 1 man accused and convicted, and 1 man awaiting trial. That was the state of the county during the past year, and, he supposed, for that, as well as others equally peaceable, exceptional measures would be asked by Her Majesty's Government, and the public at large would be led to believe that it was in a condition of anarchy and civil war. Lately in that county there occurred that which might have resulted in serious disaster had it not been for the prompt and judicious interposition of a Catholic priest and one or two popular and public-spirited men. Lord Granard was issuing some processes to recover certain rents due to him, and the impression went abroad that what was sought was eviction, not the serving of legal processes. Lord Granard was well known to be a very humane and considerate landlord; and he might say that throughout the county during all these troubled times the landlords had been, on the whole, just, considerate, and even generous. At the very time when the newspaper Press here was raging against the Land League he attended two Land League meetings in Longford, at which he only heard the name of one landlord mentioned, and in each case he was named only to be applauded for his generosity. With regard to the disturbance to which he had alluded, he would like to read a letter from one who was present. That letter set forth that there were two days of the disturbance. On the first day the police went out to protect a process-server in the discharge of his disagreeable duty. Seventy processes were to be served, and the server was protected by 100 police. A large crowd, nearly 5,000 in number, of men, women, and children met the police on the road. If there had been any fight it must have ended in serious bloodshed. The stipendiary magistrate had, however, the wisdom to withdraw the police until he could, at all events, obtain stronger assistance. Next day it was more serious. A large number of soldiers—about 100 dragoons and 300 police—were brought out, with ambulance and hospital service corps, as if in preparation for a grand campaign. Resistance at one time seemed inevitable. The police, however, behaved, on the whole, very well. Some of the soldiers were in high spirits, flirting with the girls, and imbibing whiskey, possibly obtained from illicit stills. Fortunately, the people were well-advised; and it having been pointed out to them that it was not eviction, but merely the serving of processes, the affair terminated quietly. This, however, was not due to the action of the authorities, but to the action of private individuals and the Roman Catholic clergy. In this case, he (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) presumed that the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India would admit that there was a distinct connection between the process of eviction and the existence or possibility of disturbance and crime. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) once used a strong expression with regard to the same right of eviction. He summed up in his clear and admirable style of eloquence, in a speech made in Dublin some years ago, the leading causes of distress and misery and disaffection in Ireland, and spoke as a climax of the process of eviction—"a word which I suspect is hardly known in any other civilized country in the world." It was not very long since the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell) pointed out in that House that no such thing as the right of eviction was known either to the Statute Law or to the Common Law of England. Oh, no; it was a peculiar blessing reserved for Ireland. He invited the attention of the House to the condition of the tenantry in parts of Ireland and the rents they paid, for the purpose of showing why this fatal power of eviction should not be allowed to continue as a means of screwing from those miserable people the rack-rents imposed on them. He would first take the county of Galway, it being the first of the counties proclaimed as being in a state of disturbance. He would show the House an account of the rents and valuations of several tenants in the county of Galway. Such cases as the following were frequent:—A man paid £2 a-year for a holding which was valued at 15*s*. A man paid £12 a-year for a piece of bog which, according to Griffith's valuation, was only valued at £5 10*s*. Men paid £2 10*s*. for holdings valued at 10*s*. And in one case a man paid £4 for a holding valued only at 10*s*. He was assured that these figures contained nothing extraordinary; but were fair indications of the general condition of things in the country. What he wanted the House to consider was whether, seeing that the tenants were so rack-rented in many cases, it would be just or fair, pending the introduction of remedial measures, to allow an inhumane and unjust landlord to use this unjust power of eviction for the purpose of turning out his unfortunate tenants? The word "confiscation" had been made to play an important part during the debate in reference to the suspension of that power of eviction. The House of Commons, like other public bodies, was often a good deal under the domination of phrases. He noticed that over and over again in the course of this discussion Members had spoken of the word "confiscation" as if it settled the question for ever. He heard it stated that the suspension of this power of eviction would amount to a confiscation of the landlord's property. He did not believe that it would. On the contrary, he believed that rents would be better paid if this power were taken away. He would ask the House for one moment to consider whether it was not common enough in all our legislation to enact a law which should compel a certain class —even certain individuals — to make some small sacrifice for the benefit of the community? On that point he could speak with something like knowledge and conviction. There was a certain class of persons in this country whose income was confiscated deliberately by law for the benefit of other classes, and the public in general. That might seem surprising to some hon. Members; but not to one or two who sat near him. There was a class whose property was partly confiscated by law for the benefit of the public. It was a class, he would venture to say, although he happened to belong to it himself, which had done as much for the world as any landlord class or all the landlord classes in all countries —he meant the authors, the writers of books, who, under the Copyright Act, were prevented from bequeathing, for more than a limited number of years to their families, the money they had earned by their honourable labours. However, he held that the landlords' property would not be confiscated, and that they would not suffer but rather gain by the improvement of the system which he recommended in his Amendment. He had read a pamphlet called *The Justice of the Land League*, written by the Rev. David Humphrys, Roman Catholic curate, which was worth the attention of Members of the House. It had a very appropriate Shaksperian motto. It was—"And our oppression hath made up this League." They had heard that the Roman Catholic clergy only took part in this agitation because they were under the influence of terror. Now, terrorism had many strange ways of showing itself; but he had never known of anyone being terrorized into writing a remarkably clear, coherent, logical, and argumentative essay. In this pamphlet the writer answered the argument that Griffith's valuation did not fairly represent a proper amount of rent at present, because the price of produce had risen since the valuation was made. He showed that if the price of produce had risen, so, also, had the cost of production; and even if the cost of produce had increased in value 100 per cent, so, also, had the cost of production. The hire of labourers and the cost of their support, as well as other items of outlay, had concurrently increased, so that Griffith's valuation now stood as fair as it did when it was first made. He thought he had fairly established that crime and outrage did commonly arise in Ireland because of the exercise of the system of eviction, and even because of the dread in the minds of the people that it was about to be unjustly and harshly exercised. He had shown that there was not that absolute severance between the work of eviction and the growth of disorder which the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India seemed to think. He hoped he had induced the House to think that there was a fair case for asking the Government to suspend the dangerous, formidable, and hateful power of eviction, at least while they were considering what changes they were willing to make in the Land Laws affecting Ireland. That was the whole substance and purpose of the demand. It could be granted by Her Majesty's Government without delay, almost by a word, in a moment, and it would, he firmly believed, re-establish order and peace in Ireland, and assist the landlords to get their rents paid more willingly than they were likely to have them under a different condition of things. They were told that a change was about to be introduced of a wide and beneficial nature in the laws that regulated the land system of Ireland. The hon. Member for Cork County (Mr. Shaw) the other night said he still had faith in the Prime Minister. He would at least go so far as to say he would fain still have faith in the Prime Minister; and his opinion of public men must, indeed, be greatly changed when he ceased to have some faith in the Prime Minister, and much faith in the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, as regarded remedial legislation for Ireland. He only hoped the Prime Minister might see to the very heart of this question—might see what a great chance, what a noble opportunity lay now within his reach. Never in their time, never perhaps at any time, had a statesman so great, so splendid a chance within his reach as the Prime Minister had now. Various conditions had forced upon him the choice whether he would, once for all, settle the Irish Land Question or leave it unsettled. He had now the chance of bringing it to a satisfactory and peaceful settlement. He did not create that opportunity. Perhaps if it was allowed to pass it might never be recalled. The right hon. Gentleman was thoroughly acquainted with the great masterpieces of the poetry of classic Greece; but he had not forgotten also to make his mind familiar with the one poem of our century which alone deserved to be named with the foremost works of Grecian Art. He meant the immortal *Faust* of Goethe. The right hon. Gentleman would remember what Faust declared to be the one object and end of a great career, an object which he considered worth not dying for—he would not have thought that much—but worth living for, and living a long life to carry out. The hero was allowed by "Fate and metaphysical aid" to go through a strange and wondrous career, to exhaust every source of pleasure, to have every throb of ambition satisfied to satiety; and in none of these changes of pleasure, triumph, or passion had he found one single thing worthy of living for, or calculated to make him say that he wished his life prolonged one instant. But he did at last find a motive for wishing to live and work, and what that was the right hon. Gentleman knew well. He had placed within his means the chance of rescuing a great tract of land from barrenness and waste and water, a chance of converting that wilderness into a fruitful and blossoming country, of planting on the face of that land, before sterile and joyless, a happy and a thriving toiling population—a free peasantry, settled for ever on their own free holdings. Could he but accomplish that, the poet's hero said, he would have lived for something, and the trace of his earthly deeds and earthly work would not in all the ages pass away. Well, this enterprize, which the exalted imagination of the poet conceived to be one of the noblest man could undertake, it was actually within the power of the right hon. Gentleman to accomplish. Most cordially did he hope he might accomplish the triumph and deserve the fame. But while he was making up his mind, the Irish Members asked the Government to declare that, at least for the present, the harsh hand and armed power should not be uplifted to maintain a claim which, in the moral sense, was lawless, and which, he trusted, would, before long, be condemned by the law of the land

Mr. DILLON seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

At the end thereof, to add the words "and humbly to pray Her Majesty to refrain from using the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in enforcing ejectments for non-payment of rent in Ireland, until the measures proposed to be submitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament."—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. GLADSTONE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Gentleman who has moved this Amendment closed his speech with a most eloquent and touching appeal to myself. Divesting that appeal of what was unduly complimentary to me, and reducing it altogether from the region of poetry to that of prose and fact, it was earnestly represented to Her Majesty's Government that they had before them a very grave duty, in the introduction of a measure with the difficult, and most important, and arduous purpose of reforming the Land Laws of Ireland. I must suppose that the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) most sincerely concurred with him, at least, in the appeals he made. But the hon. Member, by his speech and Motion, has interposed a most effective obstacle to our answering that appeal. What is it prevents us proceeding with the measures which we seek to lay before the House? It is the renewal, night after night, of spontaneous debate, aimed at no practical conclusion, capable of producing no practical conclusion, capable of answering no useful object whatever, capable of causing in the people of this Island rather strong feelings of a kind I do not wish to encourage with regard to the singular method in which the proceedings of this House are now conducted; capable of promoting the continued existence of great evils, and of retarding the application of remedies to Ireland, and in utter contradiction, so far as their practical effect is concerned, to the appeal made by the hon. Gentleman, because the measures which he exhorts us to produce he does his best, by the course he adopts, to retard. I do not intend to enter at any length into this debate; but I cannot rise to take part in it without entering my distinct, but respectful protest against its prolongation. The good sense of Parliament and the practical turn which has governed—and I hope will always govern—the political mind of this country have established it as a rule, almost without exception, that the Address to the Throne, in answer to the Speech with which the Session is opened, shall be brought to a conclusion as rapidly as possible. And I will venture to say that if that practice is to be broken down, if the Speech from the Throne itself, instead of being a convenient, decorous, dignified method of meeting between the Sovereign and the people and of initiating the Business of the Session, in every intimation it contains, is to be made the subject of lengthened and renewed debate and of diversified Amendments, that Speech will become no better than a public nuisance; and it will be for the advantage of the country that it should be wholly discontinued. I am sorry, but I am compelled to observe on what is going on. On great occasions the champions of Ireland—certainly not unequal either in fame, talent, or character to those whom she now sends to represent her—have felt themselves compelled—at the time, however, before Ireland had received the same substantial marks, at least, of the regard of Parliament that have distinguished the last few years — to make debates on the Address. I refer to the case of Mr. O'Connell and his Friends in the year 1833. But in the condition of Ireland as it then was, aggravated as it then was in the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and the views of hon. Members on this side, although Mr. O'Connell did feel compelled to initiate a lengthened debate upon the Address from the Throne, yet Mr. O'Connell initiated that debate, not for the purpose of retarding —and he did not by one hour retard— the progress of practical legislation. For three nights in that year the House was occupied with the debate on the Address; but we have now reached the eighth night of the debate. The Sovereign has made a most grave and solemn call upon her subjects assembled in Parliament not to adopt, by their answer to the Speech, rash or premature conclusions; but to give to her, through her Government, the opportunity of submitting for practical consideration matters which hon. Members opposite admit to be, and which we all know to be, of the highest interest and importance. It is not our fault that we have not made considerable progress with that work. Had the usual course been pursued, had even a reasonable latitude contented the hon. Gentleman and his Friends, he would have known by this time what it was Her Majesty's Government deemed to be necessary for the restoration of law and order in Ireland; and he would have been in a condition to press, if he pleased, for expeditious progress towards the passage of that Land Bill on which he had set his heart, and which he is now doing everything in his power to prevent. That being so, I must express a hope that, although the hon. Gentleman made a lengthened address, and although he has thought it necessary to illustrate this great Irish crisis by reference to the Law of Copyright, and other matters which I must confess would better have borne delay than the task we have in hand, yet I must express a hope that this debate is approaching, and rapidly approaching, its conclusion. This is not a mere debating Assembly; it is a deliberative Assembly; it is an Assembly which reasons in order to conclude and to act; and the House has the right to expect from its Members that, instead of preventing it fulfilling this function, they shall assist those who are charged with the conduct of the Business of the House in endeavouring to dispose of that grave and complicated task with all the despatch which the difficulty and gravity of the matter may admit of. Let us see what the hon. Gentleman wants. On the eighth night after the meeting of Parliament he asks us to consider a particular Amendment. What is the character of that Amendment? I must own, if I understand it aright, that I heartily rejoice that his speech has been heard with respect and attention, and not merely patience; yet such is the nature of the Amendment itself, that it is really difficult, when we examine its terms, to believe our own eyes and ears. And what is it the hon. Gentleman thinks so valuable that it is necessary to prevent us proceeding in due order to the consideration of the measures for the passing of a Land Bill? His proposal is that we should

> "Humbly to pray Her Majesty to refrain from using the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in enforcing ejectments for non-payment of rent in Ireland, until the measures proposed to be submitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament."

What are the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown? They are the entire force at the disposal of Her Majesty. She has no other forces than these; and the desire and the recommendation of the hon. Gentleman to the House is this—that none of the forces of Her Majesty whatever shall be made use of in Ireland during the time he defines by his Motion for the recovery of that form of debt, for the enforcement of that form of civil obligation which is associated with the word "rent." That is the recommendation of the hon. Gentleman, and that proceeding is a proceeding which he desires to be taken by the Executive Government! It would be sufficiently astonishing if he asked the House to proceed to provide by a summary Act that there should be a suspension of eviction and a suspension of the legal remedy for the recovery of rent for a certain time. But he does not ask that at all; he makes his appeal to the Executive Government, which is charged with the execution of the law. It is the Executive to which belongs the executing of the law. If they do not execute the law—and for what other purpose do they exist?—they must fall at once under the adverse judgment and censure of this House. But the hon. Gentleman, not content with recommending—which of itself would be entirely permissible, and as he might have been tempted to do—consideration, allowance of time, and the adoption of expedients—not content with anything of a secondary character, he actually proposes to the House of Commons that they shall pray the Crown deliberately to renounce the doing of that for which alone the Executive exists. I greatly doubt whether you yourself, Sir, or any one of your Predecessors in the many centuries since that Chair was occupied, ever put a Motion more extraordinary than the proposal that the Executive Government shall advisedly and systematically refrain from the execution of the law for the purpose of enforcing civil obligations, and that proposal made by the hon. Gentleman not in the character — the distinct and independent character—in which many of us are agreeably acquainted with him, of a writer of books, to which he has alluded —but actually embodied in a Motion addressed to the House of Commons; so that he wishes to make the House of Commons and the Crown parties in this affair of suspending the law by a dispensing power outside and against the law, and he proposes to leave the House of Lords the only portion of the Legislature that shall not be involved in the folly and criminality of such procedure. And what is the nature of the arguments which the hon. Gentleman has given us to prove that this most extraordinary course should be taken? He says that evictions are the main cause of crime and disturbance in Ireland. It is not necessary for me to enter into that question, if it be so, and for the present purpose I will not deny it, and in certain circumstances, in certain cases, I might have been disposed to support it; but if that be so—if evictions are the main cause of crime in Ireland, let us proceed to legislate on the subject of the Land Laws. But that is exactly what the hon. Gentleman will not permit us to do. The hon. Gentleman and his Friends have kept us here for eight nights with debates which will lead to no practical result, and which, when the House has received a solemn appeal from the Throne, setting forth the extreme gravity of the circumstances and the urgency of the time, detain us steadily, persistently, from day to day, and will not let us have an opportunity of dealing with any practical remedy whatever. And then, if the general principle of the hon. Gentleman is strange, what sort of encouragement does he give us by the particular instances which he states? He gave us particular instances to support his proposition. It was what has occurred in the county of Longford. And what are the motives presented to us by him to induce us to interfere in the manner he proposes with the general course of the law? Does he tell us of some cruel case of a grinding and tyrannous landlord, who had availed himself of the circumstances of Ireland to obtain fraudulently, one might almost say, from the necessities of his tenants, engagements they could not possibly meet when the time came? No, Sir; nothing of the kind. He has told us himself that the landlords of the county of Longford are, generally speaking, considerate, just, and generous men; and then he illustrates this strange and unheard-of proposition that is now before the House by the particular case of one of those landlords—Lord Granard. Lord Granard, he says, is a kind and generous landlord. Far be it from me to question that for a moment. Well, this just, kind, and generous landlord was, it appears, compelled by the necessities of the case to apply to the civil power to serve processes on persons who would not pay their rents. The hon. Gentleman has not even given us good support for his proposition in any single form or instance. First, the landlord is kind and generous, as the class of landlords in the county are kind and generous. Sir, he has not even told us that these tenants who would not pay their rents are disabled by poverty. He has not even laid before us, in order to give colour to his extraordinary proposal, the vague and bare assertion that it is poverty—the want of means, and not the want of will—that prevents the tenants in this particular case from paying their rents. The hon. Gentleman, without asserting the slightest injustice, without asserting the slightest inability, comes down to the House of Commons and asks us to, I may say—though I am sorry to use the words—asks us to insult the Throne by carrying to the foot of the Throne the proposal that the Queen—sworn at her Coronation to maintain and execute the law of the land—shall, by her own arbitrary will, renounce the executive of the law of the land, to meet the wishes of the hon. Gentleman who has laid down this proposition for our acceptance, and who says that no inconvenience will be experienced, except that the landlords will not get their rents in rapid time, and that, perhaps, there will be, in the case of a few tenants, some little arrears. But, Sir, we are here for serious Business.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain. ["Order!"]

MR. GLADSTONE: The hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity to explain in a moment. I will not detain the House. I must say that it is a very serious consideration—as also almost a ludicrous thing—that the British House of Commons has reached to a point at which it is to be the receiver of proposals like this, and that the liberty of speech, which is its highest and dearest privilege, and its greatest ornament, is too often mistakenly applied for purposes such as this. It is quite impossible to suppose—the hon. Member cannot suppose, if he can bring himself to be serious in making such a suggestion to the House—that the bulk of the House will have the smallest hesitation in emphatically rejecting it. What I must say is, that it is not for the credit of the character of the House of Commons that such proposals should be made—should be used as the engines for the waste of these precious hours—which we are now under a more than ever solemn obligation to employ, without sparing ourselves, and without fear or favour, in considering both what is required for the peace and order of Ireland, and what are the changes which, on the principal of justice to all, ought to be introduced into the Land Laws which govern that country.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY wished to say that the right hon. Gentleman had certainly misunderstood the purport of one part of his argument. He had merely instanced a case in Longford—a peaceable county—to show that the fear of eviction was such as to bring the people who were the tenants of just and generous landlords to that mood of mind which might have caused disturbances, but for the interference of the Land League.

Lord JOHN MANNERS: In response to the powerful appeal which we have just heard from the right hon. Gentleman, I wish to say for myself, and I am sure I may add for those who sit near me, that we entirely associate ourselves with the sentiments which he has expressed; and I feel that I cannot give a more practical proof of the cordiality of the support which we tender to the right hon. Gentleman on this occasion than by at once resuming my seat.

Mr. DILLON begged to assure the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that the extraordinary speech he had just uttered would very considerably alter the position he had hitherto held in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that Irish Members had not brought forward any arguments in favour of their recommendations; but had he himself forgotten the 15,000 persons who, he told the House last Session, would be turned on the roadside to starve unless something was done to prevent eviction? Nine short months ago he told them that if a remedy was not speedily found, 15,000 human beings would be cast on the roadside to starve; but now, if they were to wait until the Irish Land Bill dragged its slow length along, before they got a Land Bill, what was to become of those 15,000 persons whom the Prime Minister compassioned last year, but for whom he seemed to have no compassion now? The right hon. Gentleman accused the Irish Members of being the obstacles in the way of legislation; but he said the right hon. Gentleman and his Government were the real obstacles, and he himself was erecting a barrier in the way of doing justice to Ireland more dreadful than could well be conceived, because in the year they passed a Coercion Act there would arise a condition of things in Ireland which would prevent the House from properly considering the Land Question. ["Oh, oh!"] He said that because he knew the people well—if they passed the Coercion Bill, outrages in Ireland would immediately become tenfold more numerous, because there would be such a feeling of vengeance as to make it difficult, if not impossible, for the House to deal with the Land Question. It was a painful thing for any Irish Member to address that House, because hon. Gentlemen did not care for the position of Ireland, and if he had the power he would prefer to deal with the matter in another way. The Prime Minister, in another part of his speech, condemned the action of his hon. Friend in asking the House to suspend the action of the law, and said such a course had never yet been pursued in England. Now, he was not a very deep student of English history; but it seemed to him that the law had often been suspended for the public good, for they did not ask to have it abrogated. Did the Prime Minister never hear of any interference with the Bank Act? All the Irish Members asked was the suspension of an Act which threatened the lives of 30,000 or 40,000 of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman complained very bitterly of their prolonging the debate to an unreasonable length. It was very difficult to answer such an accusation. [*Ironical cries of* "Hear, hear!"] The explanation, however, was easy. The right hon. Gentleman looked at the matter from an English, the Irish Members from an Irish, point of view; because they knew that the consequences which would follow from coercion would be infinitely more dreadful than the right hon. Gentleman laid before the House. Hon. Members would understand that, when they heard of the massacres and bloodshed that would follow in Ireland after such a Bill. ["Shame!"] They would follow. They whose lives might be endangered by coercion not unnaturally thought that it was right to oppose such a proceeding to the bitter end. The prolongation of the debate was entirely due to the tone and temper of the House, which seemed to offer very little prospect of a consideration of the proposals of the Government in a just and impartial spirit. Therefore, the

Irish Members thought it their duty to lay before the House a statement of the mischiefs which would be inflicted on the Irish tenant. With regard to the evictions, it was stated in July last, on the authority of the Prime Minister, that 15,000 individuals would be ejected from their homes without hope of remedy in the course of the present year unless the evictions were checked. What was the position of these 15,000 now? They were living in their homes to-day, thanks not to the English Government, but to the strong arm of the National Land League, which, in spite of the police and military forces of the Crown, had kept these poor people in their homes. The number of people who would be evicted from their homes during the past year were estimated by the Prime Minister at 15,000; but he considered the estimate was extremely low. The right hon. Gentleman had based his estimate on the evictions which had taken place during the last six months of 1879 and the first part of 1880. He had figures to show that for two years after a famine evictions in Ireland went on increasing, and the reason was that the landlord would not evict while famine prevailed, because then he would get no one to take up the farm. It was with astonishment he heard the Chief Secretary express his belief that there would be less agrarianism after the good harvest. The landlords would not evict during the famine; but when the pressure began to pass away they would clear off those men who had fallen into arrear during the famine, knowing that under better prospects they would be sure to get some one to take a vacant farm. In Armagh, in 1846—the year of the Famine—the evictions were 204; in 1849 they had risen to 81; and in 1850 to 615. In Tipperary, his own county, in 1846 they were 327; in 1849 they were 1,266; and in 1850, 771. In Tyrone, in 1846, the evictions were 90; in 1847 they were 490; and in 1848 they were 586; and the Returns for other counties showed a similar state of things. Those figures proved that in the year following a good harvest, when the famine had passed away, there was always an increase of evictions. The Chief Secretary, being new, perhaps, to Irish work, stated he had very good reason to hope and believe that the troubles of Irish agrarianism would cease after a good harvest; but Irishmen knew perfectly well that they would then begin, and that there would also be evictions where a tenant was not able to pay. Therefore, it was his belief that he did not exaggerate when he said that before next summer, if the power of the Land League were withdrawn, fully 50,000 people would have been evicted. And when the noble Marquess who ruled India so skilfully said evictions had almost ceased during the last six months, his own Colleagues had taken the argument out of his mouth when they said that the law of the Land League was supreme in Ireland——

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to point out to the hon. Member that the line of argument which he is now pursuing is not relevant to the Amendment immediately before the House. That Amendment relates to the employment of the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Empire in enforcing ejectments, and he is now referring to evictions which have taken place from time to time in Ireland. That subject is not at present before the House.

MR. DILLON wished to point out where he was in Order. It was stated that evictions were probable, and he was referring to what was likely to take place if the military were placed at the disposal of the Irish landlords, and were called upon to assist in enforcing evictions. He was sorry if he had said anything that was out of Order. The question was, whether the Irish people were to be handed over to their fate, or were to enjoy the benefits promised under the legislation of the Prime Minister. There was another point which justified the Amendment. The Government based their demand for coercion almost entirely on the number of outrages which had taken place in Ireland, and on the fact that a reign of terror had been established in that country. What ground was there for saying that a reign of terror really existed? The Government had at present 25,000 regular troops in Ireland, 14,000 constabulary, armed as troops, all the magistrates, and their agents. What were the forces at the command of the Land League? They had at their command a very limited executive, and no military and no constabulary. They had no force except their members.

He did not think such a humiliating statement had ever been made by a Minister as to state that, with that enormous force at their command, a reign of terror had been established in Ireland. The real fact was that there had been a reign of terror in Ireland for years—the reign of the Government—and when the Land League pointed out to the Irish people a way of escaping from it they instantly accepted it. His own county (Tipperary) was not a very easy one to coerce, and he very much questioned if the Chief Secretary were to-morrow to consult the magistrates there, whether the latter would advise him to enter upon any measures of coercion. He had gone into that county two months ago, and although there was not at the moment a single Land Leaguer in the whole of it he had enrolled 10,000 men. Those were the forces which the Land League now was able to array. This would show the disposition of the people, because he himself had had no means of imposing any reign of terror. But what had been the effect of the general agitation upon that county? They had reduced rents in every part of it. The League ruled supreme, and yet the reign of terror of which so much had been said had no existence in fact. Tipperary, instead of being lawless, was now acknowledged by all, including landlords and priests, to be in a remarkably peaceful condition. Never, indeed, had the county been more orderly. In former times things had been very different, and outrages had frequently occurred; but since the establishment of the local branches of the Land League so great a security had prevailed that not a single person had been shot at—not a single human life taken.

Sir HENRY TYLER: I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the hon. Member is in Order in telling us of the forces which he has at his command, and that the Land League reigns supreme in Tipperary? I wish to know whether he is not uttering traitorous and treasonable sentiments in boasting that he is upsetting the law of the land?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member accepts the version given by the hon. Member who rose to Order, I am bound to say that the expressions he used were un-Parliamentary; but no Motion having been made to have the words taken down, I can only call the attention of the hon. Member for Tipperary to them.

Mr. DILLON said, he would submit to the ruling of the Chair in any way which the Speaker might suggest. He had been merely stating what he believed to be a fact; but if he was out of Order he would withdraw any remarks which the Chair ruled to be irregular. The hon. Member was proceeding with his argument, when he was again called to Order by

Mr. SPEAKER, who said: I have drawn the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that his observations are not relevant to the Amendment now before the House. The hon. Member, as I now understand, proposes to advert to another matter which has no reference to the Question before the House. I must formally call upon the hon. Member to comply with my direction to keep himself strictly to the Question before the House, which is the employment of the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in Ireland.

Mr. DILLON said, he would endeavour to follow the instructions of the Chair. What he was endeavouring to show was this—that the Government were not bringing before the House the real object for which eviction was contemplated. The Speaker had ruled that part of his argument was out of Order; but his desire was to show that the real object of this coercion was to carry out evictions, and that that was the only object and necessity of coercion. What he was coming to was, that if the Government would consent to the Amendment of his hon. Friend, and agree to suspend evictions for a short period, all the necessity for coercion would pass away, and they might calmly proceed to the consideration of those measures which the Prime Minister was anxious to bring before the House for the amendment of the Land Laws. It was possible, however, that the blood of Ireland was a matter of indifference to the House.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I rise to Order. The hon. Gentleman first withdraws expressions which you, Sir, have instructed him were out of Order, and he is now proceeding in his argument to make use of them as though you had never interfered, and he had never been guilty of a breach of Order. I understood the hon. Member to say, distinctly, that he withdrew the expressions which were objected to —those expressions, acccording to my note, were — speaking of the Land League, that it was arrayed against Her Majesty's Forces.

> "We have (said the hon. Member), 10,000 men arrayed in Tipperary; and we have reduced the rents throughout the country. No landlord has been fired at. The Land League rules supreme in Tipperary."

SIR HENRY TYLER: Reigns supreme.

MR. NEWDEGATE: These were the expressions used; and I submit that if the hon. Gentleman means to withdraw them, he must not afterwards avail himself of their substance in argument.

MR. DILLON said, the words which had been taken down by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire entirely misrepresented his statements. The hon. Member had not taken down accurately one single sentence that he (Mr. Dillon) had uttered; and he must say that the course taken by the hon. Member, if followed generally with regard to other Members, would be extremely inconvenient, and expose them to very severe censure. This was the third time he had been interrupted without the interposition of the Speaker, and he considered it most unfair.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member would confine himself, as I have already stated, to the Question before the House, he would meet with no interruption either from hon. Members or from the Chair. He does not confine himself to the immediate Question before the House.

MR. DILLON said, the only real necessity for coercion existed in the fact that the landlords contemplated evicting 50,000 tenants. Now, he was not a very warm admirer of the administration of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who had failed to conciliate the confidence of the Irish people; but the right hon. Gentleman could hardly be such a fool—["Order!" "Oh, oh!"]—as to suppose that any moderate measures of coercion would suffice to break down the power of the Land League. He was afraid that the Government contemplated more than they showed to the House, and that they had not stated frankly all the considerations that influenced their minds. One of these considerations, he feared, was the enormous number of evictions which they foresaw would happen, and which they were now informed were to come. He thought it would be well for the House to go into this policy with their eyes open. They should know what the Government had in view was not simply the removal of a reign of terror which did not exist—not the mere stoppage of outrage, which, indeed, would be increased tenfold—that it was not for the saving the lives of landlords, which would be placed in tenfold greater peril, that these coercive measures were proposed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's remarks have nothing to do with the Question before the House, and I must call upon him to confine himself to the Amendment. I have already made this observation several times to the hon. Member, and I must now insist upon the hon. Member complying with my directions.

MR. DILLON would conclude by saying that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary knew that the evictions would not be carried out without resistance. The right hon. Gentleman knowing the temper of the people pretty well, he could tell him that this year they would not submit peaceably to force. Indeed, one of the reasons that determined him to support his hon. Friend's Amendment was the conviction that large numbers of the Irish people would attempt to meet force by force, and that a great deal of bloodshed would be the result. The blood of the Irish people would seem to be a matter of absolute indifference to that House. He knew that the tenants would resist eviction by force. As the Premier had sent an additional number of Her Majesty's soldiers into Ireland, he believed the right hon. Gentleman was himself aware that resistance would be made. What use did the right hon. Gentleman mean to make of the troops unless it were the extermination of the people? [*Murmurs.*] At all events, that was what he was afraid of, and time would show whether he was right or wrong. The majority of the Members of the House might think otherwise than they did at present, when they saw, after the lapse of a few months, the number of lives which were involved in the principle of the Amendment.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that he had no intention of taking part in that debate; but the hon. Member who had last addressed the House had done so, throughout his speech, as the Representative of some other Government than that of the Queen.

Mr. HEALY: I rise to Order. I wish to know what the remarks of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire have to do with the Question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for North Warwickshire is quite in Order.

Mr. NEWDEGATE continued to say the House had been threatened with civil war unless the policy advocated by a small minority of that House was adopted; for the hon. Member for Tipperary said that if the Government would not persist in their intended policy the blood of many of the people of Ireland would be spared, and the hon. Gentleman had not blushed to say that the lives of the Irish people were a matter of indifference to the House. A grosser calumny upon the House he did not think it was possible for any man to utter. The hon. Member stood in a very peculiar position. He was one of the traversers in a case now proceeding before the Courts of Law in Dublin. It had always been the wholesome habit of the House to avoid in debate referring to any matter which was submitted to the Courts of Law.

Mr. HEALY: I must again rise to Order. I wish to know what the Courts of Law in Dublin have to do with the employment of Her Majesty's Forces in Ireland?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's interruptions are themselves disorderly. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire is in possession of the House.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he would appeal to the Speaker as to whether it was not licence and an abuse on the part of the hon. Member, who was arraigned before the Courts, to attempt to take advantage of the good feeling of the House, which precluded other Members from alluding to the matters touching himself which had been referred to the Courts of Law. The hon. Member, who had used such language in the House, as he had never heard before was at that moment under public prosecution; and he humbly submitted that it was not wise on the part of that House, which formed part of the highest tribunal in the country, to allow such language to pass unnoticed.

Mr. DALY thought the Irish Members had some reason to complain of the tone assumed by the Prime Minister that evening. So far from the Irish Members being responsible for the undue prolongation of this debate, a great deal of time had been taken up by charges brought against each other by the Government and the Conservative Opposition. Ireland was treated as if it were Zululand or the Cape of Good Hope. Some allowance ought to be made for the deep interest taken in this matter by the Irish people. He maintained that the people of Ireland did not get fair justice; and, instead of getting credit for good intentions, there was a desire to crush them by the English majority. It was the duty of the Government to consider the prolongation of the lives of between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 of people. The Amendment, fairly considered, was simply a proposal that the powers under the control of the Irish Executive should not be applied for the purpose of giving effect to the arbitrary will of the landlords. Taken away from the disguise of the Premier's rhetoric, this proposal was not so divested of common sense and common honesty as the right hon. Gentleman would lead the House to suppose. If the passions of angry landlords were let loose, a large proportion would use the existing law in so arbitrary a manner as to lead to a system of reprisals and the commission of grave outrages.

Mr. D. GRANT said, he believed there was a willingness on the part of English Members to discuss to the core everything having reference to Irish grievances; but they objected to the introduction of questions which were outside the subject of discussion. When the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) asserted that the Land League was absolute in certain portions of Ireland, he put forward a position which, if true, was fatal to any government of Ireland. If the Land League were to be the Government of that country, then the Queen's Government ceased to exist, and there must consequently be war between them. He thought Irish Members had little reason to complain of their treatment in the House. English Members were always ready to give full consideration to any expression of opinion on the part of Irish Representatives; but there must be some limit to their speeches. One young Irish Member had spoken the other evening for two hours on one point. Now, if every Member of the House were to exercise his right in the same way, they would not be able to pass the Address by the end of the Session. They had already been discussing this first question for seven or eight days; and if the same course was to be pursued, if Amendment was to be added to Amendment, and every Irish Member claimed the right to express the same thoughts, they would be driven into a condition from which there would be no results. Let the Irish Members put forward a proportionate number of men to represent their views, and, having done that, leave the matter to come to a natural conclusion.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he had listened with great attention to the arguments put forward by the Prime Minister. The effect of those arguments was that the Irish Members, by prolonging the debate, were stopping remedial measures for Ireland. He wondered very much that the Prime Minister appeared to ignore the very important fact that between this debate and the Land Bill there intervened another measure—a measure which proposed to destroy the rights and liberties of the Irish people. If the Prime Minister could overlook that fact the Irish Members could not. The Prime Minister had referred to the example of Daniel O'Connell; but O'Connell was, in his time, just as violently abused as the hon. Member for the City of Cork. The time, perhaps, would come when the conduct of his hon. Friend would be held up as an example to future agitators. The question before the House, as they had been reminded, was eviction. It was a sore word in Ireland. It had caused woe, misery, and desolation in that country; and evictions were still going on. He did not see that there was anything opposed to the dictates of humanity in the proposal that evictions should be suspended until remedial measures were brought in. It would not be a great stretch to declare that, pending a settlement, the military and other forces should not be employed for the recovery of rent any more than for the recovery of other debts in Ireland. He would give one instance to show how severely Ireland had suffered from evictions. He would not go back to the period of the Famine, when the people were cleared out by hundreds of thousands. He would take a subsequent period, and only two counties, Meath and Westmeath. In the latter the population, which in 1841 was 141,300, in 1851 fell to 111,409; in 1861 it fell to 90,879; and in 1871 the population was only 78,432. What it was in 1881 they would soon learn. These figures showed a decrease in the single county of 12,477 in the last 10 years; 32,977 in the last 21 years; and 62,868 in the last 30 years. In Meath the population in 1841 was 183,116; in 1851 it was 140,750; in 1861, 110,373; and in 1871, 95,558. These figures showed a decrease in 30 years in that one county of 87,558; in the last 20 years, of 55,192; and in the last 10 years, 14,815. A whole army of people had been cleared out of those two counties. Did these terrible things take place without suffering, without feelings of excitement and vengeance? Certainly not. And if the poor evicted people did not wreak vengeance at home for the measures of oppression and wrongs they had suffered, it was not the law of England that had prevented them, but the influence of the clergy and people of Ireland. Talk of the reign of terror. The reign of evictions was the true reign of terror in Ireland. He could not help calling to mind that the enforcement of the coercive laws would be in the hands of the landlords. Between the passing of those laws and those remedial measures, that was not a very pleasant prospect for the Irish people. A very considerable period might elapse between the passing of the Coercion Act by the House of Commons and the passing of the remedial measures by the House of Lords; and, in the meantime, the Irish people would be exposed to the horrors of exceptional laws. The Ministry was trying to purchase applause from the Opposition at the expense of the liberties of Ireland. He would venture humbly to warn the Government against the course they were adopting. It was one which would not bring peace to Ireland. If they wished to bring peace to that unhappy country let them at once bring in their remedial measures. The statistics on which the Government relied had utterly broken down. No doubt, there had been a temporary increase in crime, but there had been exaggeration. The proceedings of the Government were unworthy of the Prime Minister. During the last elections there had been a great rejoicing at the access of the right hon. Gentleman to power; but that feeling was rapidly disappearing. He must enter his protest against the whole proceedings of Parliament with regard to Ireland.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR rose to address the House, when

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the sparseness of attendance was sufficient to prove the amount of consideration and justice which any Irish subject, however much it concerned the domestic happiness and national dignity of the Irish people, received at the hands of an alien Legislature. This Amendment affected closely the happiness of tens of thousands of families in Ireland, and it affected also the rights of property of hundreds of thousands of families in Ireland; and yet when Irish Members endeavoured to plead the cause of their oppressed countrymen, the House of Commons was found to have scarcely 10 Members listening to the discussion. The Amendment appeared to him to be most reasonable and moderate. The reply of the Prime Minister, expressed with unnecessary warmth, was that while the law remained as it now was it must be enforced. The right hon. Gentleman had apparently forgotten his language on a former occasion with regard to the character of these very laws which it was now proposed to enforce by the bayonet and buckshot. He declared that the Members of the Government, including himself, looked forward to a time when it would be impossible to enforce those laws without doing violence to the consciences of those charged with its enforcement. The law was still what it was when those words were uttered, and was the very law against which Irish Members were protesting. The Government had regard to the welfare of some 10,000 or 12,000 landlords exclusively. What the Irish Members, on the other hand, concerned themselves with was the welfare of the people of Ireland generally. It was notorious that under the existing law the landlords were able by means of eviction, or threats of eviction, to exercise a vast amount of oppression upon the people. They thoroughly understood the Horatian maxim—"*Captivum occidere noli; serviet utiliter.*"

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he wondered it had never occurred to the Government to reflect on the results to the police, the military, and the people which might follow from their policy. They were pursuing a course which was fraught with danger. The police were recruited from the class of small farmers, and they sympathized with that class. The Government did not trust the police, and had found it necessary to deal with every member of the force as if he were a foreigner. They sent him from the part of the country where he was born into another part, where he was among strangers; and if he happened to get married and to form connections in the district, they removed him a second time. They could not, however, prevent the Constabulary from being filled with indignation and disgust at the work which they were called on to do, and he had been delighted to hear expressions from members of the force of the indignation which they felt on the subject. With regard to the military, they were sending to Ireland men who were drawn from English and Scotch recruiting fields; but in the same way as in 1829, when the Duke of Wellington found that the army quartered in Ireland was not to be trusted, so he believed that in the present instance it would be eventually discovered that the very men whom they were sending over to dragoon the people into submission to the law would act as useful auxiliaries to the Land League, and would disseminate among their own people more accurate notions of the evils from which the Irish people suffered. While sending English soldiers to Ireland, they were sending Irish troops abroad to fight against the Afghans or the Boers, with whom the great majority of the people heartily sympathized. Under these circumstances, if the Government resorted to coercion, it appeared to him, looking at the matter dispassionately, that it was only natural that the Irish people should make up their minds that, as far as they could, they would prevent all recruiting in Ireland for an Army which was used in such a way. He was not addressing any threats to the House, but was simply expressing his opinion of the natural consequences of the policy on which the Government had entered. He believed that the Irish women, who were as active Land Leaguers as the Irish men, would say to the recruiting sergeants in Ireland that they should not have a single boy from their village for Her Majesty's Army—that, in fact, the recruiting sergeants would be "Boycotted," and before long the Returns from the recruiting centres to the Horse Guards would show that the system of managing the Irish people which had been adopted had brought about a practical paralysis of the recruiting system in Ireland. And, furthermore, he believed the falling off in the number of recruits would extend to the Irish populations in England and Scotland also. Therefore he could not help thinking that the policy of the present Government, whether it related to the Constabulary or the Army, was fraug htwith unwisdom, and could only result in a highly wrought state of feeling among the Irish people, when they found that the soldiers and constabulary were to be employed in enforcing the certainly unjust, though possibly legal claims of the landlords upon them. No matter how much they might attempt to disguise the fact from themselves, it was clear that a spirit of insurrection must be rapidly developed by the persistence in a policy such as the Government had sketched out for themselves. He knew that in the Queen's County they had the materials for insurrection. He had spoken to many and many people there who had suffered from this system of eviction. He never heard one single word approaching to a proposition which savoured of sedition. They knew perfectly well that he would not listen to anything of the kind, if they themselves entertained such sentiments. But he knew from the demeanour and the language of these men what their real sentiments were. He knew there were thousands of men who entertained those sentiments at present; but they were in the minority. If the Government showed an earnest desire to act fairly towards the Irish people, they might conciliate them and induce them to believe in a chance of obtaining from the British Government something like justice for Ireland. They were only the minority of the population, and an insignificant minority; but if the Government pursued the course they had entered upon their numbers would be rapidly developed. Complaints had been made as to the length of the speeches which had been made by Irish Members in the course of the present debate; but he ventured to say that by far the longest speeches had been addressed to the House from the Ministerial and Front Opposition Benches. The ex-Attorney General and the ex-Solicitor General, the two right hon. and learned Members for the University of Dublin, had each occupied an hour, and the Solicitor General for Ireland had occupied much more than an hour. For his part, he owed it to the Queen's County te rise upon every occasion of the kind to protest against the system which the Government sought to enforce. The Queen's County in 1855 had 163,000 inhabitants; at the present moment there were not 70,000. So far as he could make out, 83,000 had been swept away by evictions. In the name of the Queen's County, he protested against this further infliction of a murderous system; and though he should, as in duty bound, endeavour to secure a peaceful course of things in the Queen's County, and would, if necessary, be prepared to risk his own life to prevent anything like insurrection in that county; still he must say that he could not find it in his heart to blame any man who, having lived there, and witnessed scenes which had been seen there, were he inclined to join any enterprize, however rash, however foolhardy, which appeared to promise them some way out of their existing misery.

MR. HEALY, in answer to the complaints which had been made of the length of time taken up by Irish Members in this debate, reminded the House that such Members had a duty to perform, and had as much right to occupy the time of the House as any other of its Members. If that complaint continued to be urged, they might point out that it was by no feeling or desire of their own that they contined to thrust themselves upon the attention of that House. They were there by compulsion, and it was a most painful thing for them, and for himself personally, to be obliged upon every occasion to be putting themselves at right angles to the other Members of the House; but, being in the House, they meant unflinchingly to discharge the duties intrusted to them—duties which, among other things, impelled them to resist to the uttermost the expulsion of poor miserable tenants from the holdings which they, on many grounds, wished to retain. The condition of Ireland was a disgrace to the people of England, and yet the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) was anxious that those wretched people should be driven out of their hovels by Her Majesty's troops. ["No!"] Then why did not the right hon. Gentleman vote for the Amendment? It was true that for a long time the people could not pay their rents, and that fact was acknowledged by the Government when they brought in their Disturbance Bill. But when it was thrown out, what did the Government do? They shut up House, and went away for a holiday. They did nothing to help these unfortunate people; but the hon. Members for Ireland had tried to help them. He himself had given three months of his time to stirring up what was called this agitation, and he should be ready to do it again for the same cause. He found that every Irish Member who got up to speak in that House was met with a spirit of hostility, although they represented 5,000,000 of the people. ["No!"] The House seemed to think that the Irish Members had some malign purpose in view. If that feeling continued to be exhibited, the people of Ireland would be driven to desperation, and they were very near to it already; but the Prime Minister could, of course, draft regiments into the country week after week. He wished it was not in the right hon. Gentleman's power to do so——

Mr. SPEAKER called the hon. Member to Order. He should speak to the Amendment before the House, to which his observations had no reference.

Mr. HEALY said, he was ready to bow to the Speaker's decision; but all he wanted to show was that the landlords had facilities enough already for getting rid of the tenants; but now they were to receive the additional assistance of Her Majesty's soldiers and sailors, and, he supposed, Volunteers, and that was a matter which the Irish Members felt they were bound to resist at all hazards. If such a thing were done in any village in England as that tenants should be evicted with the aid of Her Majesty's troops, what would be said by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen? But it was said that the Irish Members took up a great deal of the time of the House. He freely admitted that they did, and it was possible that more of the time of the House would yet be taken up by them; and for this reason—that they were there to safeguard 5,000,000 of people, and that they were determined to make the House feel the injustice of the measure which Her Majesty's Government proposed to bring in. What would hon. Members opposite have said if a Coercion Bill had been brought in by a Tory Government? Why, a turn of the handle would have been given to the Birmingham caucus machine. In that House, and throughout England, the Tories would be denounced, and an effort would be made to "Boycott" the Government. Why was the heart of the great English people not stirred at the present moment? Why were the mouths of hon. Gentlemen shut? Why, because they had in their mouths the plums of Office—

> "As bees on flowers cease to hum,
> So Whigs, in Office, straight are dumb."

He contended that hon. Gentlemen opposite were guilty of hypocrisy in adopting the course they were pursuing. They spoke with two voices—one at the hustings, and another when they got to that House.

Mr. MACLIVER observed, that hon. Members on that side might feel very much at ease as to the charge of hypocrisy which had been brought against them by the hon. Member who had just sat down. The charge, too, that they were indifferent to the condition of the Irish people was wholly unfounded and erroneous. There was the warmest sympathy towards Ireland on the Liberal Benches. They were as anxious, if not more so, to do justice to Ireland in the truest and best sense than the Irish Members themselves. The benefits which Ireland had hitherto received had been at the hands of the Liberal Party, and he felt sure additional benefit in the present instance would be obtained from the same quarter. Nor was it just to assert that Irish Members received but scant attention from the House, for the eighth night of the Session they had had almost to themselves. With respect to the Amendment, it simply meant that there were to be no more evictions—a very pleasant doctrine for gentlemen who travelled through Ireland and preached that landlords should be expatriated. But was it fair or just? Had the landlords no right to the property they possessed, or to the protection of the law? How, he asked, were the owners of landed property to live if they did not get their rents? On that subject they had heard nothing from the Irish Members. If force was to be no more employed in maintaining the rights of landlords, he supposed the land must be given up entirely to the tenants and the landlords expatriated. Perhaps in this unhappy country, in which, according to Irish Members, there was more crime than there was in Ireland, they might be received into the workhouses. A good deal was said about the voice of Ireland; but what about the voice of England? Whenever there had been an opportunity of eliciting public opinion in England it had been against the policy of the Irish Members and in favour of the Government. The Irish Members professed to be anxious to know what the Government Land Bill would be; and yet, with the curious perversity characteristic of the country, they put all sorts of obstacles in the way of that Bill being brought in.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, that while the Irish Members could not refuse to listen to advice given in the kind and gentle spirit of the last speaker, they would make their own estimate of the value of that advice. The hon. Member had echoed the complaint of the Prime Minister, made at an early period of the evening, and which seemed to him (Mr. O'Connor Power) to have derived no additional force whatever from the support which the hon. Member had given to it. He had listened to the complaint of the Prime Minister, and he felt that in his experience of seven or eight Sessions of Parliament he never heard a complaint that was so groundless in its character. If they perused the list of those who took part in the debate on the Address, they would find that a large number of the Members were English Members; and he was sure it would be in the recollection of the House that the Solicitor General for Ireland occupied as much of the time of the House in the delivery of his speech as would satisfy any six Irish Gentlemen. He believed the hon. and learned Gentleman occupied two hours and a-half in delivering his views to the House; and he would not have called attention to the fact were it not for the purpose of rebutting the allegation that the Irish Members had wasted the time of the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman had lost a golden opportunity in connection with the State trials in Dublin, and, no doubt, he had laboured conscientiously in the preparation of his speech, portions of which were more suited to the atmosphere of a Court of Law than to that of a Legislative Assembly. The Prime Minister spoke of the debate of last week as a spontaneous debate. The Prime Minister was very subtle, and it was not for a person of his (Mr. O'Connor Power's) limited intellectual power to define with any confidence the meaning which the right hon. Gentleman attached to that phrase; but if "a spontaneous debate" had a plain and common meaning, he supposed it was a debate not brought forth by the force of opposite arguments; in fact, the accusations amounted to this—that the discussion of the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) last week was one-sided throughout. He ventured to say that the Prime Minister happened not to be a very good authority upon that subject, because, owing to a circumstance which they all deplored, his temporary illness, the right hon. Gentleman had not the advantage of seeing how many sided the debate, was and how useful it had been in elucidating some of the most important features of the Irish Land Question. The right hon. Gentleman complained also that the Government should have been called upon to assent to the proposal of the hon. Member for Longford, and said that the Irish Members were preventing the Government from applying a remedy to the social condition of Ireland in reference to the Land Question.

If Her Majesty's Government were ready with their Bill he could scarcely conceive that they would be so reticent in their declarations on the subject before the House. Up to the present time the House had not received the slightest inkling of the intentions of the Government in reference to that important question; and he ventured to say that, judging from all former precedents, an announcement indicating the broad lines upon which the Government intended to legislate in reference to the Irish Land Question might afford them some reason for abridging, as far as they could, the present preliminary discussion. But, with the indulgence of the House, he would call attention to a very remarkable feature of the question raised by the Prime Minister. If the patience of Her Majesty's Government was completely exhausted by the length to which the debate had extended, how was it that it was left to the Prime Minister to come down from his sick room to give expression to the indignation of the Government? During the seven nights during which they debated the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, not a single Member of the Government made any complaint of waste of time; and he must say that if he were inclined to be swayed by the argument of the Prime Minister, he would be inclined to accuse the right hon. Gentleman's Colleagues of a gross dereliction of duty in having allowed the debate to go on hopelessly without protesting a word against the alleged waste of time. He was afraid that the indignation of the right hon. Gentleman was spontaneous. He was afraid that the indignation was extemporised for the occasion; and he was bound to say that the Prime Minister himself, when he reconsidered the subject and made himself acquainted with the character of the debate, would regret very much the speech he had delivered. The right hon. Gentleman dealt very severely, and, in his opinion, very unjustly with the arguments of the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy). The hon. Member for Longford, in moving his Amendment that evening, based his case principally upon the existence of rack-renting in the county of Galway and other places which he specially brought under the notice of the House. In the course of his speech the hon. Member for Longford referred incidentally to the county which he represented, and he described it as a model county, where the tenants were prosperous and the landlords fair and moderate—the two things generally went together. But how did the Prime Minister deal with his speech? He got up and told the House that the hon. Member based his whole case on the condition of the county Longford, entirely ignoring the references of the hon. Member to rack-renting which prevailed in the county Galway, which was the strong reason he put forth for asking the Government to refrain from employing the Military or Constabulary Forces of the Crown in carrying out evictions. He did not mean to say that the Prime Minister wilfully misrepresented his hon. Friend; but he was bound to say that a grosser misrepresentation of the character of the speech which was delivered that evening by the hon. Member for Longford he never heard. He did not wish to pay his hon. Friend the bad compliment of saying that the Prime Minister was asleep during the essential portions of his speech. That was, however, the only supposition upon which he could acquit the right hon. Gentleman of having wilfully and grossly misrepresented the argument which the hon. Member submitted to the consideration of the House. If it was true that the Irish Members had occupied the attention of the House on this question it did not seem to him that the offence would be one of a gross character. Hon. Members should recollect that it was an Irish question; that if there was any force in the Constitutional method which the English Government themselves had adopted for eliciting public opinion they should remember that the Irish Members were the Constitutional Representatives of Irish opinion, and unless the Government proceeded on the principle that they were free to deal with the Irish Question without adequately considering that opinion he did not think they could complain of the part the Irish Members had hitherto taken in those discussions; and of all men he could not understand the Prime Minister making a complaint of that character. He had a vivid recollection of the many times which the right hon. Gentleman occupied the time of the House when he was in Opposition upon questions of far less importance than Parliament had been called together six weeks before the usual time to discuss. He well remembered how the right hon. Gentleman occupied the time of the House for hours upon hours on the grievances of remote peoples for whose government, for whose freedom, and for whose peace and prosperity not a single Member of that House was responsible. Now, however, the Prime Minister had discovered that the weapon which he used himself in his day of Opposition might be equally convenient to Members now in Opposition, and he wished to wrest from their hands that very weapon which enabled himself to carve his way to power. The right hon. Gentleman elicited the applause of the House when he stated that it was the Business of the Government to execute the law, and that Her Majesty's Government were obliged to use the forces of the Crown in carrying out evictions. The Prime Minister had appealed to the traditions of past times at the expense of himself and his Colleagues, and had complimented the Irish Representatives of the past on their legislative wisdom. He venerated the name of O'Connell, whose spirit the right hon. Gentleman had invoked in the attempt to abridge the oratory of the Irish Members; but the right hon. Gentleman did not tell them that the Law Officers of the Crown had found the law elastic enough to include O'Connell in their net, although he was the expounder of the famous maxim that he who commits a crime gives strength to the enemy. Yes; and he spent some of the best of his latter days in a prison cell because of the strength of the Constitutional agitation he carried on in Ireland. One of the earliest political speeches he (Mr. O'Connor Power) had read was an address by the Prime Minister, in which he complimented another of his distinguished countrymen—Edmund Burke. Against the dictum of the Prime Minister he now quoted Edmund Burke, who, in his essay entitled, *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, made this remark:—

> "The question with me is not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not your interest to make them happy. It is not what a lawyer tells me I may do; but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I ought to do. I am not determining a point of law. I am restoring tranquillity; and the general character and situation of a people must determine what sort of government they are fitted for."

There was discontent in Ireland; and in reference to the process of eviction he (Mr. O'Connor Power) laid it down that the doctrine of the enforcement of the law was not always the absolute duty of the Executive. He felt it his duty to support his hon. Friend the Member for Longford. He himself represented a county in some of the baronies of which as many as 6,000 evictions had been carried out in the famine year, which deprived Ireland of nearly 2,500,000 of her population. The Government was now big with the promise of repressive powers; they thought of another Westmeath Act; they intended to deal with the discontent in Ireland in connection with this question; but the political consequences of allowing the landlords of Ireland to exercise the absolute power of eviction would be very serious in the immediate future. The rejection of this Amendment, especially accompanied by the language which the Prime Minister had used, would have the most serious effects in Ireland. *The Times* said on the last great exodus that "the Irish had gone with a vengeance." But the expatriated in America had leagued themselves together in a great confederacy extending from New York to California. Another similar movement was taking place, and foreshadowed a time of trouble to the English Government. He did not indulge in menace; but he called attention to facts which no wise statesman, anxious to lay the foundations of justice and mutual peace between Great Britain and Ireland, could shut his eyes to. He had intended to bring down an Irish-American newspaper, *The Irish World*, published at New York. That was a newspaper which the right hon. Gentleman, considering his position as responsible Minister for Ireland, might well employ some time in reading. He did not mean that the right hon. Gentleman should accept all that was stated in that paper; but he would find in it some useful information. It appeared that within the last week 54 new branches of the Land League had been established in the City of New York and its vicinity. That fact suggested that if they stopped agitation in Ireland they would, as a consequence, stimulate it in America, and agitation carried on beyond their jurisdiction was likely to be of a far more dangerous character than agitation in a country under their constant supervision and amenable to their laws. He did not mean to say that it would result in the disintegration of the Empire, or that the Irish in America would come over in a magnificent fleet and lay the Crown of England in the dust; but it was a serious matter to have 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of people whose minds were full of the memories of the wrongs inflicted upon them by the very process of evictions now going on in Ireland, and to see that Her Majesty's Government looked on the whole affair as something scarcely deserving of passing notice. ["No, no!"] The right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin did not take quite so hopeful a view with regard to Irish disaffection as Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench. The right hon. and learned Gentleman described the condition of things as a danger to the Empire. Now Her Majesty's Government were taking the utmost efficacious means of intensifying that danger and enlarging its scope and area. Why was it that 1,500,000 of Irish people inhabiting the English and Scotch towns, by political combination, were so constantly frustrating the designs of English public men and disturbing the balance of Parties? It all arose from the unrestrained power of eviction exercised by Irish landlords, who drove those people from their homes and told them they did so under the sanction of British law. It must be plain to everybody that it was Ireland's connection with England which was the source of her misfortunes with reference to her tenure of land. If Ireland were 1,000 miles away from Great Britain he could conceive very well the issue of the struggle now going on. History would repeat itself. In great struggles where a small section of the community had exercised arbitrary power, without justice and mercy, the people had risen in their might, destroyed that power, and superseded by it a Constitution of their own.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must appeal to the hon. Member to keep to the Amendment before the House. He is wandering wide of the Question.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, he would endeavour to show the precise application of the considerations he was submitting to the House. If Ireland were in that position, unquestionably the tenantry of Ireland would not be in the power of the landlords; but now the landlords knew they could rely on the Government to carry out evictions. He could not contemplate without abhorrence any collision between large classes of people which would deluge the land with blood, even though the result might lead to the greater happiness of the greater number. But if Ireland were not connected with England this question would never have arisen, because the landlords would have shared in the fortunes and the struggles of the rest of their countrymen. A Member of Her Majesty's Government (Mr. Evelyn Ashley), addressing his constituents at Gosport recently, and speaking on the subject of Irish emigration, said—

> "The Irish people were undoubtedly idle and improvident; but for this they were not wholly to blame. They married at 18, and after having families of 13 they expected to be millionaires and Rothschilds."

Official figures might be quoted to prove conclusively that the Secretary to the Board of Trade was entirely wrong. He held in his hand a very interesting pamphlet on this subject by Mr. Pim, a solicitor of Dublin, which he would place at the disposal of the hon. Gentleman, from which it appeared that in 1879 there were twice as many marriages in proportion to population in England and Wales as there were in Ireland in the same year.

Mr. SPEAKER: The character of the Irish people is not the Question before the House. I call upon the hon. Member to confine himself to the Amendment, which relates to the employment of the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, that if he was to understand that he was not entitled to illustrate his argument by a reference to these figures, then, of course, he would bow to the right hon. Gentleman's decision; but he did not take the right hon. Gentleman to rule in that sense. If the right hon. Gentleman did rule in that sense, he had only to signify his pleasure, and he (Mr. O'Connor Power) would at once bow to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound to tell the hon. Member distinctly that the line of argument he is now pursuing is not relevant to the Question before the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, there were only too many arguments in favour of the Amendment, and they were likely to have several discussions on the subject. He would now confine himself to giving the most direct contradiction to the statement of the Secretary to the Board of Trade. The Prime Minister, and those who had written up his policy in the Press, had justified it by reference to the policy of previous distinguished statesmen. Instead of grappling with difficulties of this kind in a thorough-going manner, it had too often been the habit of Parliament to deal with Irish questions in a hand-to-mouth fashion. He need not refer, in illustration, to the well-known declaration of the Duke of Wellington, when he recommended the passing of the Emancipation Bill on the ground that it would prevent civil war. But the policy of Sir Robert Peel had been so often appealed to that he hoped the House would give him its indulgence while he read a short extract from a speech of that statesman in Parliament. He said—

> "You must in some way or other break up that formidable confederacy which exists against the British Government and British connection. I do not believe you can break it up by force."

Now they were employing force in the odious process of evictions in Ireland. The contention of the Irish Members was that neither law nor justice would suffer by suspending evictions for a short time. If the tenantry of Ireland had withheld their rents, as the landlord organs alleged, in some cases for two years, it could not be a great hardship to leave the matter as it was for a few months longer, until the land proposals of the Government had been discussed by the House. Sir Robert Peel went on to say that they could do much to break up the confederacy by acting in a spirit of kindness, forbearance, and generosity. The concluding and most important words of the speech referred to the dispute then going on with the United States over the Oregon question. Sir Robert Peel, after announcing the terms of a firm declaration which he had sent to the American Government, added—

> "I own to you that when I was called upon to make that declaration, I recollected with satisfaction and consolation that on the day before I had sent a message of peace to Ireland."

It was noticeable that three of the most eminent statesmen of our century, the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and the present Prime Minister, all had to use a disguised threat in order to induce the Government to do an act of justice to Ireland. His contention was that they were not bound by any rule of duty to assist landlords in carrying out the process of eviction pending the consideration of any proposals the Government had to submit. If they did give assistance they would incur a grave responsibility. They would be going with buckshot and bayonets against a people who were agitated to an extreme degree, struggling for rights which the Government acknowledged had been too long withheld. There was no question now as to the extent of the land grievance in Ireland. There was no doubt that, in some shape or form, the power of eviction so recklessly carried out must be abridged; and he asked them with what face they could send their armed men into the midst of a maddened people with a sense of the wrongs they had suffered for a long period, and which Parliament had been unable to redress. The land system of Ireland and the system of eviction was the handiwork of Parliament; and he charged them before the civilized world with being responsible for all the mischief it had wrought in the past, and upon their heads, and not upon the heads of the Irish Members, would rest the innocent blood which he was afraid would be shed in any future contest that they might force upon that unfortunate, down-trodden, but still, thank God, unconquered people.

MR. PARNELL: In rising to support the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy), I wish to utter a strong protest against the tone and character of the speech of the Prime Minister. I regret exceedingly that the right hon. Gentleman should have allowed himself to be carried away by his feelings into the delivery of that speech. The speech is unjust and ungenerous to the Irish Members, trying to do their duty in this House in the face of great odds, and to the Irish people, struggling against the great odds of your power to keep themselves in the land of their birth. I say I regret that the Prime Minister should have been hurried into these utterances, and that he should have attempted to stifle free and full discussion in this House, not for the first time, in reference to the Irish Land Question.

I can recollect an occasion when he attempted to put to silence one of the Members of the Irish Party. These, then, are my charges, and I think I shall be able to prove that his speech was unjust and ungenerous, and that he has made ineffectual attempt to stifle discussion. The wildest shrieks of some of the men, instructors of public opinion, to whom the Prime Minister certainly does not owe his position, could not have exceeded the over-ridden character of, and the apparent indifference with, the real state of affairs manifested in the speech of the Prime Minister. What did he say? He told us that if the Irish Members, sitting in Opposition, had taken a reasonable attitude, and had not wasted the time of the House for eight nights, he would have been able to have given us his cordial approbation. I do not think a grosser exaggeration was ever uttered by a Member of this House, all things considered, than that the Irish Members had kept the House sitting for eight nights. We have been warned for some days past by the tone of the utterances of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), and especially of the Metropolitan Press, that an attempt would be made to charge us with Obstruction in this debate, and in view of that I have taken the precaution to have notes taken of the time occupied by the Irish Members belonging to the Party of Opposition in the debate on the Queen's Speech, and I find that during the six or seven Sittings they only occupied something about 12 hours of the time of the House. I appeal to the sense of fair play that, no doubt, is entertained by the majority of the Members of this House, if 12 hours, considering the circumstances of the case, that we come from another country, with which you are very imperfectly acquainted, and in reference to which you have very imperfect means of obtaining information about, if 12 hours was an unreasonable time for Irish Members to occupy in order to state their case? Consider the difficulties with which we have to contend. It has been repeatedly stated that the Irish Members with whom I have the honour of acting are men of ordinary, and not extraordinary, talent and oratorical powers. We have to contend with all the talent of England and Scotland. We have also to contend adversely against the verdict which was given against us in advance. When I commenced the task I did not feel very sanguine; but I thought itwas our duty to do our best to inform the public and the House of the true state of affairs. We had great ability and oratorical powers on both sides of the House against us, and we had many misapprehensions to remove, which hon. Members of this House are much interested in creating and perpetrating for the selfish interests of their own class. I can understand that you must be exceedingly prejudiced against us; that many things we do and say must be hard for you to see and listen to; and it is, in fact, almost a hopeless task for us to attempt to remove the prejudices that exist on every side, and the misapprehensions that surround Irish questions—it is almost a hopeless task; and this may be the last Session that you will have any large body of the Irish Members coming to this House and striving to carry on this work. Already in Ireland there are many who say—"What is the use of going to the House of Commons at all?" It would be far more dignified for Irish Members to retire in a body by themselves than tell their countrymen that it is a farce to seek redress from the English Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must be aware that the observations he is now making have no relevance to the Amendment before the House.

Mr. PARNELL: I was endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to the exact terms of the Amendment, to answer the speech of the Prime Minister, and to show that there was no foundation for the charge he had made against us of endeavouring unduly to protract the discussion. However, I think, perhaps, I have gone sufficiently into the matter, and I will proceed to refer to the Amendment of my hon. Friend; but first I would ask you to allow me to remove some misapprehensions which have arisen in the minds of many hon. Members of this House with regard to my position in this land movement. I have been charged several times, and the impression seems exceedingly prevalent, with desiring to make the land movement of Ireland a lever for disintegrating the Empire. ["Hear, hear!"] I am very glad if I have stated the idea that prevails correctly, and I admit that isolated sentences which have been read from time to time from my speeches are, taken by themselves, capable of that construction. But these sentences have usually been taken from speeches which I have delivered from platforms in the open air; from speeches of a very brief character, in which I was unable to explain thoroughly the position which I then assumed, and I still hold; and it is obvious that if you cull one or two sentences in that way they are likely to be misunderstood. With regard to the integrity of the Empire, and if I speak more candidly upon that subject here than I should venture to do in Ireland, it is because I should be prosecuted for saying in Ireland what I trust I may rely on the generosity and fair play of the Members of this House to allow me to say here.

MR. MAGNIAC: I rise to Order. I am quite sure that every Member of this House is willing and anxious to hear the hon. Member upon any question which is properly before the House; but I submit that the hon. Member is now making a personal explanation which has no reference whatever to the Amendment before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The observations of the hon. Member were not strictly relevant to the Amendment before the House. At the same time, I did not interpose, because the House is generally indulgent when an hon. Member desires to make a personal explanation and is speaking in reference to his own personal position. I trust that when the hon. Member has concluded that line of observation he will at once address himself to the Amendment before the House.

MR. PARNELL: I feel very grateful to you, Sir, and to the House, for the very kind indulgence with which you allow me to remove the misapprehension which exists, and I promise to do so in as few words as I can. It is quite true that, speaking in Ireland, I have frequently said that the indirect consequences of the land movement would be the doing away with, or the destruction of, English misrule, and the restoration of an Irish Parliament; and I can understand very well that such an expression of opinion, if not gone into very fully, as was the case on those occasions, may have given rise to the idea that prevails in the House that I was seeking to use this land agitation for the purpose of violently destroying the English power in Ireland. But what I have always endeavoured to convey in such speeches is this—that if landlordism in Ireland could be abolished; if the landlords could be deprived of those unjust rights which they now possess under English-made laws, and which they look to England to assist them in maintaining and upholding; if we could, in this way, teach landlords to look to the people, to throw in their own interests in common with the people of their own country, and not look to a power outside Ireland to maintain their rights; if, in short, we could abolish the right of the landlord to inflict injustice upon the Irish tenant; if we could have such a settlement of the Irish Land Question as would prevent the interests of the landlord and tenant from being in antagonism with each other, I believe that the only settlement that would lead to such a result would be a settlement by which the landlord's interest in the land would be abolished, and the land handed over to the tenant, for I cannot conceive how you can ever adjust relations of landlord and tenant in the soil on a system of partnership in such a way as to prevent constantly recurring disputes as to the tenure of the land. If, then, we could abolish landlordism, the Irish landlords and the numerous and powerful classes who depend upon them for a living, they would be no longer tempted to place themselves in a position of antagonism to the rest of their countrymen. There would then remain no class in Ireland interested in the maintenance of English supremacy there; and we should in a natural and peaceable way, without any violent revolution, in my opinion, and without jingle of arms, but by the union of all classes in Ireland, obtain the restoration of our legislative independence. When I say this, I wish also to say, what, perhaps, I ought not to say in this House, and I should not venture to say it in a public meeting in Ireland—I wish to say that I believe it would be the duty of every Irishman, if circumstances could so come about that a fair chance presented itself of obtaining the freedom of his country, I believe it would, under those circumstances, be the duty of every Irishman to do that which it would be the duty of every man to do, and which the people of every country are proud to do—shed his blood; but I do believe it would be a crime to plunge the Irish people into an unequal and useless struggle. I have never gone beyond the usual lines of Constitutional agitation. I believe that if we can abolish the divisions that exist between classes in Ireland, we should obtain by peaceable and Constitutional agitation the right to make our own laws; and under a system of Constitutional government, such as prevails in this country, I believe that right to make their own laws would be practicable, that we should remain friends with England, and that, as Grattan used to say, there would be the link of the Crown between England and Ireland. You would have lost the right to make confusion and mischief in Ireland, and inflict bad and unjust laws upon us, and you would then see that we were not so terribly hostile to you as you found was the case before. I trust I have now shown the House that when I spoke of the land movement being designed to knock away one of the props of English misrule, I intended to indicate my desire for the friendly settlement of the differences between the two countries. I feel convinced that the great reason why hon. Members are so misled about the state of affairs in Ireland, and the great reason why you continue to work injustice to us, is because a powerful, an educated, and a rich class in Ireland are interested in misinforming you about everything concerned with this country. I will now address myself to the substance of My hon. Friend's Amendment. This is a question of grave urgency; but were it not that the Prime Minister intends that the suspension of the Constitution and measures of coercion should precede concession it would not be a question of such urgency. Last year the ejectments in Ireland numbered, in the first quarter, 554 families and 2,748 persons; in the second quarter, 687 families and 1,355 persons; and in the third quarter, 671 families and 3,447 persons. In the fourth quarter, the number was reduced to 198 families and 954 persons, and I notice that the Land League claims that the smallness of the evictions in that quarter is due to its exertions and organization, and to the fact that it was able to induce people to refrain from taking farms from which others were evicted. The coercive legislation introduced by the Government is intended to put down the Land League, and I warn Ministers that if this is done the state of things which existed in Ireland before the establishment of that organization is likely to recur. I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether he contemplates with any other feelings than those of the gravest alarm an increase of evictions similar to that which took place in the first three quarters of last year? Is it not likely that the Irish landlords, enraged, as many of them are, by the action of their tenantry in organizing and refusing to pay unjust rents, will commence to take vengeance upon the tenants as soon as the Land League has been put down, as soon as the liberty of anyone is at the mercy of any common policeman who chooses to perjure himself by swearing false information, as soon as it is possible to put anyone in Ireland in gaol on no charge whatever? There is not the slightest doubt that the Irish landlords will be encouraged to recommence the series of evictions which the Prime Minister so deplored last year. It is exceedingly probable that the landlords will not wait for coercion, but that the very prospect of coercion will encourage them to proceed to eviction, and before very long you will find the eviction figures again exceeding those of the first three quarters of last year. I have a letter from a gentleman who has applied for protection, and who needs protection no more than I need it; but the writer has persuaded the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland that he is in danger, and he has been provided with two constables. In his letter this gentleman says he intends to make Forster send him 2,000 troops to help him in evicting tenants in a Southern county; and he is, so to speak, rubbing his hands at the prospect of having the Habeas Corpus Act suspended, and 2,000 troops to carry on evictions. The feeling of this gentleman is the feeling of thousands and thousands of Irish landlords. They are looking forward to the Bills, which the right hon. Gentleman calls measures for the Protection of Person and Property, to enable them to revenge themselves upon the tenants for the stand they bravely made during the past 12 months against rack-renting and evictions. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, strong as he may consider himself, will find that the Irish landlords, with the Habeas Corpus Act suspended and the Land League put down, a far more terrible enemy to himself and his Government than the Land League. Does the right hon. Gentleman suppose that public opinion in this country, difficult as it is to get at, difficult as it is to move, will not start back affrighted when it sees the first result of the additional powers—an enormous increase of evictions; that the terrible scenes of 1847 and 1848 have been renewed; that the crowbar brigade is again in full swing; and that the landlords have returned to their ancient practices of burning the roofs and levelling the walls of the homes of the people? The experience gained by the right hon. Gentleman in the famine years can hardly have been thrown away. The right hon. Gentleman must have witnessed many evictions. Does he wish that the ejectments now shall be more numerous than any known since the famine years? 1870 was considered a bad year, but the number of ejectments then was only 753; whereas the number of ejectments in the first three quarters of 1880 was very nearly two and a-half times more than that. I really hope the Government will pass some measure tiding over the time before the passing of the Land Act. A very long time must elapse before a Land Bill is passed. The Government does not even now know its own mind. These great questions must necessarily prolong the discussion on the contemplated measures in this House; and it will certainly be many months before you can embody in any Act of Parliament any idea of yours as to remedial measures. In the meantime, what is to become of the Irish tenants threatened with eviction? We are told—"You are standing in the way of remedial legislation, by every night prolonging this debate." The only thing, the only measure that it seems to me we are standing in the way of is the Coercion Bill. Hon. Members must know that the only Bill the Government is certain of passing is the Coercion Bill. With regard to any projects of Reform in Ireland, the Prime Minister must know that he cannot do much. The fate of the little Land Bill of last Session should be a warning to the right hon. Gentleman before he gives the Irish landlords the terrible weapon of coercion. The Chief Secretary for Ireland must recollect the treatment he received from the landlord party last Session before he attempted to pass a Coercion Bill. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) promised to aid the Government in passing a Coercion Bill; "and then," he said, "we shall give a candid consideration to any measure on the Land Question." The Government will soon find, after coercion is agreed to, that the "candid consideration" their Land Bill will receive from the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University will be constant obstruction in this House; and either its rejection in the House of Lords, or such a whittling of it down as will render the Bill useless. I believe that if the Government had approached the question in a fair and candid spirit they would have been met with an instant diminution of crime in Ireland. Crime is already decreasing, and I am looking forward to the next fortnightly Returns to show a marked diminution of serious crime. At all events, for many weeks there has been no agrarian murder, and the outrages are much less serious than formerly. I have never thought that the cause of the tenant farmer could be benefited by any class of offences but one, and I will candidly admit what that is. It is true, I have never advised the commission of this one; but I have never reprobated it as I have others, and I have taken no practical steps to prevent its commission, as I have in reference to every other class of offences. The only offence against the law which, I think, Irish tenants are justified in committing is the offence of taking possession of holdings from which they have been unjustly evicted; and this, of course, is only excusable, because the law does not protect them. ["Oh!"] There is no active resistance to the law in taking possession of holdings from which they have been unjustly evicted. Just consider the severity of the punishment which is likely to follow this offence. If a man still remains in that possession, he can be taken without bail, and, if convicted, can be sentenced to seven years' penal servitude, or more. That is the terrible punishment awaiting them under the Whiteboy Act for an offence which I cannot regard as an active resistance to the law, an Act which provides the punishment of flogging. I say, if the Irish tenant is willing to suffer for his faith, if he is willing to face the consequences, and retake possession of his holding from which he has been unjustly evicted, that then moral right will sanction the offence against your law. I then would, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, entreat the Government to look the situation in the face. It is all very well to say that it is impossible to ask the Crown to refrain from using the forces of the Crown against resisting evictions; but is it not possible for the Government to pass some short measure through the House of Commons and send it to the Lords, with the intimation that if it be not carried the Lords may be free to govern Ireland as best they could? I think if the right hon. Gentleman would put that august Assembly in his position for a short while, without the ample means that he has at his disposal for enforcing his will, that the Members opposing it would see that it was, perhaps, not so advisable to resist just and prudent measures of reform. I think that if you suspend evictions in Ireland, if you refrain from passing coercion, that it may be possible for you to go a long way in the settlement of this Irish Land Question; but if you go on the lines you have commenced with, if you apply coercion first, the settlement of the question will be taken out of your hands. It will be impossible to restore the people to the calm state of mind which is necessary, in order to obtain the introduction of gradual reform. I am one of those who believe in the abolition of landlordism; but I should welcome any reform, however small, which tended in that direction, and which did not serve to perpetuate and fix the old and evil lines of feudal tenure in Ireland. I do not suppose for a moment that we shall, during this Session of Parliament, get you to adopt the plan of the Emperor of Russia, who made his suffering serfs owners of their lands, and compensated their landlords by the issue of State paper. I do not suppose we shall be able to persuade the Government immediately to adopt the other equally sensible plan of the King of Prussia, who provided that a certain class of the land in the country should leave the possession of the nobles, and go into that of the tenants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must confine himself to the Amendment before the House. He is now travelling very wide of it.

Mr. PARNELL: I was tempted to think, Mr. Speaker, that I might allude to the matter, because the Amendment of my hon. Friend closes with these words—

> "Until the measures to be submitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament,"

and I supposed that in a discussion upon the nature and extent of those measures, and the time which they might probably occupy in passing, I should be in Order in recommending to this House the suspension of ejectments until that time might elapse. I intended merely referring to the fact that these things had been done in Prussia, without any intention of going into a detailed description of what had been done. While expressing my belief that it will not be done, that such a measure will not be attempted or intended by Parliament during this Session of Parliament, I wish to recommend to the Government the consideration of some proposal or plan by which the settlement of this question might not be taken entirely out of their hands by the Irish landlords. If you adopt coercion in Ireland, and I do not say this for the purpose of using any threat, but if you adopt coercion in Ireland, the first man that is arrested will be the signal for the suspension of the payment of all rent in Ireland. Such a proposal was made at the end of last Session. I am glad to say that I have successfully resisted it up to the present moment; but it would not be possible for me, if you insist upon taking the leaders of the people and putting a stop to this organization—it will not be possible for me to resist it any longer. The most moderate men in Ireland, the Catholic Bishops and Catholic priests, will recognize its necessity, and you will find yourselves face to face with a far more formidable movement than that which preceded it — most probably a secret movement. Let not the right hon. Gentleman suppose that the tenants, who have found out how to organize themselves, will not be able to carry on an organization in such a way as to baffle any attempt to stop them, in spite of all his spies and policemen. It certainly will. He does not recognize all the nature of the force he has got to deal with. If he finds the situation is intensified; if he finds evictions increase, murders increase, and no rents coming into the pockets of the landlords, then no class in this country or in Ireland will thank him for his pains. I would therefore entreat him to consider this subject, to look at it in a statesmanlike manner. If the Prime Minister has not yet made up his mind as to the nature of the measures to be submitted to Parliament, let him put a stop to this business of ejectment. He could carry out that by the suspension of ejectments, and all that the landlords at the outside would lose would be their rents during that period. All that they would lose would be a certain sum of money during that period; but would it not be better that even the Irish landlords should be without some of their money during the period of two or three months, while Parliament was calmly considering at its ease the settlement of this question, than that they should be horrified by reading, day after day, accounts of outrages and murders? The present movement in Ireland cannot be stopped unless 10,000 or 15,000 persons are arrested. During the last agitation, the Government was obliged to arrest 2,000 persons under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. For every one who is put in prison, at least five or six or seven will have to leave the country. A fortnight or so after the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act the Government will find that 10,000 persons must be arrested. That is only a small proportion of those who will be obliged to leave the country. The House does not know what the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act means. They do not know what a humiliation everybody feels under it, not knowing whether his liberty or, in many cases, his life is safe. I cannot understand any self-respecting citizen being content to live in a country where that Act is suspended. Englishmen cannot realize what that suspension is, or how it works, because it is so far away from their practical experience. No Ministry could attempt to apply such a measure to England. They can do it in Ireland, because they are the stronger of the two, and because they know that when argument fails they have brute force to rely on. They are engaged in a struggle which they cannot measure; and I entreat the Government, before it goes too far, to pause, and, in the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, to declare, by bringing forward their measures of conciliation and concession first, that "force is no remedy."

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, I am most reluctant to take up any part of the time of the House at this stage; but I must confess that I had looked, after the speech to which we have just listened, for some Member of Her Majesty's Government to rise and call the attention of the House to the very serious character of some of the observations which have been addressed to it. I am not sure, and I think you yourself, Sir, intimated so much, that many of the remarks of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) were somewhat wide of the particular Motion before us; but you thought it right to allow the hon. Gentleman, under the particular circumstances which he stated that he stood in, to travel somewhat outside of the Amendment under discussion. I think we must feel that we have gained one advantage by that permission so given to him, because we have had from the lips of the hon. Member, in his place in Parliament, a most distinct avowal of many of those sentiments which have been attributed to him in other places, but which we had not had so distinctly laid before the House of Commons; and I must say that, although I am not disposed to enter into any general discussion on the subject, I think notice ought to be taken of the extraordinary terms which the hon. Gentleman has addressed to this House of Parliament. I refer, Sir, to the manner in which he has spoken, wholly irrespective of the sentiments which he has announced. He has spoken as if he were an equal power addressing the power of the Crown and the Parliament, as if he were—for anything I know he may claim to be—supreme over the organization which is now the virtual ruler of a portion at least of Ireland. He speaks of what he considers to be right and fair and just—of what the particulars are in which the law of this country ought to be obeyed, and what are the portions of it which ought not to be obeyed; and he told us, in the frankest possible manner, that his intentions in all these proceedings have been such as we know have been avowed on other occasions—that they have been directed, not for the redress of particular grievances or inequalities in the Land Laws of Ireland, but to the destruction of a great element of British power in that country, and to the ultimate separation of the Legislature of the two countries. I am sure that the hon. Member will not deny that that is the general tenour of the observations which he made, or that we have now before us a much greater and wider issue than any involved in the question of any amendment of the Land Laws. I have always said that we are perfectly ready to enter into any discussion of those laws, or of any amendment which may be proposed in them by Her Majesty's Government; but, in the first place, we demand that Her Majesty's Government shall take steps—and Parliament will, no doubt, support them—to restore and vindicate law and order. We listened with patience to the debate that was carried on upon the Amendment moved by the hon. Gentleman; and I, for my own part, thought that, although that debate was carried on at very considerable length, and at times, as it appeared, with unnecessary expansiveness, still, under the circumstances of the case, it was but reasonable that the Irish Members should be able fully and fairly to state all that they had to state to the House of Commons. I felt that the question whether Her Majesty's Government were right in advising Her Majesty to call Parliament together at an unusual time and to ask for extraordinary powers should be fairly discussed, and that everything that hon. Members wished to say should be brought forward. It was discussed, and discussed at great length, and frequently with great ability. We were told that the outrages had been exaggerated, that repressive measures are not the proper way to deal with them; and, after hearing the case fully debated, the House decided, by an overwhelming majority of something like seven or eight to one, in favour of the course which the Government proposed. Under these circumstances, it is but decent that we should proceed without further delay to consider the proposals which the Government will have to submit to us. But a speech such as we have just heard waives all questions as to whether the outrages have been exaggerated or not, and seems to be apart from any question of dealing with them either by repressive or remedial measures. It seems to me we are told to listen to the dictation of the organization called the Land League; and when we listen to the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork speaking with an authority almost co-equal to the Queen of England, it is time this House should enter a protest against doctrines of that kind, and that we should make it known to the people of this country what is the true issue that lies before us.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Allow me, Sir, to assure the House that the only reason why no Member rose from the Treasury Bench when the right hon. Baronet opposite rose was that the Government thought the debate had now gone on so long that it was desirable to take the division. I think there is no loyal subject of the Crown, no matter on which side of the House he sits, who did not consider that the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), which, I suppose, is still ringing in the ears of the House, carried its own refutation with it in an Assembly of loyal subjects. The hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), and the hon. Member for the City of Cork alike, have repeated doctrines which must have much astonished this House, and which cannot be recognized in any settled and civilized Kingdom. The law of this Realm, as made by the Crown and Parliament, is that which the Government is bound to administer; and the Government which does not enforce the existing law fails in its elementary duty of maintaining the organization of society. What I have learnt in early days—though this new Gospel would unteach it—is that the first duty of a Government is to maintain public order, and to preserve the rights of property and the rights of individual persons. That is the object to which the Government must address itself in the first instance. It appears to me that you might as well give tonics to a fevered patient as, at the present moment, give remedial measures to Ireland, before law and order are restored in that country. I will, in a word, give an illustration which occurs to me by reference to an answer I gave to a Question put to me in this honourable House. I then stated that, in my opinion, the Land Courts held by the Land League were amongst the most illegal and formidable of their operations that have come before us. These Courts prevent tenants from fulfilling their obligatlons, which they are willing to discharge. It is a libel upon the tenants of Ireland to say that they are all dishonest enough to withhold their rents, and I take leave to say in this honourable House that that statement is unfounded. I have to tell the House of a case in which when it was established that the law of the land is stronger than the law of the Land League, the tenants, when the supremacy of the law had been asserted, came forward and paid their rents, which they were well able to pay, but which they had hitherto been afraid to pay, on account of the Land League, and lodged them in bank to the credit of the landlord.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the debate raised great practical issues and a great question of policy. Complaints were made by the Government that the discussion had been unduly prolonged; but it was by no means unprecedented to move an Amendment upon the Address, and to discuss it at much length. In 1841 Mr. Stuart Wortley moved and carried an Amendment to the Address. The debate commenced on the 24th of August, and was not closed until the 27th, having extended over four days. The result of that Amendment was that the Administration of Lord Melbourne went out, and that of Sir Robert Peel was established in its place. A similar course was taken in June, 1859, when, after a debate extending over four days, an Amendment to the Address was carried, and the Government of Lord Derby went out, being replaced by that of Lord Palmerston. In the face of these precedents, it could not be said that the present debate had been unnecessarily prolonged. The House was engaged in an Irish debate, upon which 70 speeches had been delivered, and of those 70 speeches, only 36 had been delivered by Irish Members, and not exclusively by Home Rule Members, but including the speeches of the Liberal Members from Ulster, and Irish Members like the two right hon. and learned Members for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson and Mr. Plunket), who sat on the Conservative Benches. The debate had never for an instant flagged. Several Members constantly endeavoured to catch Mr. Speaker's eye; and, seeing the great eagerness to speak thus manifested, he did not think there was any just cause of complaint as to the prolongation of the debate. By a secret understanding between one of the Home Rule Whips and the Representatives of Her Majesty's Government—he hoped it would be the last secret understanding between them—it was arranged that the discussion on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) should be closed on Friday night. That arrangement was strictly observed by the Irish Members, and yet Her Majesty's Ministers had now the cheek to come down to the House and abuse the Irish Members for unduly prolonging the debate.

MR. WARTON: I rise to Order. Is the expression "cheek" Parliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER motioned to Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR to proceed.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he entirely agreed with some of the remarks of the Prime Minister with regard to the terms of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy). He thought that those terms were unfortunate, and that they afforded the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of answering the Motion by a side issue. It was the duty of the Executive, in ordinary cases, to enforce the law by every means at their disposal; and it was absurd to ask the Government to decline to avail themselves of the Military and Constabulary Forces at their command, in order to enforce the law. Nevertheless, the Amendment was perfectly justifiable, if it were regarded in the light of a protest. The statement of the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson), that there was no precedent for the Government suspending the law if they thought fit to do so, was altogether inaccurate. If Her Majesty's Ministers chose to enforce the law at the present moment they could expel every Jesuit from the country; and when, in view of the speedy repeal of the Stamp Duties, Charles Dickens and others published newspapers without a stamp, the Government abstained from putting the law in force against them. In point of fact, the Government should have brought in a

Suspension of Eviction Bill at once, or have renewed the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. A very important point to bear in mind was that the prospect of remedial legislation was calculated to lead to an increase of eviction, as the landlords would be anxious to make the most of their powers in the interval before their abolition. This contention was borne out by facts and figures. In the three years ending with 1869, the number of evictions amounted to 5,955, the average being under 2,000 per annum. But in 1870, when there was a prospect of remedial legislation, the number of evictions increased to 2,094. Under these circumstances, as there was an increased temptation to evict, it was the duty of Ministers, pending their proposed remedial legislation, to suspend the power of eviction. Instead of taking steps for that purpose, the Government contemplated coercive measures, and were taking action against the movement set on foot by the Land League. If successful in their object, they would deprive the Irish tenants of the only source from whence they could at present expect assistance. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had stated that in times of distress a sentence of eviction came very near to a sentence of starvation. Yet the Returns showed that there had been more than 5,000 evictions, and the right hon. Gentleman had done nothing to prevent them. In 1848, when cruel evictions were carried on, women and children were thrown into the roadway in the middle of the night, to perish of cold and hunger, as, indeed, some of them did perish, Sir Robert Peel expressed his gratitude to an hon. Member for bringing the subject under the notice of Parliament. Instead of imitating Sir Robert Peel, the present Prime Minister attempted to stifle all discussion of the wrongs of the miserable people of Ireland. The whole history of the relations of Ireland with Liberal Ministries in times of distress showed that it was their habit to turn a deaf ear to the complaints of the Irish people, until it was too late to deal with the matters complained of. With an almost absolute certainty of the same terrible scenes being re-enacted, it was not to be expected that the Irish nation would put their trust in a Liberal Ministry. Distress had again overtaken the country. Evictions were daily taking place, and the Prime Minister did nothing to prevent the carrying out of what he himself had pronounced to be, in such a case, a sentence of starvation. On the contrary, he had come down to the House that very night, and complained of the delay that was being interposed in the application of coercion to Ireland. The Minister that moved Heaven and earth to save the peasants of Bulgaria from the cruelty and oppression of the Turks had nothing but coercion for the wretched peasants of Ireland. He could understand the sympathy of the right hon. Gentleman for the people of Bulgaria, if he could see one-half as much sympathy expended by him upon the people of Ireland.

Mr. SPEAKER: I fail to see the relevancy of the remarks of the hon. Member to the Amendment before the House. They are quite wide of the mark.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR would bow at once to the decision of the Chair. If the right hon. Gentleman would allow him to explain, he was only endeavouring to show what the meaning of eviction was in Ireland, because the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford was intended, if possible, to arrest evictions. He would now read from a Liberal paper—*The Radical*—a description of a family, which was now threatened with eviction, and of the wretched hovel which they occupied. The hon. Member proceeded to read at some length an account of a visit paid by the correspondent of the newspaper to a family under notice of eviction, which described the miserable condition of the cottage, the only furniture of which was a stool, a box, an iron three-legged pot, and some straw with a sack over it. The writer also described the appearance of the three inmates of the cottage.

Mr. RITCHIE: I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the personal appearance of any person has anything to do with the Motion before the House? The hon. Member is now disregarding the ruling you have given from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. Member to be describing a case of eviction.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I am describing a case of threatened eviction. I was reading the appearance of a family which is threatened with eviction.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot say that the hon. Member is entirely out of Order. At the same time, I trust that he will strictly confine his remarks to the Question before the House. He is certainly travelling somewhat wide of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford. Observations of this kind would have been more in Order when the House was discussing the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he would accept the hint which the Speaker had been kind enough to give him, and he would omit several sentences in the description of the condition of this poor man and his family. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would find that his remarks were strictly applicable to the Amendment before the House. Three times had the rent of this poor man—whose name was Michael Conolly—been raised for improvements he had made himself. The English Correspondent of *The Radical*, who gave the description, said that the case was one of moral robbery on the part of a titled landlord, who took 80 per cent above Griffith's valuation. There were other cases equally as bad, said this writer, on the estate of the same landlord. Processes were served, and to enforce them the hero of Mid Lothian and the orator of Blackheath would lend the aid of the Military and Constabulary Forces of the Crown, the sole object being to maintain a system far worse than Turkish tyranny and misrule. The case he had been describing was that of a villager, who was one of his constituents, and who had sent him there to speak for him. He would not be fulfilling his duty if on every occasion he did not raise his voice to protest against the cruelty, the tyranny, and the injustice of the present system. If the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had been sent to that House by the votes of cottier tenants, he would feel it his duty to resist to the last gasp even as powerful a Minister as himself, and to raise his protest against the injustice, tyranny, and death which was being dealt out broadcast to these unfortunate people. It was quite possible that in performing his duty it would be his (Mr. O'Connor's) lot to encounter the hostility of the House. He should be sorry for that. He disliked putting himself needlessly in hostility to any person; but he was animated by one feeling only, and that was the protection of the lives of the people whose interests he was sent there to serve. It might be said that the action of the Irish Members would create a feeling of hostility against the Irish Members and their cause. It might be that that feeling was excited already. He had little doubt that it was excited. Wherever he went he found the air full of horrid rumours, and the Prime Minister had spoken of that feeling as likely to impede him in the ameliorated legislation he intended to pass. Perhaps it might; but nothing he (Mr. O'Connor) could say to an English audience could have much effect, except to irritate them a little more. If the Prime Minister told English feeling to be hostile to the Irish Members, English feeling would be hostile to the Irish Members. But if the Prime Minister told English feeling to be fair and patient towards the Irish Members, Englishmen, to whom the name of the Prime Minister was justly dear, would be fair and patient. If English feeling went against the Irish Members it would be because the Prime Minister had deliberately excited it against them.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL rose to Order. The Amendment before the House dealt with the question of employing the Naval and Military Forces of the Crown and the Constabulary in preventing ejectments in Ireland. The hon. Member was now discussing the coercive measures that were going to be introduced by the Government. He wished to know if the hon. Member was in Order in discussing those measures?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the coercive measures which may be submitted on the Amendment now before the House. Such observations would have been in Order when the House was discussing the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). The hon. Member had an opportunity of discussing the question on that Amendment.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR submitted that he had not said one single word upon the coercion measures of the Government. What he was speaking about was the feeling of the English people, and he was desirous of calling attention to a letter written by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), in which the right hon. Gentleman stated that a feeling and temper might be aroused in the country which would prevent the proposals of Her Majesty's Government from being carried out. But why had not the right hon. Gentleman taken care that no intemperate proposals were made? [*Cries of* "Question!"] He believed that he was speaking to the Question. He was answering that part of the Prime Minister's speech in which the right hon. Gentleman made reference to the feeling of the country. Why had the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that evening, upon false and inaccurate information, accused the Irish Members of having unduly prolonged the discussion? It had been shown by facts that they had not prolonged the debate, and that the majority of the speakers were not Members representing the principles of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Therefore, the basis of the homily delivered by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) was proved to be altogether false and inaccurate. Yet the right hon. Gentleman, proceeding on this false and inaccurate basis, appealed to public feeling against the Irish Members. Knowing that his appeal would be worth more than ten thousand Irish speeches, the right hon. Gentleman first laid down his inaccurate premisses, and then called upon the people to draw their conclusions from them, knowing well that few English people would take the trouble to examine the premisses, but that all would accept the conclusion. Nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand would accept the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the Irish Members had unduly prolonged the debate, and would become inflamed against the Irish Party in consequence. One reasonable, just, and impartial man in every thousand might take the trouble to examine the premisses for himself, and he would find that every particle of the statement of the Prime Minister was disproved by the facts. Out of 70 speeches delivered in the course of the debate only 36 had been delivered by Irishmen, and they represented Irishmen of all classes. The Irish Members agreed to close the discussion on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork on Friday, and at the moment it was brought to a close there were a large number of English Members who were anxious to continue it. He appealed to hon. Members to know whether that was the fact or not? Yet the Prime Minister was exciting a hostile feeling against the Irish Members, and instead of inaugurating a new era of reconciliation between the two nations, they would, on the contrary, see the dawn of a new era of fierce hatreds and hotter passions. Upon the head of the Prime Minister and his Colleagues would rest the heavy responsibility of beginning this new era of national hates, in place of a new era of national reconciliation.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Lalor.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Her Majesty's Government cannot consent, without taking the sense of the House, to an adjournment of the debate. I do not propose at this hour to enter into any of the reasons why, in my opinion, this debate has been sufficiently protracted. If hon. Members were open to argument, or to expostulation, I think the speech of my right hon. Friend at the head of the Government in the early part of the evening would have produced some impression upon them. At all events, I shall not attempt, in a speech of weaker language, to repeat the arguments my right hon. Friend used for the purpose of endeavouring to impress upon hon. Members that they are not taking the best means of favourably disposing the House and the country towards them. The hon. Member whose speech preceded the Motion for the adjournment of the debate has said that it was the duty of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) to calm any feeling of irritation that might arise in the country against the policy of the Irish Members. I venture to assure the hon. Member that not even those two statesmen to whom I have referred, nor a statesman powerful in the country as the Leader of the Opposition himself, if he added his influence, would be able to calm the feeling of irritation which is arising in this House, and is arising in the country against them. Hon. Members know their own business best; I presume they know the practical object they have in view. Certainly, this discussion can lead to no practical result. It may lead to the postponement of certain measures—to the postponement for a time of measures for the restoration of law and order, which the Government have declared it to be their intention to introduce; and unquestionably it will lead to a considerable postponement of the remedial measures they are about to bring forward. I leave it to the House to judge—I can form no opinion myself—whether hon. Members wish to retard measures of repression or measures of relief and reform.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the noble Lord—from what he (Mr. O'Donnell) had learned from his Colleagues—had misapprehended entirely the feelings of the Irish Members, when he accused them of not having been impressed with the speech which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. Hon. Members from Ireland had, on the contrary, been very deeply indeed impressed with the speech, and, having greatly pondered over it, it was their unanimous opinion that it consisted of the rashest possible assertions, coupled with a complete absence of a basis of reliable information. The right hon. Gentleman, instead of endeavouring to impart a tone of calmness to the debate that was to follow, did all he could—at least, in the opinion of the Irish Members—to predispose the House against any argument or expostulation which might be forthcoming in the course of the evening from the Irish Benches. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken as the chief of a powerful army, consisting, on this occasion only, of a close union of two Parties that could only be united in common hostility to Ireland. Knowing the power at his back, the right hon. Gentleman had used it mercilessly against the cause of Ireland. The House responded to the cue that he gave, and the most moderate statements of hon. Members who followed him had been received with almost constant interruptions from the devoted liegemen of the ex-emancipator of Bulgaria. The conduct of the Prime Minister and the fidelity, with which his dictates were followed by those over whom he had complete control, formed one of the strongest reasons in favour of an adjournment of the present heated debate—heated by the Prime Minister—to some other day, by which time, perhaps, reflection would have given the Prime Minister himself the extent of the mischief he had wrought between England and Ireland. No one could deny that the right hon. Gentleman had great power over the Members of his own Party. It might be true that he was losing his power over the constituencies—at least, he had gathered as much from the speech of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India—but, at any rate, he still, for several very good reasons, possessed power over the rank and file of his own following. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman recommend his followers to listen with attention to the expostulations—to the entreaties if they would—of the Members from Ireland pleading, on one of the last occasions open to them, for the full consideration of the question before the House, before the Ministry had irretrievably committed itself, by the actual introduction of unfortunate measures, to a course which future generations of Irishmen and Englishmen might not improbably rue? The right hon. Gentleman did nothing of the kind. He exercised no pacifying influence over his followers, and his followers were doubtless abandoned to the direction they might receive from their constituents. Well, the sort of influence that was being brought to bear on the constituencies was pretty well known. The right hon. Gentleman ought to know something about it, and his knowledge ought to have armed him with some courage and resolution on the present occasion, for the purpose of securing fair play for the Irish people in this great controversy. He (Mr. O'Donnell) had not done such injustice to any English Member as to imagine for a single moment that a proposal to withhold relief and protection from an enormous number of English people threatened with utter ruin would have been tolerated, or, at any rate, would have been allowed to pass by an English majority, or minority either, without the most protracted, the most stubborn resistance and opposition. He was perfectly sure that whatever might be the opposition offered by Irish Members to anti-Irish legislation for Ireland, ten times more stubborn opposition would be offered by English Members to anti-English legislation for England. Perhaps he might be allowed to correct that expression. Judging from the precedents of past times, Englishmen might prove themselves ten times more stubborn on behalf of England than Irish Members used to prove themselves on behalf of Ireland; but it would be learnt on the present occasion that the sturdiest Englishmen would not be able to pride themselves on the possibility of a more determined defence on behalf of their country than it would be the pride as well as the miserable duty of the Irish Members to assume against the coercive proposals of Her Majesty's Government. He believed that the proposal to adjourn the debate would materially facilitate the conclusion of the debate. The discussion could not terminate to-night, and if it was adjourned, even at this time—after the provocation the Irish Members had received, and the want of consideration which had been shown to the Irish Party—it would, he believed, be found that the obstacles, the perfectly legitimate obstacles, that might otherwise be placed in the way of progress with this particular Business would be removed. He was sure, at any rate, that courtesy from the other side of the House would be responded to with courtesy from that (the Opposition) side. Let hon. Members not take up that word. Were the Irish Members pushed to the last resort in defending the rights of their constituents, the question might be one altogether above the rules of courtesy. They could not deal in compliments when the fundamental liberties of a people were threatened. It would be a disgrace—the foulest disgrace—to any English Party to deal out compliments to men who were dealing out coercion to England. The Irish Members were most willing to meet the courtesy of their English friends or English opponents with courtesy; but there must be a point—if the Government chose to push them to it—at which courtesy must cease on the part of those who were defending a down-trodden and wretched country, whose miserable condition was the direct result of British rule. They were still at the courteous period of discussion, and he would apologize to hon. Gentlemen opposite if he had said anything to strain the courtesy he was anxious to preserve. He hoped the Government would consent to an adjournment without delay, so that an opportunity might be given to the constituencies to judge between the assertions of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government, and the proofs and facts brought forward on the Irish side. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Irish Members had occupied an altogether disproportionate share of the discussion; and if the debate had concluded at that point, it would have concluded without the English constituencies being reminded that half of all the speeches on this purely Irish question, debated during the past week, were made by English and Scotch Members. Let them have a little time for reflection, and who knew but even the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister might have something more statesmanlike to observe before the debate had completely terminated. He would address an appeal to right hon. Gentlemen who were responsible for the government of this country, and ask them to make use of their high position to stigmatize, in language of just severity, the wholesale dissemination of the foulest and most abominable caricatures of Irish nationality, of Irish national character, and of the Irish Members in that House, which was now taking place from one end of Great Britain to the other. He had not heard from any hon. or right hon. Gentleman a single word in condemnation of all these foul and abominable outrages, which were only worthy of a people sunk to the lowest depths of barbarism and savagery. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, and the noble Lord who had just warned them that the feeling of the people of this country was rising against them, had not—[*Cries of* "Divide!" *and prolonged interruption.*] It was the English Members who were now interrupting the debate and causing delay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

Mr. O'DONNELL begged to thank Mr. Speaker for the protection he afforded him. He was saying, when interrupted, that the noble Lord who had admonished the Irish Members should have done his duty and admonished the men who were engaged in the foul work of stirring up English prejudice against Ireland, to cease their dirty trade, at least for the decent reputation of their country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is the adjournment of the debate. The hon. Member is now speaking to some Question certainly other than the adjournment.

Mr. O'DONNELL need not assure Mr. Speaker of his readiness always to bow to the rulings of the Chair. He might say that the protracted annoyance systematically kept up by some of the lovers of Order on the other side of the House, had effectually prevented Mr. Speaker from gathering the drift of his last observations. One of his reasons for supporting the adjournment of the debate, was to enable the House to continue the discussion in a less heated frame of mind than that which was induced by the Prime Minister at the commencement of the evening, and still further excited, later on, by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India. When hon. Members opposite interrupted him with what he could not help calling persistent clamour, he was advocating calmness of discussion, and was asking the noble Lord and the Members of the Government, previous to the resumption of the debate, to address some strong words of reproof and condemnation to the men who were stirring up the blood of England against Ireland—to the publishers of villainous caricatures. [*Cries of* "Question!"] That was just the Question. If the noble Lord would do his duty towards calming the heated mind of England, towards repressing the scurrility, the violence, and the scandalous infamy of the attacks showered upon Ireland now, his appeal to the Irish Members would come with much better grace and much greater force. He hoped the adjournment would be granted without irritation and unnecessary delay, and that they might all be able to pursue the debate free from the pre-occupation and fatigues of the present moment.

Mr. PARNELL said, it was quite evident which side of the Cabinet had got the upper hand. He was not at all surprised that the noble Lord, who was at present the Leader of the House, should advocate a policy which could not fail in misrepresenting the Irish cause to Englishmen. He was asking for additional time and additional facilities for this discussion—["Question!"]—and he thought it was very much the Question, although it might not yet have arrived within the comprehension of some hon. Gentlemen opposite, who had been spending the evening elsewhere, and had not attended the debate. He asked for additional time, and he would recommend that course by pointing out to the House the result of a want of information. Ireland had often been misunderstood, and doubtless would be misunderstood again; he thought the House had usually regretted the result of that misunderstanding and if he was not much mistaken it would again regret, before many years—perhaps, before many months—were over, the result of the present misunderstanding. He was not surprised that the same policy which recommended the butchery and bludgeoning in Phœnix Park, when the noble Lord who now sat on the opposite Bench, and whose policy was a territorial policy, and who had now got the upper hand, was then Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. He was not surprised that such a policy should be desired by that school of English politicians to which the noble Lord belonged; but he was surprised that the Prime Minister should have allowed that section to control and to hinder him as to his policy towards Ireland. It looked very much as if the Prime Minister, recognizing his inability and want of force to carry a satisfactory Land Bill for Ireland, was casting about in advance for some excuse to present to the Irish people for his failure a few months hence to do justice to them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Motion before the House is the adjournment of the debate. The House has shown great indulgence in allowing the hon. Member to address himself to that question, and also to the Main Question; but I am bound to say that the hon. Member is far exceeding that indulgence, because he is not speaking to the Amendment which is now before the House.

Mr. PARNELL said, if they were not to be heard, he really did not know for what purpose the Legislative Assembly was to be brought together. The Government were going to strike the Irish people—to strike down their liberty——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must caution the hon. Member that he is now disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. PARNELL said, they simply claimed the right to be heard. They asked for an extension of time in order that the House might hear them before it debated these unconstitutional measures. They thought that was not an unreasonable request for a nation to make under the circumstances—for the House would please to remember that the Irish people were a nation; and although England had striven for many centuries to deprive her of her nationhood, it had been to this day and, please God, it would remain, unsuccessful.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN rose to support the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. The noble Lord the Secretary for India had told the House that the feeling of the country was rising against the Irish Members. But what was the country? The country meant England, and Ireland was left out of the calculation. It was true that the feeling of England was, perhaps, rising against the Irish Members; but there was another country concerned.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I did not say the feeling of the country was rising against the Irish Members, but against the policy the Irish Members were advocating.

MR. SULLIVAN again asked what country? England, and only England, came within the purview of the noble Lord. But there was another country concerned in this matter, and the feeling of that country was rising, and it was in favour of the policy advocated by the Irish Members. He protested against this system of ignoring that country, and they, the Irish Members, so far as they could help it, would not allow it to be ignored. Now, why was this great hurry about this Business that night? He would tell the House. The hurry was to pass a Coercion Act for Ireland. A proposition had been made for the suspension of evictions in Ireland. That could not be entertained at all; but a proposition for the suspension of the Constitution in Ireland could be entertained, and was very readily taken up. And, indeed, he did not much wonder at that; for the Constitution in Ireland was a very light weight, and could be very easily suspended. He saw no fair reason why further time should not be given for the discussion of this important subject; and he maintained that, in this contention, the Irish Members had the feeling of their country with them, and they would adhere to it.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 40; Noes 223: Majority 183.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Molloy.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I thought it necessary, Sir, that the House should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion whether the debate should be continued or not. The House has now, by a substantial majority, expressed its opinion upon that point. I am well aware that it is in the power of a minority, smaller than that which has just voted, to overrule the will of the majority except at great inconvenience and discomfort to the majority. I do not say that it may not be necessary at some time or another that some sacrifice of that sort should be incurred. Notwithstanding what has been said by some hon. Members opposite, I can assure the House that nothing is further from the wish of Her Majesty's Ministers, and I believe of the great majority of the House, than to enter unnecessarily and prematurely on anything like a conflict with hon. Members from Ireland. I only hope that those hon. Members will take into consideration the strongly expressed opinion of the House, as shown by the division which has just taken place, that they will, when the debate is resumed, not tax too much the patience of the House, and come to a conclusion within a reasonable time. On the understanding, of course, that this Motion is withdrawn, I wish to state that no further opposition will be offered to the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. I will take this opportunity to say, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, that a similar Motion to that made last week by my right hon. Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government, will be made by him at half-past 4 o'clock this day—namely, that the Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned debate on the Motion for the Address to Her Majesty have precedence over Notices of Motion set down for the day.

MR. PARNELL said, that, in order to show the *bonâ fides* of the Irish Members, no opposition would be offered to the arrangement proposed by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, for resuming the debate on that day. He thought that where the Government afforded them facilities for discussion, they should meet the Government by postponing their own Motions. He himself had two important Motions down, for the purpose of giving Her Majesty's Government facilities for making progress with Public Business, and those he should be happy to postpone. He had no doubt that his hon. Friend would withdraw the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE — MOTIONS ON THE PAPER — ABSENCE OF MEMBERS WHEN CALLED.

MR. M'COAN said, he was not in his place when Mr. Speaker called his name, with regard to a Return on the Paper. Might he be allowed to move for the Return then?

MR. SPEAKER: I called the hon. Member's name, and he did not answer. The hon. Member will have to give another Notice.

PUBLIC HOUSES (CLOSING ON SUNDAY) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. PEASE, Bill for closing Public Houses on Sundays in England and Wales, making provision for the Sale of Beer for consumption off the premises during certain Limited Hours, and for the exceptional requirements of Large Towns, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. PEASE and Viscount CASTLEREAGH.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 26.]

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 18*th January,* 1881.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 18*th January,* 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading* — Educational Endowments (Scotland) * [65]; Universities (Scotland) (Voting) [69].

First Reading—Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) * [66]; Judicial Committee * [67]; Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment * [68].

Withdrawn—Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) * [61].

QUESTIONS.

TREATY OF BERLIN—MOBILIZATION OF THE GREEK ARMY.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the despatch in which they advised the Greek Government to mobilize their army, or, at least, in which they formally withdrew the advice of Her Majesty's late Government against such a mobilization?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I stated last year that Her Majesty's Government were the last of the European Powers to withdraw their objections to a mobilization of the Greek Army.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked, Whether the despatch would be laid upon the Table?

[No reply was given.]

CHINA—THE CHEFOO CONVENTION—THE OPIUM TAX.

MR. J. W. PEASE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the "observations" in a separate despatch on the subject of opium taxation in China, promised by Sir Thomas Wade in his letter of January 31st 1880 (China Paper, No. 2, 1880), have been received, and whether they will be laid upon the Table; whether the remaining portion of Sir Thomas Wade's Report, kept back in 1877, but promised by Lord Derby to some mercantile firms in London, in a letter dated October 22nd 1877, will also be laid upon the Table; and, whether Her Majesty's Government approve of the arrangement made by Sir Thomas Wade with the Government of China, in his letter to the Prince of Kung, January 30th 1880?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE; Sir, the separate despatch referred to by my hon. Friend has not yet been received, and in accordance with the usual practice it will not be advisable to lay on the Table the remaining portion of Sir Thomas Wade's Report of 1877 until the close of the negotiations respecting opium now pending, and of the discussions which have been opened, and are still proceeding, between the foreign Representatives at Pekin and the Chinese Government in relation to inland taxation and other matters. Her Majesty's Government are daily awaiting the views of the Government of India before coming to a final decision as to the arrangement proposed in Sir Thomas Wade's despatch of the 31st of January, 1880.

WATER SUPPLY (METROPOLIS)—LEGISLATION.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill this Session dealing with the water supply of London?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes, Sir, I hope to be able to do so.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE IRISH CONSTABULARY.

Mr. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the demand for a sworn investigation into the conduct of the Police before the magistrates at Castletown-Berehaven, co. Cork, on the 7th inst. when the Rev. Dr. R. Harrington, President of St. Michael's College, Listowell, said—

> "The people in that district had to watch day and night over their property, and, at this inclement season, when even farm beasts are stabled at night, men and women must watch around cow-sheds and haggards from dusk till dawn. For four weeks, by day or by night, the light has never been extinguished in any house in Ahabruck. Although the district is situated within reach of three distinct Police patrols; still, night after night, the cries of tortured brutes are heard; the fire of the incendiary blazes under their very eyes, and no one is brought to justice. I speak with full deliberation, and with a sense of responsibility becoming the gravity of the statement, that through the length and breadth of this barony you will not find six men of the people who do not believe that the recent outrages are the work of the police. Father Harrington (to the Head-constable)—You know that this belief prevails? Head-constable—I do;"

and, whether sworn informations have lately been laid against the police, and if the Government will now refuse all inquiry into their conduct?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had received a Report on this matter from the Inspector General of the Constabulary. He had not had time to communicate with the local authorities, and therefore he had no precise knowledge of the language used by Dr. Harrington, but was aware that he had made a statement before the magistrates on the 7th instant, to the effect that in the district there was a belief that the police were committing outrages themselves. A sworn information was made in November last by a man named Harrington—it did not follow that he was a relative of Dr. Harrington—whose hay was maliciously burnt, and on whose farm other outrages were committed, to the effect that he suspected the police to be the authors of the outrages. The information was brought to the notice of the magistrates of the district, who recorded their opinion on it in writing, declaring that they were perfectly satisfied that there was not the slightest ground for the charge that the police were themselves the perpetrators of the outrages in that locality; that they believed that the offenders were the persons who had induced the man to make the charge; that Harrington was a very ignorant man, and that the information he swore was not warranted by any evidence; and that they had no doubt the object of these charges was to incite the feelings of the people against the constituted authorities. He himself had no doubt that that was the case. He understood that the constabulary authorities themselves were anxious for an inquiry into the charges made against them, but he was not convinced as yet that there was any ground for an inquiry.

MR. HEALY was understood to inquire whether six other farmers in the district had not also sworn informations?

MR. W. E. FORSTER replied, that he had no further information to give.

SOUTH AFRICA—CETEWAYO, LATE KING OF THE ZULUS.

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true that several months ago a numereus embassy from the Zulu nation, including men of the highest rank, was sent to the Natal Government to intreat that their King Cetewayo might be restored to them, upon whatever conditions the British Government might think proper to impose; and, whether any conditions have been proposed to the Zulu people for their acceptance, with a view to the release of Cetewayo and the conciliation of his former subjects?

MR. GRANT DUFF: Sir, in reply to my hon. Friend's first Question, I have to say that Sir Bartle Frere, in a despatch printed on page 76 of the South African Papers, marked C 2,695, and presented in September of last year, mentions an unofficial rumour of some such transaction, speaking of as many as 200 natives; and, again, at page 86 of the same volume, in a despatch of Mr. Osborn's, the Resident in Zululand, I find the following words:—

> "With reference to the application lately made by Undabuko, Panda's son, for the release of his brother, the ex-king Cetewayo, I understand that it has been alleged in some of the Colonial newspapers that several of the appointed chiefs joined in or supported the prayer. I wish to remark that I have reason to believe that there is no truth in the latter allegation, and I do not think that the chiefs desire to see Cetewayo back in Zululand."

In reply to my hon. Friend's second Question, I have to say that no conditions have been proposed, that there is no intention whatsoever of proposing any, and that no embassy of the kind came or could have come from what he describes as the Zulu nation, which is now divided into 13 quite independent chieftainships. Such moves on the part of individuals are to be expected from time to time. I never yet heard of any exiled Ruler who was so unlucky as not to leave some Jacobite to regret him.

IRELAND — THE SEEDS ACT, 1880 — REPAYMENT OF SPECIAL RATES.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that in the Ballyshannon Union, in the county Donegal, some of the rate collectors have resigned their posts in consequence of being required to collect the special rate struck under "The Seeds Act, 1880," stating that they apprehended personal violence if they endeavoured to fulfil this duty; and whether it is the case that in this, and other parts of Ireland a disposition to resist the obligations under this Act is being manifested?

MAJOR NOLAN also asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has received letters, memorials, or resolutions from Ballyshannon Union, County Donegal, or from other parts of Ireland, stating that, although the Seeds Act has been of considerable use, yet that, owing to over three-fourths of the potatoes planted last year having been old seed and not new Champion seed, that the full benefit of the Seeds Act cannot be obtained until next autumn; and the first instalment due thereon might fairly be postponed until there has been a full crop from the new seed; if the county of Donegal has not been one of the counties most sorely visited by distress in 1879; and, further, whether it is the fact that the poor rate collectors strongly object to having to enter into new bail bonds for the collection of the seed rate, and if this objection is not in many cases the origin of their complaints upon this subject?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he hoped that the answer he had to give to the noble Lord would practically answer the Question of the hon. and gallant Member (Major Nolan). He was informed that four collectors of the Ballyshannon Union had apprised the Board of Guardians that their sureties were unwilling to give security for the collection of the seed rate, believing that there would be great difficulty in enforcing payment, and that the Guardians had, therefore, advertised for new collectors. There was nothing in the paper received by the Local Government Board to show that the collectors apprehended personal violence in their endeavours to fulfil their duty. There was reason to fear that in some parts of Ireland there would be an indisposition on the part of the ratepayers to make repayment of the sums due. In consideration of the circumstances of this year, or rather of the non-recovery of some parts of the country from the effects of last year, the Local Government Board had postponed the seed rate in 32 Unions, and in parts of 29 other Unions. It was true that the county Donegal was sorely visited with distress in 1879, and that there was a great difference between the eastern and the western parts of that county, the western part having been in most distress. He had not heard that three-fourths of the potatoes of last year were old seed, and he should hope that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had exaggerated unintentionally the proportion.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND).

Mr. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to a statement that there were several districts in Ireland where it is not easy to find local gentlemen fit for the bench who are not connected with the landed interest, Whether it is not the fact that there is in every petty sessions district at least one or more clergymen well qualified by position and education for the position of magistrate; and, if any obstacle exists to the appointment of such gentlemen to the commission of the peace?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER was not aware whether there was in every petty sessions district one or more clergymen well qualified to serve as magistrates; but he had referred the Question to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, who informed him that the rule which had been generally acted upon by all parties for many years past, and which was departed from only in very exceptional cases, excluded clergymen of various denominations from the Magisterial Bench.

Mr. HEALY gave Notice that on an early day he would move for a Return of the number of clergymen who were on the commission of the peace in England.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT, 1880—LOCK OUT OF MINERS.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the statement in the public Press that 40,000 miners who refused to contract themselves out of the Employers' Liability Act have been "locked out" in Lancashire; and, whether, considering the pressure which is being put on working men by employers, to contract themselves out of the benefits of this Act, he contemplates any amendment of the Act in the interests of the working men?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, I have observed with regret statements in the Press to the effect that a difference has in this instance arisen between employers and employed; but I have no further knowledge of what pressure, if any, has been brought to bear by one party upon the other. I trust, however, that the parties, if they have not already virtually done so, will soon arrive at a friendly agreement, either to remain under the Act or to enter into some just and satisfactory arrangement in lieu thereof. The Act of last Session, as I repeatedly pointed out while it was under discussion, imposed no restraint on freedom of contract. The Government have no intention, at all events, before full experience of the working of the Act shall have demonstrated its necessity, to propose a Bill to amend its provisions. I especially hope that the power of free contract will, if resorted to, be used with such good sense, fairness, and moderation by all concerned that no occasion will arise for curtailing it in the interest of any party.

THE NAVY — ADMISSION OF BOYS FROM REFORMATORIES.

Mr. DALY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether boys from a reformatory, having completed their time and discharged with good characters, are ineligible for service in Her Majesty's Navy; and, if such be the rule of the service, to state the reasons which induced such rule?

Mr. TREVELYAN: It is the case, Sir, that boys discharged from a reformatory are ineligible for Her Majesty's Navy. The regulation may be defended on the ground that the country has the same right as other employers to take the best class that it can obtain; that broad rules must be laid down for the guidance of the officers who recruit for our Navy, and that boys who have been sent to a reformatory are, as a class, inferior, physically and morally, to boys who have not. But, to deal frankly with the House, it has been ascertained beyond all doubt that a strong feeling on this subject exists among our seamen, among the boys on the training ships, and still more strongly among their parents. If this rule were ever relaxed, the Service would be very differently regarded among a class of families from which, by slightly shifting the standard of height, we can always get as many boys as the Navy requires.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — OFFICERS OF VOLUNTEERS.

MR. MACLIVER asked the Secretary of State for War, If the Government are disposed to appoint officers of Volunteers, otherwise qualified, as aides de camp to the Queen; and, if not, why that branch of the Service should be excluded from an honour enjoyed by officers in the Army, Militia, and Yeomanry; also, if he is disposed to recommend that officers of Volunteers who have served in the Regular and Auxiliary Forces for fifteen years may retire with the rank of their last commissions, provided that one-third of such service shall have been passed in the Volunteers; and, if not, why, under rule 17, section 9, Volunteer Regulations, 1878, an officer who has served ten years in the Army or Militia is only entitled to count half his service towards rank on retirement?

MR. CHILDERS: In reply to the two Questions of the hon. Member for Plymouth, I can only now say that in moving the Army Estimates I hope to be able to state what is proposed by Her Majesty's Government in connection with the Volunteers and their officers.

LAW AND POLICE—DETECTION OF CRIME.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Under which of the Police Acts or under what power do the Commissioners of Police claim the right which has been stated exists to combine, or to authorise their subordinates to combine, to create crime, by inducing persons to commit offences in order that they may afterwards denounce the offender without being responsible to the Law; and if the Police Acts or other Statutes permit these combinations, what limit is there to such power; whether he has any objection to say how many persons are now suffering in prison for offences created or designed by the police; and, whether any reward or advancement in rank follows a completely successful police combination ending in conviction?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, neither under the Police Acts nor under any other power do the Commissioners of Police claim the right to combine or authorise their subordinates to combine to create crime. That is my answer to the first Question. To the second Question, I answer that there are no persons suffering imprisonment for offences created or designed by the police. To the third Question, I answer that when the police combine properly and for the detection of crime they are rewarded; if they commit errors through excess of zeal they are reprimanded; if they misconduct themselves they are punished. I may be permitted to add, that if there is any special case in which the details stated are impugned I shall be always ready to answer them. I did the other day answer such a Question at, perhaps, too great a length. But I would venture to submit to the hon. Gentleman and to the House that it is not to the advantage of the public that general aspersions of this character should be cast on the whole body of the police. To do so creates a danger to the cause of peace and order in this Metropolis. These charges are, in my opinion, entirely unfounded.

ARMY—OFFICERS' UNIFORM OFF DUTY.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has any objection to state the terms of the recent General Order relative to officers wearing uniform off duty, as some misapprehension appears to exist upon the subject?

MR. CHILDERS: In reply to the noble Lord, I have to state that no General Order on officers wearing uniform has recently been issued; but a confidential letter was addressed to Generals commanding districts calling attention to Section 12, paragraph 7, Queen's Regulations, which is as follows:—

"Officers are to wear their prescribed uniform in camp and quarters while on duty; but it is left to the discretion of general officers commanding to permit the use of plain clothes for purposes of recreation. Officers will appear in full dress uniform when attending public balls or entertainments within the district in which they are quartered."

It is not usual to publish such confidential communications.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1880—LABOUR CERTIFICATES.

Mr. RANKIN asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether, under the provisions of the Elementary Education Act of 1880, children who are above the age of thirteen years but under the age of fourteen years, can obtain a certificate to enable them to go to work if they have made 250 attendances for five years in not more than two schools, even although they may not have passed the standard of proficiency laid down in the bye-laws; and, whether children above ten years of age who have passed the Third Standard may be employed as half-timers, until fourteen years of age, without further examination?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, in reply to the first Question of the hon. Member, I have to state that children above 13 years of age can obtain a labour certificate if they have made 250 attendances for five years in not more than two schools, even although they may not have passed the full-time Standard of the bye-laws of the district. In reply to the second Question, I may say that children from 10 to 13 years of age may be employed as half-timers, if they can pass the half-time Standard of their district; but that Standard varies. It is generally, however, the Third Standard. Children between 13 and 14 who have not passed the Standard of the local bye-laws must pass the Fourth Standard, or have made the 250 attendances required by the Act of 1876.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will request the Judges to favour him with written statements of their views for or against the abolition of the offices of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Chief Baron; and, whether he will lay such statements, if given, upon the Table for the information of the House before the discussion takes place on the Order in Council?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I should have been very glad to have done what the hon. Member suggests, but the Judges, 25 in number, assembled in Council under the express provisions of the Judicature Act of 1873. They discussed the expediency of the changes proposed to be made by Order in Council. Every Judge delivered separately his opinion, besides which two of the Judges, who dissented wholly or partially, stated their views in printed papers. These Papers, if the Judges do not object, will be produced; the names of the Judges who dissented from the proposal appear under their own hand in the original record of the proceedings of the Council, of which a copy will be laid before the House. Under these circumstances, the Lord Chancellor is of opinion that, the dealing with this matter in the manner prescribed by the Statute having been followed, and the whole matter having been concluded, it would not be proper to ask each of the 25 Judges to give his separate opinion.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE (SCOTLAND).

Mr. COCHRANE-PATRICK asked the Vice President of the Council, What steps have been taken, or are in contemplation, to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Scotland?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, we have taken what we hope will prove the most effective means to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease, not only in Scotland, but throughout Great Britain. The severe temporary restrictions upon the movement of cattle which came into operation yesterday, will, we trust, arrest the further progress of the disease. Up to this time there has been no case of foot-and-mouth disease in Scotland, or in any of the four northernmost English counties, and we hope the restrictions imposed in England will prove a sufficient protection in Scotland.

Mr. PELL asked whether a similar satisfactory statement could be made as to Ireland?

MR. MUNDELLA: I am happy to say there has not been a case of foot-and-mouth disease in Ireland for the last two years.

COLLECTION OF CROWN RENTS—INCOME TAX, &c. (IRELAND).

MR. TOTTENHAM asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, in accordance with his assurance to the effect that every consideration would be shown, in cases in which indulgence was proved to be necessary, to the persons liable for payment of Crown Rents and other charges, he would state what instructions had been given to the officials charged with collection of the same; and whether he would lay Copies of such instructions upon the Table of the House?

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH: Sir, as regards Crown and tithe rents and loan charges, I think the hon. Member will see that nothing beyond general instructions could be given to the collectors to show indulgence where it could be proved to be necessary. Each case will have to be considered on its merits, reference being made to the Treasury when necessary. As regards Income Tax in Schedule A on agricultural lands in Ireland, which are let to tenants, instructions have been issued that the Tax due on the 1st instant shall be taken from the landlords on the actual rents received, supplemental lists being furnished by the landlords, from time to time, of subsequent receipts on account of rent, on which the collectors will receive the duty until such time as the full charge is accounted for. As the instructions, of which I have given the purport, are not categorical, but are in the form of a correspondence with several Departments, I do not think it would be desirable to lay them on the Table.

MOTION.

—⁂—

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS—ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty have precedence of Notices of Motions this day, and of the Orders of the Day appointed for To-morrow."—(*The Marquess of Hartington.*)

MR. R. N. FOWLER, who had a Motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the financial and general Administration of India, appealed to the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India to consider the whole question, in order to see whether he could not, consistently with his duty, allow a Commitee of the House to be appointed, or accept the Motion of the hon. Member for the Haddington Burghs (Sir David Wedderburn) for the appointment of a Royal Commission. It was long since any Committee had examined into the affairs of India, and there was a strong feeling that such an examination would be a public service. He regretted his inability to bring forward his Motion, because he believed that an evening devoted to Indian debate would be of advantage at the present time; but, as regarded the decision, he did not regret it, because he felt that was in the hands of the noble Marquess rather than of the House.

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN seconded the appeal of the hon. Member for the City of London, and intimated that he was ready to accept any inquiry the noble Marquess might propose.

MR. RITCHIE intimated that at the first opportunity he would bring on the Motion standing in his name to move for Copies of the Correspondence found at Cabul between the late Ameer, Shere Ali, and the Russian authorities in Turkestan.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON expressed the hope that another day would be provided him for discussing the question of the Transvaal insurrection.

MR. MAGNIAC urged the importance of measures being taken for the prevention of floods, in accordance with his Motion.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I shall be very happy to give my most respectful attention to the appeals made to me by the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. R. N. Fowler) and my hon. Friend the Member for Haddington (Sir David Wedderburn), with regard to the subject to which they intend to invite the attention of the House this evening. I think that the most convenient plan would be that, after I have had time to consider the question, a Question should be addressed to me in this House, when I should be prepared to state as fully as possible what my view on the subject is. With regard to the appeal by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) and the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Magniac), I think I need hardly point out, in the present state of Public Business, that the great delay that has taken place in the discussion on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, and in view of the other important subjects to which the Government have to call the attention of the House as early as possible, it is not in my power, especially in the absence of the Prime Minister, to give any pledge whatever on the subject. We are well aware of the great importance of the subjects mentioned by my two hon. Friends, and I am sure the Government will be disposed to afford them every facility which may be in their power to bring forward the questions in which they are specially interested; but, till we can see our way more clearly, I do not see it would be possible for me to mention a day when it would be convenient for those questions to be considered. I need not remind the hon. Member for Bedford that the Government have themselves proposed to call the attention of the House to the question of the prevention of floods, and that we will give all reasonable facilities to the hon. Member to place his views before the House.

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [NINTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

At the end thereof, to add the words "and humbly to pray Her Majesty to refrain from using the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in enforcing ejectments for non-payment of rent in Ireland, until the measures proposed to be submitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament." —(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

The Marquess of Hartington

MR. MOLLOY expressed his surprise and regret that the Prime Minister should yesterday have thought it his duty to make a speech calculated to inflame, as it had done, the prejudices of certain hon. Members against the Representatives of Ireland, and everything connected with Irish interests. There was not a particle of foundation for the right hon. Gentleman's assertion that his hon. Friend's Amendment was an insult to Her Gracious Majesty, to the House of Commons, and to the common sense of the country; at most, it was an error in the form and wording of the Amendment. Certain powers and an organized force were at the command of the Government; and all that the Amendment asked was that the employment of this force and those powers should be suspended for a certain period in enforcing evictions, pending the discussion of the Land Measure which the Government had announced its intention of introducing. The sole object the Representatives of Ireland had in view was to serve the cause they represented, and not to promote obstruction. As if the attempt of the Prime Minister to raise prejudices against the Irish Liberal Representative Party were not sufficient, the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland and the Leader of the Opposition added their voices, boasting of their loyalty to the Sovereign in an extraordinary and uncalled for manner. Nothing could be more certain than this—that if no precaution was taken such as his hon. Friend proposed the unjust landlords of Ireland, knowing that their power was to be broken, would take advantage of the Coercion Act to clear their estates of objectionable tenants, and so render the subsequent Land Act, so far as they were concerned, a dead letter. The Amendment had his (Mr. Molloy's) approval, and he should vote for it.

MR. BLENNERHASSET said, he yielded to no one in the desire to promote the passing of those great measures of redress that were so necessary for the welfare of Ireland; but he believed he could not more effectually impede those measures than by rising to discuss them on the present Amendment. There was a deeper and graver issue before them than that involved in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford. That issue was one involving the question of their Parliamentary conduct and their relation to the Business of the House, and it was fraught with consequences which might bring disaster to Ireland. For many nights past they had been engaged in discussing the Address on the Speech from the Throne. Every question affecting Ireland mentioned in that Speech had been discussed with great—he would not say inordinate—length, and, as an Irish Member, he must acknowledge that every facility had been given to Members from Ireland for the expression of their views. This was how matters stood when the hon. Member for Longford invited them to discuss his impracticable proposal. He did not wish to bring any charge against any Members of that House; but the charge to which he was about to refer was public property. If it was unfounded, hon. Members should consider that he was doing them good service in giving them an opportunity of meeting it with a full denial. The charge in question was based upon the belief that the discussion now proceeding was not that full and fair discussion on which the theory of representative Government was based; but a discussion carried on for the purpose of retarding and delaying measures which were obnoxious to certain Members of the House, but which the House had resolved to consider. He yielded to no Member in his jealousy of coercive measures; and it was with great humiliation and sorrow that he approached the consideration of a proposal for the suspension of liberty and of the Constitution in his country. But the course which hon. Members opposite were taking was likely to prove a greater and more permanent danger to the welfare and dignity of Ireland than the step contemplated by Her Majesty's Ministers. By the proceedings of those hon. Members, the freedom of debate enjoyed by minorities was endangered, and that was a right especially valuable to a country whose Representatives must always be in a minority. He maintained that the delay of Public Business was likely to be very hurtful to a country having many grievances requiring redress; and that the conduct of some Members, if persisted in, would alienate the friends to whose support Ireland must look for the measures which her people desired to obtain. The attitude of those Members was also calculated to cause such a feeling of resentment in England as would lead to the postponement of the great reforms which Ireland needed. If hon. Members opposite had any doubt about this, let them cross the floor of the House and ask the Representatives of the great popular constituencies of England what was the state of public feeling in the country. He would have hon. Members bear in mind that the course which he had described was being pursued at a time when there was a great and earnest desire among the English people to find out the grievances from which Ireland suffered and to remedy them. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had spoken of Constitutional action. Well, no hon. Member could be permitted, under the pretext of Constitutional Parliamentary action, to use the freedom of Constitutionalism for the destruction of the Constitution. Every Assembly was supreme over its Members. Could the hon. Member doubt that the House would vindicate its claims to existence at whatever sacrifice of custom or tradition? Did the hon. Member think that the people would stand tamely by while the House of Commons, with its glorious memories, was rendered impotent and was degraded? What, he asked, must be the end of all this? What power of resistance did the hon. Member for the City of Cork rely on? That hon. Member seemed to ignore the fact that behind the majority in every Legislative Assembly lay the power of compelling and coercing the minority, and that behind the authority of Parliament lay the whole power of this great country. Unless the hon. Member was able to overthrow that power, what could he expect but defeat? There had never been a time when prudence, moderation, and good sense were more likely to lead to the passing in that House of measures of improvement for Ireland. He believed no greater disaster could happen to his country than if, through the action of its Representatives, its power was wasted and its best hopes destroyed. Yet this would, he believed, be the result of the conduct of hon. Members opposite if they persevered in it. He felt it his duty to oppose the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford, because it was the manifestation of a policy calculated to create exasperation and bitterness of feeling, to alienate Ireland's friends, and to lower the dignity of her people in the eyes of the civilized world.

MR. GRAY said, the speech of the hon. Member afforded an exemplification of the saying that if an Irishman were to be attacked there never was wanting an Irishman to do the business. He (Mr. Gray) was of opinion that the speech of the hon. Member, who was such a stickler for Order, was in its essence disorderly, as it did not refer even remotely to the Amendment before the House. He had deliberately charged Irish Members with wasting the time of the House; but there was no foundation whatever for such a charge.

MR. BLENNERHASSETT: I brought no charge against hon. Gentlemen; but I said it was a general belief.

MR. GRAY distinctly heard the hon. Member use the word "charge." The hon. Member also said that he yielded to no one in his jealousy of the introduction of coercive measures. But jealousy was a vague phrase. Sometimes it implied affection, sometimes the reverse. If the jealousy of the hon. Member meant hostility, he had taken a peculiar mode of showing it on a recent occasion, when he abstained from voting on an Amendment directly challenging the Government on the question of the proposed imposition of fetters on the Irish people. If the hon. Member had delivered the speech which the House had just heard in the county of Kerry, he would receive a very clear intimation as to whether the people of Kerry considered him a true Representative of their interests or not. He had heard his hon. Friend's speech with pain, for he well recollected that on his first election the whole force of the popular Party was exercised in his favour. Though the peasantry were driven, sometimes two days' march, surrounded by cavalry, to vote for his opponent, they, notwithstanding, at the risk of life and property, voted for the hon. Member. Mothers came out on the roadside and held up their little children to bless him. For, though he was himself a landlord and the representative of a family owning some 75,000 or 76,000 acres, he was looked upon as the advocate of the popular cause and the champion of tenant-right. He did not think the hon. Member's change of place in that House was calculated to induce others of the Irish Members to follow his example. He was quite willing to attribute to the hon. Member every desire to act conscientiously. He would ask him to give others of the Irish Party credit for like motives. He could say from personal knowledge that he and those with whom he acted had no desire to impede the course of legislation. They should, however, offer an uncompromising resistance to the coercive measures of the Government, and should go to any lengths in that opposition. They would find a precedent for that course in the action taken by the Prime Minister on the Divorce Bill, upon which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken about 90 times, with a copiousness which no one could hope to equal; and the present was an occasion when the Irish Members would be justified in following that example, and moving as many dilatory Motions as the right hon. Gentleman had done. He and his Friends were, he considered, much more intimately acquainted with the opinions and feelings of the Irish people than other Members of the House, and they more thoroughly represented the tenant farmers. The matter before the House was to them one of vital importance. They were sent there by helpless men, whose cause, in a question of life and death, they pleaded. If the hon. Member realized as keenly the feelings of the people as they did, he would pursue a different course, and would not talk so glibly of the rights of majorities. As to the Amendment before the House, which had been styled unconstitutional and disloyal, what did they ask? Simply that the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces should not be employed for the purpose of enforcing evictions. They were asked what was to become of the landlords? Did they propose to send them to the poor-house? He thought there was a misconception. They did not propose to deprive the landlords of their rights, but simply of their extraordinary remedies. They wished, in fact, to place the landlord on the same footing with other creditors. If the landlords had those extraordinary means placed at their disposal they would wreak their vengeance on their tenants. The Prime Minister had said that a sentence of eviction was equivalent to a sentence of death; and they were thus pleading on behalf of the lives of the tenant farmers of Ireland. How could they adopt any other course when, as they believed, the lives of men, women, and children depended upon the course they took? He had had no intention of speaking; but the hon. Member's speech had constrained him to do so, and when he spoke he always said exactly what he thought, though he feared it was hopeless to expect the Government to reconsider their determination. It had been said, and truly, that the present condition of things was unprecedented. It was most important to bear in mind that the present movement was a movement from below. It had been initiated independently of the Catholic clergy, and was even now, to a large extent, independent of them. In the history of Ireland no movement before had been carried on independently of the Catholic priesthood. The present agitation had even been discouraged by them; not because they sympathized with the British Government—far otherwise—but because they were ministers of peace. But if they attempted to check the movement they would be powerless; and, therefore, he warned the Government that coercive legislation would be productive of more serious and dangerous consequences now than it ever had been before, because the influences of religion would not have the same restraining power over the people. His hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been much misunderstood in his recent speech, in which he had simply repeated former declarations. He had simply said that if the present movement destroyed landlordism—which was its object—it would end in the legislative independence of Ireland. He did not mean by that statement that all connection between the two countries should be severed; but that, while making its own laws, Ireland should still be subject to the Government of the Crown.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that he is not confining his observations to the Amendment before the House; that Amendment is of a very limited scope, and relates to the employment of the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in Ireland. The hon. Member is now diverging into the general question of the legislative independence of Ireland.

MR. GRAY said, that after the remarks of the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell), he thought he might refer to the subject. He knew that a former agitation in Ireland for fixity of tenure, when it seemed likely that the Government would grant it, was broken up by the Fenian organization, because it was held by the Fenian Party that fixity of tenure would make the Irish farmers loyal. Had fixity of tenure been conceded in 1870, he ventured to say that there would not be any revolutionary propaganda in Ireland now; and if fixity of tenure were now granted, he was satisfied that in five years there would be no revolutionary propaganda, but simply a loyal movement for local self-government, which the Government might then very safely give way to.

MR. LABOUCHERE intended to trespass upon the time of the House for a few minutes only, while he explained his reason for the vote he intended to give on this occasion. He had voted in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City because he disapproved the proposal of Her Majesty's Government, in the existing state of affairs in Ireland, to make coercive measures precede any clear and distinct scheme of remedial legislation for that country. That question, however, was not then before the House, and, no doubt, there would be ample opportunity for discussing it when the Coercion Bill was brought in. With regard to the present Amendment, he could not agree with many Members on his side of the House that it showed any intention of obstruction, or that the speeches which had been made in its favour showed any obstructive spirit. He fully recognized that on a question like this, which must affect the whole future of Ireland, the subject ought to be exhaustively discussed by the Irish Members. But, though that was his opinion, still it was not his intention to vote for this Amendment. He could not understand how any English Radical Member could vote in favour of such an Amendment. His objection to the Amendment was, not that it was intended as an insult to Her Majesty, but that, according to his view, it proposed to give too great a dispensing power to the Executive. He could not help remembering that in the time of James II., that Monarch made such use of the dispensing power that the country had in the end to dispense with him. Nevertheless, he maintained that hon. Members had a perfect right to discuss this subject at length. In the present state of Ireland, it was a mere truism to say that the country was in an unsatisfactory state. But what was the practical effect of the present law? During the first half of last year the number of evictions was enormous; and while the Americans were endeavouring to feed the famishing people of Ireland, the landlords were doing their best to profit by the destitution of their tenants by driving them away from their lands. Now, evictions had decreased enormously during the last quarter of 1880. To what was that due? Did any man doubt that it was owing to the action of the Land League? He did not approve everything that had been done by the Land League, and he regretted very much the outrages that had taken place in Ireland; but he could see no proof that the hon. Member for Cork City, or the other leaders of that Association, had been in any way connected with those outrages. It had been sought to prejudice this question by spreading the belief throughout England that the Land League were responsible for the outrages that had been committed. He did not believe that they were. As far as he understood the matter, the Land League were doing their very utmost to put down these outrages; and he could not conceal from himself the danger that might arise if the Association were to be suddenly put an end to by coercive means. In that case, there would be the danger that the number of outrages would largely increase, and that open agitation would be succeeded by that curse of Ireland—secret associations. If the Land League were to be put down, there would be no hold upon the people of Ireland, who, by excited secret agitators, might take upon themselves to enforce their views by numberless outrages. It was, however, possible that if the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland were, before introducing the Coercion Bill, to bring in some measure in the nature of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, much good might result. There were in Ireland two camps—there was on the one side that of the vast majority of the Irish people, and on the other that of the landlords and of those who lived by landlordism. If before any Land Bill was brought in, and during the discussion, which must be a long one, on the Coercion Bill, the Government allowed the landlords to have at their backs the whole power of the Crown to carry out evictions, there was not the slightest doubt that they would greatly envenom the question, and envenom the feelings of Irishmen. He would make the suggestion—but he did so with very little hope that it would be listened to—that before a Coercion Bill was brought in there should, if they could not have a Land Bill, be some Bill creating a sort of truce between the opposing camps in Ireland. If it were a question of any indemnity to the landlords for what they might lose, he was certain that the people of England would willingly vote that indemnity. He hoped the Chief Secretary for Ireland would take this suggestion into his consideration; for if he did not, he (Mr. Labouchere) was certain that the policy now being pursued would perpetuate instead of putting an end to the differences existing in Ireland.

Mr. BYRNE supported the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford, which he regarded as embodying a very moderate proposal. The Government were asked, not to abolish, but merely to suspend, the system of eviction for a time. Eviction was a system not known in England. Judges of County Courts in England often suspended their judgments, and gave debtors the benefit of more time to pay their debts. His contention was, that the landlords in Ireland should be placed on the same footing with English landlords as far as eviction was concerned; for he could see no reason why a law which existed in England should be suspended in Ireland merely in the interest of the landlords. As far as the speech of the hon. Member for Kerry (Mr. Blennerhassett) was concerned, he had no doubt that the hon. Member meant as well as any other hon. Member in the House; but it was to be feared that he was influenced in his opinions by the fact that he was a landlord. He thought the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had spoken a little "off the book" in saying that the Military, Naval, and Constabulary Forces were alone available for carrying out the law. Of course, those forces were available for performing particular duties; but he failed to see the grounds on which either soldiers or sailors should be employed in executing or assisting in the execution of processes of eviction. As far as the business of the Constabulary was concerned, it was, as he understood it, to protect life and property, and in the detection of crime; but the facts showed that the Constabulary were, to all intents and purposes, soldiers, and that while they were going on with their military exercises crimes, which they ought to have detected, were committed with impunity. He would venture to suggest that the condition of the labourers of Ireland should receive the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. Ireland did not want any Coercion Bill, but a complete Land Bill, to enable her to become prosperous and happy. Her condition at the present moment was different to what it had ever hitherto been. Religious difficulties had been entirely settled, and her people had become organized and united, and were determined to have justice and fair play, which had been too long denied to them. He believed three-fourths of the people were in favour of legislation in the direction of the "Three F.'s," and all Ireland in favour of a peasant proprietary in that country.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that although he could not, in the present state of feeling in the House, vote for the Amendment, he greatly sympathized with the spirit of it. He could not vote for it, because it had been so injudiciously pressed that the course adopted delayed the introduction of the Land Bill, and permitted evictions to go on at an accelerated ratio—a state of things which tended to throw the country into revolution. He believed that there were many English Members who would gladly support Her Majesty's Government if they brought in a Bill to stop evictions until the settlement of the Land Bill. He did not refer to tenants who were able to pay and who would find it better and more convenient to pay than to be turned out; but he did refer to the vast number of poor tenants who were unable to pay. If evictions were allowed to be carried out in the case of these poor people, it would be a disgrace to the Government and the country. He earnestly wished that the Government would act on that suggestion; but, at the same time, he feared that they were so wrapped up in their own conceptions that they were perfectly impenetrable to the advice of those non-official persons who were aware of the true condition of the country. He had not the slightest sympathy with a great deal that was said by hon. Gentlemen on the other side, and who, whether intentionally or not, had done more to injure the cause of the Irish tenantry than could possibly be stated in words. He would not use the word "Obstruction" as to their conduct, because they denied that; but he thought the tactics of what was called a policy of exasperation were, of all others, the least calculated to obtain justice for Ireland. But he did not the less blame Her Majesty's Government for concealing their intentions—for not letting the Irish people know what they meant to do by their Land Bill. Having once fixed on a purpose, he supposed they imagined their credit was at stake, and they would not yield. With respect to the Amendment of his hon. Friend, an interpretation had been put upon it which it did not deserve. What he believed it meant was, that wholesale evictions should be stopped pending the consideration of the Land Bill. Was not that a reasonable thing to ask? He could not, as he had said, vote for this Amendment, because he thought it was unwise to irritate the House by the course which had been adopted. When, however, they came to consider the Coercion Bill, he would be found as strongly protesting as any hon. Member could against the application of coercion without the production of a remedial measure. Within the last three weeks the Government had been putting in force the power they already constitutionally possessed. They had awakened from a sort of lethargy, and the effect was that within three weeks the condition of the country had greatly improved. For his part, he believed that if they put into operation the powers they already possessed they might drop their Coercion Bill altogether. If they took that course, he could only say it would save hon. Members opposite from adopting a course which would not add to the reputation of the House, and might tend to exasperate the country. Instead of their Coercion Bill, why should they not at once bring in their Land Bill? If the Government, having suddenly awakened, found themselves possessed of a treasury of law by which they could restore order where there was now disorder, why should they not apply that law vigorously, and proceed with their remedial measure?

THE O'DONOGHUE said, that the Prime Minister, last night, had attributed to the supporters of the Amendment of his hon. Friend a desire to pursue a policy of Obstruction. The object they really had in view in continuing the debate was to show the House and the country that there was no necessity for a recourse to coercion. The Amendment was directed against the carrying out of evictions. Those evictions would be conducted by the magistrates, who were landlords. The stipendiary magistrates were as unreliable as the local, and, indeed, were nearly all related to, and naturally and for interest were drawn into sympathy with, the local justices. To illustrate the violence in which officials indulged, he had but to refer to the arrest of one of the officials of the Land League. Fifteen or 20 gentlemen were sitting round a table in their room, when sub-constable Knox rushed in with his sword drawn to effect the arrest. What was the meaning of such an outrage, and would it, he asked, be for a moment tolerated in this country? The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had stated that when, in 1833, Mr. O'Connell found himself obliged to move an Amendment to the Address, he did not protract the debate, and there was no unnecessary interruption of the Public Business. The insinuation, so far as the supporters of the Amendment was concerned, was obvious. He could not admit that it was well-founded. The means of action at the disposal of O'Connell were very inadequate to the object he had in view. If O'Connell enjoyed the political advantages which politicians now enjoyed, he would have left very little to be done by his hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). He might, in passing, remark that all through these debates the Solicitor General for Ireland had done everything in his power to blacken the character of his countrymen. Last night, the hon. and learned Gentleman repeated his statement that the Land League branches exercised an illegal coercive jurisdiction. They exercised no such jurisdiction. They never attempted to bring people before them; what they did was to arbitrate between parties who were willing to bring matters before them for settlement. He challenged the Solicitor General for Ireland to show that, in doing so, the Land League branches had exceeded their legal and constitutional rights. The Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford presented very important considerations for the attention of the House. The Naval and Military Forces of the Crown were public forces—the common property of the people of the Three Kingdoms. Their legitimate employment was to arrest invasion and maintain the authority of the Crown abroad. The police force was distinct in character and duty from the military; but it happened that the police force in Ireland had acquired a military organization, and therefore the Amendment protested against the constabulary being employed to make war upon the people. The dead-lock which had been brought about in Ireland had been occasioned by the refusal of Parliament to listen to the constitutional expression of the wishes of the Irish people. Parliament had disregarded their demand; and now the people of Ireland had struck against the payment of rack-rents—an event against which Her Majesty's Government had been warned by the then eloquent Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), who, he was sorry to say, was now the silent Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Speaking with a due sense of his responsibility, he (The O'Donoghue) called upon his countrymen to resist the attempt to extort rack-rents from them; not to be moved by the menaces of those who threatened to draw the sword on them, to be of good heart in the conflict, and to enter upon it trusting in the justice of their cause. They all knew that in France and America the public forces were employed to maintain order, but they were wielded by the representatives of the nation for the benefit of the nation; while in Ireland they were used by the representatives of a class for the benefit of a class, to enable them to carry out their selfish designs, and, in many cases, to plunder the people. He protested against the prostitution of the public force in order to carry out the will of a selfish oligarchy. It had been suggested by hon. Members that Ireland should wait and see what the effect of the proposed remedial measures would be. If the Government had announced their intention to suspend evictions, they might have waited; but the Government appeared only anxious to place additional force at the disposal of the exterminator. The hon. Member for the City of Cork moved an Amendment against the principle of coercion; and little faith could be placed in the sincerity of the man who, having voted for that Amendment, was still prepared to leave the means of exterminating the people in the hands of the Irish landlords. Dreadful as the consequences might be, they felt they had a duty to discharge to the honour as well as to the interests of Ireland, which were at stake, and they would urge the people by every means in their power to resist the extortion of rack-rent.

MR. MARUM: I deny that the Irish Members are chargeable with Obstruction in supporting this Amendment. It is the right of all the constituencies to state their views to the Government before they take a step which cannot be retraced. At the same time, I feel that in doing so, especially after the speech of the Prime Minister, they subjected themselves to a great amount of prejudice and interruption. The question before the House comes to this—the relations between landlord and tenant are such that the Government ought by every means to discourage evictions; whereas, if this Amendment be rejected, the necessary result will be to encourage them. If the powers of eviction are suspended, the landlord will still have four distinct and separate remedies. He will be able to eject on title, and by that process the tenant will be entitled to claim for disturbance and for improvements. Then there is an action for debt. The third remedy will be by distress for one year's rent; and, fourthly, the landlord can serve on the tenant a summons in bankruptcy, which is largely resorted to in Ireland. I feel bound to say that a large portion of the time—styled by the Premier "precious"—of the House has been, I will not say wasted, but certainly consumed by the Members sitting on the Treasury Bench and on the first Opposition Bench, in adroit attack and defence of their respective policies during their respective Governments of Ireland. A deal of special pleading was exhausted, and, no doubt, considerable ability displayed. But it struck me that the real merits of Ireland were lost sight of in these discussions. What matters it to Ireland which of the two great English political Parties may be in fault or in default? We—Irishmen—look to Parliament for legislation, and it suffices to say that we have not got what is required, as is proven on the admission of the present Administration now framing Radical Land Reform, and admitting the present necessity for other vital measures of Reform. What is Ireland's case? Ireland is almost purely an agricultural country—except in the North there are no manufactures. What is the condition of home agriculture? Without going into detail I may refer hon. Members to the Report of Messrs. Pell and Read, which has appeared some months ago, as to the condition and prospects of home agriculturists. Nay, farther, refer them to the Report of Mr. Griffin, Secretary of the Board of Trade, wherein is set forth the fact that in England, in 1880, some 812,000 acres of land were in fallow—fallow he adds by courtesy, for these lands were full of weeds and dirt, in fact, neglected and out of cultivation, and there was a steady diminution of stock, especially of sheep, in England. But without appealing to statistics in detail I need only appeal to the personal experience of hon. Members of the House—landlords throughout England and Scotland—to testify to the great agricultural depression existing, and to the allowances or reductions in rental they are obliged to submit to. If, then, this be so in a rich commercial country with large centres of population, extending a sort of town park value to holdings, what must the condition be of a purely agricultural community under the same conditions of agricultural depression without any commercial adjunct to assist the population? I will just glance at the position of landlord and tenant in Ireland, and touch lightly on the history of rental. In the commencement of this century, or rather towards the end of the last, it was stated by Mr. Flood, in the Irish House of Commons, that the rental of Ireland was only about £4,000,000 sterling including non-agricultural lettings. During the Peninsular War the rental was pushed up apace with war price of products, or rather in advance of them, to some £9,000,000 sterling, which was about the figure in 1814 and 1815. Then, upon the Peace Proclamation a panic similar to the present occurred—contracts could not be fulfilled, and general agricultural distress supervened. What was the remedy proposed and enacted? We all know it was Protectionism; and under protective duties upon farm produce, rental was sustained and bolstered up until 1846, when cheap and abundant labour, and a large population, with competitive letting of land, further enhanced rental. Well, the Famine period brought Free Trade legislation, and yet no compensation or equivalent was afforded to the tenantry for the vital interference of Free Trade principles with contracts based upon Protectionism. From that period to the present the gradual development of the principles of Free Trade took place. A few years ago we experienced the sharp action of foreign competition as to cereal crops; but still, stall-feeding enabled the tenants to meet rental by the high price of ordinary meats. But within the last two or three years the development of the import of live stock, and of meat preservation processes, has struck away the last plank of the tenant farmers, and they are met by universal Free Trade action. And all this time, rental—which in 1846 touched £12,000,000 sterling—was further pushed up to £15,000,000 sterling in 1880. This is the short history of rental in Ireland *in globo*. Let us just glance now at the present position of the tenant farmer interest under these repeated raisings of rental. Rental is portion of the margin between the cost of production and the price of produce. The cost of production has risen since 1846 between 100 and 200 per cent in reference to manual labour alone. Well, then, as to the price of produce. First take cereal produce. Wheat is now worth about 40*s*. per bushel, ordinary home grown, and this will not pay. When railway and steamboat transit is fully developed—in five or six years hence—home wheat will not fetch 15*s*. per barrel of 20 stones. Well, wheat has gone out of cultivation, and barley is the staple crop now of tillage farming in Ireland. Well, barley is at present unsaleable, and the price is 5*s*. per barrel of 16 stones less than in 1879—that is, 30 per cent less. As to produce, I am in a position to say that in quality and quantity the crop is worse in many districts than in 1879, and there are 37,000 acres of barley less in Ireland in 1880 than in 1879. The proof of the depression lies in the fact that within the last 30 years Ireland has 1,250,000 acres less of cereal crops, all that area of the surface having gone into pasturage. With this lesser of scientific husbandry, have cattle and sheep increased? On the contrary, I find a steady and enormous diminution this year of all the lower animals. It appears by the official statistics of 1880 that there has been during the last 12 months a diminution of sheep of nearly 500,000, in cattle a diminution of 146,000, of which 67,000 were milch cattle; in pigs a diminution of little less than 500,000 in two years. Upon the entire of the official Return appears the fact that there is a diminution on every single item of the lower animals, including poultry, to the extent of 1,250,000 head of animals. Such, then, is the position of the tenant farmers of Ireland. The stock diminished to a startling amount, showing the loss of capital, and lower prices for their grain, with indifferent quality, and, save with oats and potatoes, a lesser quantity. On the other hand, we have an enormous rental, forced up for years past to the figure of £15,000,000 sterling. Then we have the sharp universal foreign competition from favoured climates, and produced by foreign farmers paying no rents and little taxation. The country, then, is over-rented, not merely by landlords locally and partially, but generally and universally by the foreign meat and cereal competition. I regret to be obliged to say that the land classes in Ireland are heavily indebted under all the circumstances. The landlords are heavily encumbered—many of them to the extent of 75 per cent of their incomes—they are but nominally owners, and are not in a position to make substantial reductions in rental equal to the exigency of the case of the tenant farmer interest. The indebtedness of the landlords is only exceeded by that of the tenantry. The tenants are indebted to the landlords for the past three years, during failure of crops and low prices of produce; arrears are outstanding, and landlords have, in many instances, discounted the tenants' bills, which are now being renewed in the banks. Secondly, the tenants are indebted to the shopkeepers for food, groceries, clothing, &c., and manures, and the local traders have been obliged to discount their bills to meet the demands of the wholesale merchants; and, thirdly, the tenants for their own working capital have been obliged to raise amongst themselves funds upon bills, making often three sets of bills, running and renewing all the time, at the expense of the tenant farmer. Of course, it is impossible for farmers so circumstanced to meet their engagements. The situation, then, was this—landlords were indebted to the necks, and tenants were likewise hopelessly involved, that not one bad season could have a feather weight to lighten. It would take years of goods harvests and of good seasons to extricate them. The tenants had their Land League as well as the landlords—there was a struggle for existence now going on—there was social war, civil revolution. There were outrages, no doubt, which all men deplored; but the grand and real outrage was the non-payment of £15,000,000 of rental—the non-payment of rental that in many cases was impossible of realization, and in all cases involves the absorption of tenant interests and property. If this rental of £15,000,000 could be paid, and were paid, the outrages would be all condoned, and we would hear nothing about it. There was not the slightest notion of any insurrection or rising of the people against the Queen's Government in Ireland—it was a myth and a delusion. It was encouraged or bruited about merely to give colour to the drafting of troops over to Ireland, and to cover the true and real design which was to employ the military forces, the naval ones, and the police as special bailiffs and rent-warners to collect exorbitant rentals. Would coercion or ejectments raise the produce or lessen the cost of production? Certainly not; and it was not sought to employ 12,000 Constabulary, 28,000 military, and, I suppose, a large naval squadron on the sea coasts, to collect the £15,000,000 rental arrears besides. It was alleged that there was a "reign of terror for landlords;" but Government sought to establish by coercion a "reign of terror for tenants." "Rent, or your liberty," was the motto of Government. We have tenure in villeinage in Ireland in 1881. Your own history can tell you of the results of tenure or villeinage in England centuries ago, and how outrages prevailed, and how they were put down. It was first tried to do so by coercion, but it failed; and then came the real remedy. What was the condition of England centuries ago, when its surface was in an aboriginal condition unsurpassed, like that of Ireland of to-day? [The hon. and learned Member then read from Macaulay's *History* the striking description of the relative position of the Saxons and Normans after the Conquest, and the gradual fusion of the two races and languages, and proceeded]: The animosity of race existed between Norman and Saxon greater than at present in Ireland between Celt and Saxon, or Catholic and Orangemen. "Do just take me for an Englishman," was a common expression of a Norman gentleman. "I am not an Englishman," was an ordinary remark, for a couple of centuries. The descendant of that Norman was proud of the English name, and justly so. What brought about this beneficent change? History tells us that it was copyholdism that enfranchised the ancient British tenantry. What was copyholdism? It was fixity of tenure and fixity of rent, and it was under such occupying proprietorship that the face of England was changed from its rude aspect to its present smiling landscape. If their ancient feudalism had its privileges, so had the British tenantry their compensatory equivalents—namely, copyhold tenure. It is no answer to say that such tenure no longer exists, because it has been enfranchised and purchased up. Pass Ireland through the phase of copyholdism likewise. Why should Irish tenantry not get the benefit of the British institution of copyhold? No trace of it is to be found save in the Ulster custom. Lord Devon, in his Report, called it an "embryo" copyhold, and he recommended that it should be stifled in its birth. Continental history tells the same tale—namely, the magic results of occupying ownership; no other incentive will be sufficient to stimulate such radical improvement and reclamation of the exigencies of foreign competition, make double produce if not double price. All I ask is that the same thing should be done for Ireland. The hon. Member was proceeding to discuss the system of land tenure in other countries, when——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has been for some time discussing the Irish Land Bill, and he is now approaching the discussion of the Continental land system. I am bound to point out to the hon. Member that these matters have no reference to the Amendment now before the House, and I must call upon him to address himself to the Amendment.

Mr. MARUM: I bow to the ruling of the Chair; and I will proceed at once to another branch of the subject. A demand for the legislation which I desire in Ireland has been made 50 years ago by the Irish people. I will not, however, go further back than the Land Act of 1870.

Sir HENRY TYLER: I rise to Order. I appeal to you, Sir, whether the hon. Member is obeying the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is certainly not addressing himself to the Question before the House. The hon. Member for Longford has moved an Amendment to the Address, and the hon. Member must address himself to that Amendment.

Mr. MARUM: I will bow, of course, to the decision of the Speaker; but I am just coming to the Amendment, which lays down the principle that ejectments for non-payment of rent should not be encouraged. Now, may I ask, are the people making demand for radical Land Reform? An English lawyer has just published a bulky pamphlet, filled with the edicts, suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and penal enactments of the last 50 years, which ought to bring a blush of shame to the cheek of any English statesman. For the past 50 years the Irish people had been making demands for Land Reform year after year, in season and out of season, until their hearts had grown sick with hope deferred. In 1870 I myself was one of a deputation sent over on behalf of Ireland to remonstrate against the inadequacy of the Land Bill —now Land Act. At our interview, as spokesman for Leinster, I pointed out to the then and now Premier how any measure of a merely penalizing character, and not touching tenure or preventing eviction, could never meet the requirements of the then situation. I pointed out how competitive lettings of land and rack-renting would still be enabled to flourish whilst the peasantry decayed. Who was right events quickly developed. The Duke of Leinster led the assault, and others followed. In 1871 landlords doubled, trebled, and quadrupled Griffiths' valuation as rental over unfortunate tenants, and it was at once exhibited unmistakeably that the Land Act was inoperative to prevent rack-renting. Tenant Defence Associations sprung up all over the country. National Conferences were held, and Irish M.P.'s brought in Land Bills to Parliament. In 1874, Mr. Butt, as Leader, introduced a Land Bill, and brought the state of the tenantry before Parliament. In the following years—1875-6-7-8-9—Bills were also introduced, and the position of tenantry brought forward with great ability by the Irish Party; and the demands of the tenantry were forwarded in detail in Mr. Butt's Land Bill. But it was all to no purpose; not only were the Bills rejected by enormous majorities on each occasion, but even inquiry by Select Committee or by Royal Commission was refused. After the late General Election and change in Government, the present Ministry brought in and passed through the House of Commons the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. Government declared this Bill to be imperatively necessary for the protection of the scheduled districts of Ireland. Yet when it was thrown out of the Lords the responsible Ministry let six months pass by without the least effort to protect or sustain the tenantry of these districts. The people were abandoned by the responsible Government of the day to their fate, and they are censured for endeavouring to protect and sustain themselves by a legitimate organization. The people had for years made legitimate demands—what it is now admitted were *bonâ fide* by the Government gang—to legislate in the direction demanded. After seven or eight years of demand, we are now to have hurried legislation for coercion, and no time for Land Tenure Reform. Ten years ago the present Premier was fully aware of the Irish problem, as it is termed. He has had nine or ten months of Office to prepare a measure, and yet he has no Land Bill; but a Coercion Bill or Bills are ready cut and dry. I tell the right hon. Gentleman that if he seeks to ignore the Land Question now, and only apply coercion, he will plunge Ireland into a state of anarchy, of despair—nay, desperation. The feudal element of the Empire has, alas, been too strong for the cause of justice, and the Irish people are again to be sacrificed as of old. But Government has not done with us yet; and if they seek to suspend the Constitution let them commence with Parliament before the ages of the civilized world.

MR. O'DONNELL, on rising to support the Amendment, said, he felt bound to enter his protest against the curious misconception of the Prime Minister with regard to its purpose. The right hon. Gentleman denounced that Amendment as being almost an insult to the Crown and the common sense of the House of Commons. There was no insult whatever either to the Crown or to the right hon. Gentleman himself in proposing that the laws ordaining evictions in Ireland should remain suspended under present circumstances, and pending the time necessary for the passing of a remedial measure. The power of eviction for the non-payment of unjust rents stood justly condemned in that House; and all that his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) did in asking that, during a limited period, the Queen should direct the exercise of force and military power to be placed at the disposal of rack-renting landlords for the purpose of facilitating evictions to be suspended while the Legislature was engaged in the consideration of the best mode of improving the Irish land tenure system, was justified by the fact that Resolutions quite as absurd had ere now been submitted to the House by the Leaders of the Liberal Party. His hon. Friend was also justified by the course taken by the present occupant of the Office of Home Secretary with regard to the punishment of juvenile offenders. That right hon. and learned Gentleman had issued a Circular to all the magistrates in the Kingdom, telling them not to execute the existing law by which juvenile offenders could be sentenced to the demoralizing associations of an ordinary gaol. His hon. Friend the Member for Longford, being able to quote opinions expressed by Members of Her Majesty's Government, that the land system of Ireland stood foredoomed, asked Her Majesty's Government and the House of Commons to declare that the existing evil law of land tenure and eviction in Ireland should stand as practically obsolete until the introduction of a better system; and, forsooth, a Colleague of the Home Secretary, a Colleague who approved the conduct of the Home Secretary, denounced his hon. Friend as offering an insult to the Crown. That was an instance of the gross injustice and scandalous unfairness with which the action of the Irish Party was being treated by Members of that Liberal Party who were the advocates, not only of reform, but also of rebellion in almost every country in the world. He (Mr. O'Donnell) was painfully moved and shocked by the statement of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government yesterday, when he endeavoured to prevent Irish Members from urging the claims of their constituents, by informing them that they were speaking to no purpose, and that they knew they were speaking to no purpose. Until the hope of reconciliation with England was at an end, he was prepared to incur odium among devoted friends of Ireland in his endeavour to persuade the Irish people that their welfare, their future prosperity, their legitimate independence could be fully reconciled with connection with Great Britain, and with co-citizenship with the other members of the Anglo-Irish Empire. He spoke, therefore, on the present occasion, as one sincerely desirous of seeing, even so late, the foundations laid of a permanent reconciliation between the much-injured, the long oppressed, and the cruelly-deceived people of Ireland and the Government of this country. The Government proposed to enforce the ordinary law which they themselves declared was unworthy of being maintained. The Government proposed to lay no obstacle in the way of eviction even at this crisis. He ventured to say to the Members of the Liberal Party that never did a sense of discipline in any Parliamentary Party run the risk of betraying a Party into such deplorable error as would a blind obedience to the policy of enforcing the ordinary existing law in Ireland prior to the introduction of any remedial measures. It was the unanimous opinion of the Irish Party, not only of what might be called the extreme section of the Irish Party which rallied under the Leadership of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), but also of the Irish Liberal Members who sat on the Ministerial side of the House, and who were supporters of Her Majesty's Government—it was the opinion of such non-Home Rule Liberals as the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell), that if you insisted upon the enforcement of the ordinary law, if you insisted on placing at the disposal of the landlords of Ireland the military and police force in Ireland for the purpose of enabling them to use their last opportunity of clearing away tenants, the result would be dismal and disastrous to Ireland in the first place, and finally to England. He (Mr. O'Donnell) was no admirer of the Land Act of 1870, and he fully recognized the objections which were taken by Sir John Gray, in that year, to the provisions of the Act. He was satisfied that the Prime Minister was honest in his desire to put an end to the present land system in Ireland; but he was entrammelled by a House of Commons which sympathized with the landlords. The right hon. Gentleman had disregarded the warnings of that day, which were insisted upon by Irish Members; but 11 years after, that was to say, last year, when the crisis in Ireland was not so acute, the Government recognized that that Act was a failure, and that there was the greatest danger that the landowners would make an unfair use of their power under the ordinary law, and on that ground it pressed the Compensation for Disturbance Bill on Parliament. Now, whatever might have been the need last year for protecting the Irish tenantry, it was infinitely greater this year. Last year the head of the Government calculated that some 15,000 evictions might probably be the result of the unscrupulous use of their power by the Irish landlords. If, last year, 15,000 tenants were in debt to the rack-renting landlords, he believed that there were now about 200,000 agricultural families in Ireland incapable of paying their technically lawful, but not morally lawful, debts to the landlords. They had heard much of the magnificent harvest of last year; but if it had been much more magnificent than it was, it would not have filled up the deficit in the coffers of the Irish tenants produced by so many decades of rack-renting and so many seasons of agricultural failure. Under the ordinary law, there was nothing to prevent landlords from turning out those families on the bleak roadside in the mountainous districts of Ireland, even on a night of sleet and snow and cutting wind such as brought the sense of misery home to the richest and most comfortable families in London. The Government was not only renegade to all the principles of Liberalism, but it was going to carry out the execution of that impossible, detestable, and inhuman law, which had never been condemned on an Irish platform more vehemently than it had been condemned by the leading orators of the Liberal Party. But, supposing the Government carried their Coercion Acts, it should be remembered that the landlords, never in a very amiable mood towards the tenants, were not exceptionally so disposed towards them at present. A powerful section of the Irish landlords had proved itself unworthy of confidence; but still he (Mr. O'Donnell) did not lay all the blame for their inhumanity on that class alone. Even such a bitter enemy of the Irish race as Mr. Froude had declared that the action of the Union had taken away from the landlords every incentive to fair dealing with their countrymen, and placed before them no higher object than passing a luxurious existence in London, at the cost of a fearful amount of cruelty and of eviction to their despised tenantry. He (Mr. O'Donnell) did not deny that many of the landlords themselves had been sorely pinched by the present revolt of the tenantry, and reduced to the very door of starvation by that land system of which they were such active agents. But the English Government had taken from the Irish landlord every reason for acting as a patriot and as a man. It should not be forgotten that the tenants had been reduced to a state of misery over and over again; and he feared that too many of that privileged class might be expected to carry out their legal powers to the utmost extremity during the next three months, while Parliament might be engaged in considering a new Land Bill. If the Government had brought forward a Resolution binding the House to proceed at once to the question of remedial measures for Ireland from day to day, such an announcement would at once have paralyzed the Land League. But, notwithstanding their declaration that "Force is no remedy," they, on the contrary, addressed the landlords in the clearest terms, to the effect that they were about to give them one last chance of wreaking their vengeance upon their revolted serfs who had bearded them on the high road. They determined to proceed with coercion, and deliberately proposed to increase all the facilities at their command for the purpose of enabling the desperate landlords of Ireland to make a final clearance of those tenants whom, after the passing of the Land Bill, they would not be able to remove from the soil. The Government offered this temptation to the Irish landlords, and the gigantic clearance which would result might exceed even those of the famine years. But did the Government affect to misunderstand what would be the reply of the people? Did they not understand that their action would justify the Irish peasants in dying scythe and pike and blunderbuss in hand behind the cabin which was to be levelled by the crowbar over their heads, rather than go out to starve on the roadside in inclement weather, without hope from a Liberal Ministry. If assassination and murder were committed in Ireland, if there were to be a hundred Ballycoheys, if landlordism in its expiring moments were with its dying breath to avenge itself on the serfs who were about to become freemen, the responsibility of all these outrages would be on the head of a renegade Liberalism. Her Majesty's Government offered temptations to the Irish landlord to pick the pockets of the Irish tenantry; and if they were not responsible for the consequences under the tribunals of the unreformed law, they would be responsible under the tribunals of a reformed law, and before the universal conscience of humanity. The right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devonshire (Sir Stafford Northcote) last night taunted the hon. Member for the City of Cork with speaking as the Representative of a power in opposition to the Crown. The hon. Member for Cork was, indeed, the Representative of a power—a mighty power in Ireland. He was president of 15,000 men, amongst the most quick-witted and courageous in the world, who were ever placed in opposition to any Government; but, in mentioning such a power as being in opposition to the power of the Crown, the right hon. Gentleman was guilty of the most unjustifiable infraction not only of the courtesies, but the duties of Parliamentary debate. The object appeared to be to attach a taint of treason to the Constitutional action of the Irish Members. The hon. Member for the City of Cork represented a power only in the morning of its growth. The Irish nation was a power. But it was a power which would not readily offer opposition to the Crown, unless the Ministers of the Crown proved traitors to the Sovereign by not doing justice to a people who were ready to be reconciled. Nothing could be more odious than the attempts which had been made to widen the situation. The Irish people were anxious to conduct their agitation within Constitutional limits; they were anxious to leave out of the question, and to treat with becoming deference, the whole considerations which might attach to the relations between the Sovereign of Great Britain and the Sovereign of Ireland. The Constitutional position of the Home Rule Party was that the Queen of Great Britain was also Queen of Ireland—that was the tradition on which they acted, and which they had received from their forefathers, from the greatest statesmen and lawyers of either Kingdom. But because they were seeking to redress the evils of the people, and went so far as to say that the Queen of Great Britain should reign also as Queen of Ireland, and not act merely through her Ministers as mouthpieces, an English statesman, even far inferior to the present Prime Minister, ill-discharged his duty to the Constitution when he endeavoured to persuade the Irish people that the Irish statesman who came forward with large demands for Irish reform was, in virtue of his character as a Reformer, a power acting in opposition to the Crown. The Irish Members were a power in opposition to the Conservative Party—in opposition, it might be, to the Liberal Party. But neither Conservatives nor Liberals ought rashly to bring the name of the Sovereign into Party contentions or disputes. He believed that the debate was to conclude that evening; and though he did not expect any formal apology for the misrepresentations which had been showered upon the Representatives of Ireland, still he hoped that even yet it might be acknowledged that they had laboriously endeavoured to place the Irish case from the Irish standpoint before the British Members of the House of Commons, and that the few remaining hours of that debate might not be used to envenom disputes. The Irish Members were prepared for anything that might happen, though the axe might await them in the Lobby. They would not shrink. Hon. Members must be very ignorant of Irish history if they imagined that the English axe had ever proved an obstacle to the Irish nation. The failure of the English Government to crush Irish patriotism had proved that their axe and gibbet and their scourge had totally failed to break the spirit or quell the resolution of the ancient people of Ireland; but though, as he had said, the axe were waiting for Irish Members in the Lobby they would not shrink from their duty; and Her Majesty's Government knew right well that there was no axe in store for the Representatives of the Irish people. No English Government dared to harm a hair of their heads. Any measure of coercion that they might apply to the Representatives of the Irish nation would but make their power ten-fold greater; and from the prison in the Clock Tower, or from a prison in the Tower itself, although they were compelled in idle ostentation to mount the steps of the Traitor's Gate, the power of the Irish Representatives would be irresistible; their voice would be able to pass across the grates and bars to the Irish nation, in every clime, on both sides of the Atlantic—from the great cities of England to the great cities of America, and far into the hearts of the Colonies in the Pacific Ocean. He still hoped at the last moment that the Government would think over once, twice—nay, thrice—before they carried out the menaces and threats which had been showered not only upon Irish Representatives, but also upon the Irish people. He would conclude with a story which he had recently heard from an Irish tenant farmer, who had said that if his landlord evicted him and he submitted, he had nothing to do but starve; ruin and death were inevitable; but if he resisted, all that could happen to him would be that he would be thrown into prison, where the Government would, at least, be bound to give him food and shelter. He hoped the Government would not push the Irish tenantry to such an extreme that it would be their interest to follow such an example in breaking the law.

Mr. LEAMY expressed his fears not only that the rejection of his hon. Friend's (Mr. Justin M'Carthy's) Amendment would lead to a great clearance of tenants, but that there would be a terrible resistance to eviction on the part of the Irish peasantry. The Amendment did not propose to interfere with the landlords' rights to procure their rents; its object was simply to provide that during a short time, pending the passing of the Land Bill, which would wholly or partially do away with their power, they should not be able to use the forces of the Queen in order to carry out their evictions. It was most desirable that some measure should be brought in to deal remedially with Ireland; but there appeared to be some opinion connected with Dublin Castle that a little more blood-letting was necessary. Hopes had been held out to the people of speedy relief from the oppression of landlordism; and, by the encouragement they had given to those hopes, the Members of the Government were equally responsible with the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) for the present land agitation. He held that the Government would be perfectly justified in declining to assist in the perpetuation of a wrong for which they were preparing a remedy, especially as it was only too certain that while the landlords in Ireland were clearing out their tenants so that the Land Bill when it came should not affect them, the landlords in Parliament would be delaying that measure by every means in their power. The Government, by their own confession, had 26,000 troops in Ireland, which, with the 12,000 Constabulary, made an army of 38,000 men. Why was such an enormous force required in Ireland, where no one could pretend that any symptoms of an armed rebellion existed? It was to uphold not, he contended, the Queen's Government, for that had never been exercised in that country, but the most selfish, cruel, and rapacious oligarchy which had ever imposed its yoke on the neck of a people. In the struggle which was being carried on the Irish Members and the Irish nation were fighting the battle which had been fought in nearly every European country; they were fighting the battle of an oppressed people against their oppressors; and in spite of the powerful army which the Government maintained in Ireland, in spite of coercion, and in spite of the coalition of Liberals and Conservatives in that House against them, he was confident that the cause of the people would triumph.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY contended that the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) was nothing more than a modified form of the Eviction Bill which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland introduced last year. The main ground on which it was to be defended was that, the moment a Coercion Bill was passed, the landlords would avail themselves to the utmost of their powers of eviction before the Land Bill was passed. In 1869 they did so when the Land Bill of 1870 was looming in the distance. The landlords were now threatened with reforms of a larger character than were suggested in prospect of the Act of 1870; and it was, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the landlords would follow the same course they followed 10 years ago. Until this agitation sprang up in Ireland the evictions used to be carried out in a wholesale manner, but since then they had considerably decreased in number; and the Motion of his hon. Friend, following the principle of the Compensation Act of last Session, merely asked that they should be restrained pending the settlement of the Land Bill promised by Government. His object was not that the rights of the landlords should go entirely unprotected by the law; it only meant that Parliament should express its opinion that they ought to be slow to avail themselves of their full rights. He knew it was unconstitutional in its form; but whatever might be the little technical error which rendered it such might easily be amended. It was objected to this view that the Crown had a right to grant, and ought not to withhold, the assistance of force in order to compel the rights of subjects; but the student of history must know that in the reign of Charles I. the House of Commons resisted this right in order to prevent the Army being used unfairly. It was clear that, so far as the intentions of Her Majesty's Government could be ascertained, their coming proposals must have the effect of abrogating more or less the power of the Irish landlords; and he would ask whether it was reasonable that the landlords should be entitled to exercise, to the fullest extent, their rights of eviction during the intermediate period with the assistance of the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces. He hoped the speeches of the hon. Members for Sligo and Cork would make it perfectly safe for the Government to lay down, as a general rule, that the Constabulary and the police need not be used on the occasion of evictions. If he believed that the officers of the law would be beaten and murdered in the execution of the law he would not support the Amendment. As he understood the movement, they did not rely on violence, but on the united opinion of the entire people. He felt intense pain, as did his hon. Friends, that a great and good cause should be marred by violence of speech or act. The Report which was about to be issued by the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, but which was not yet published, rejected the idea of fixity of tenure, but admitted that the rents were high, that a revision for the purpose of reducing them was necessary, and that provision should be mede against their being raised in future. He believed that if the Government would accept the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford, and thus give expression to English public opinion against any undue exercise of the right of eviction, the public opinion of Ireland would cooperate with them; and it would be possible, laying down as a general rule that as long as violence was not used to the officers of the law, and armed force would not be brought in to terrify the people into submission, to carry out the processes of the law without any fear of violence. By resorting to unnecessary force, the Government were playing into the hands of the extreme Party, and they were silencing the mouths of those—not an increasing number—who still hoped against hope that it was possible for Ireland to be happy under the Crown of England. They were playing into the hands of men who wanted to keep Ireland in a perpetual state of turmoil, and who wanted to obtain separation from England. Even concessions of Land Reform would not stop the present agitation, and he should be sorry if they did, because experience had shown that it was only by agitation that other reforms could be obtained. It was only when the landlords saw their rents endangered by the continuance of the agitation that the present remote prospect of Land Law Reform came into view. Before it was undertaken they saw the proposals for remedy in the present state of affairs contemptuously rejected without discussion by both Liberals and Conservatives. It was the duty of every Irish Member to take part in and sustain this agitation, at the same time doing all he could to restrain its abuses. The farmers of Limerick formed a phalanx which coercion would not break down. There was no word, act, expression, or placard which could be alleged against any farmer or body of farmers in his constituency which violated either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution. If the agitation were maintained in the spirit he advocated it must ultimately triumph. He believed it possible to accept the Amendment without danger and without fear of violence; and, therefore, he gave it his hearty support.

Mr. ERRINGTON said, he did not rise with any intention of prolonging this debate by entering into the main question before the House; but a statement had been made which ought not to pass unnoticed. In the course of his speech, introducing this Amendment to the House, his hon. Friend (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) alluded to the employment of the military and police in serving notices to quit at Drumlish, by a most respected Nobleman in the County Longford, Lord Granard, in terms that were not perfectly fair and proper. Lord Granard's name having been mentioned in connection with what was, undoubtedly, an unfortunate circumstance, it was only fair that one, at least, of those who knew him well should openly bear testimony to the fact that there was not a landlord in Ireland more deservedly beloved and respected than Lord Granard. He (Mr. Errington) had known him in his various capacities, as a resident landowner devoted to his property and tenantry, as a magistrate, as a Chairman of Poor Law Boards; and his duty in these various capacities had always been done in a way to win the respect and affection of his neighbours. During the last two years his devotion had been unremitting, and, at a considerable sacrifice of means and an entire sacrifice of time, to promote measures both public and private, for relief rendered necessary by the distress. It would be a slur on the people to say that the relations of the tenantry with Lord Granard were not as they always had been, of the most grateful and friendly description. There was another point also of a satisfactory nature to which he wished to allude. He meant the conduct on the occasion in question of a priest who was present. He believed it was due mainly to the Christian and manly behaviour of the parish priest under difficult and dangerous circumstances, amid the great excitement that prevailed on the occasion, that, if not bloodshed, at all events serious disturbance, was avoided. His name should be mentioned here. It was the Rev. Father Conefrey, P.P. of Drumlish. The House would agree that his conduct was that at once of a good priest and a brave man. As to the connection of this episode with the main question, the House would hardly consider the fact that even so kind and indulgent a landlord as Lord Granard was reluctantly compelled to invoke civil and military aid to preserve order was hardly a logical reason for suspending the employment of such forces throughout the country. With respect to the observation of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), that the land movement had passed beyond the Catholic clergy, he would only point out that it was supported by them while it was maintained within perfectly just limits; but it had now passed beyond that point. ["No, no!"] Whatever the result might be, of this he was confident —that in the future they would show themselves, as they always had in the past, ministers of peace, opposing any movement, however popular, as soon as it went beyond the strict limits of justice, of religion, and of honour. The power of the clergy might not be so great as it was in times past; but it would not pass away entirely so long as it was exercised in the best interests of the people, and in the maintenance of order and tranquillity.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he might save time by announcing a determination to which he had come with the object of meeting the views of some of his hon. Friends. Certain objections had been taken to the form of the Amendment which had not occurred to himself, and about which, if it were convenient, he should still be disposed to argue. It had been said that the Amendment pointed to something like unconstitutional action, or to what had been called a dispensing power to be intrusted to the Government. No such purpose was in his mind in framing the Amendment. But some of his hon. Friends were under the impression that the object they wished to attain could be better brought before the House if the form of the Amendment were to be changed; and he, therefore, wished to ask permission to withdraw the Amendment in its present form. If any hon. Member chose to put the matter in a better form, he should be happy to give that hon. Member his support. With regard to the observations of his hon. Colleague (Mr. Errington), he (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) had said nothing of Lord Granard inconsistent with what he believed everyone who knew him would be willing to endorse. He asked permission to withdraw the Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it your pleasure that the Amendment be withdrawn?

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: I wish to ask a question, Sir, upon a point of Order. If the Amendment is withdrawn, will it be in order to introduce a modified Amendment in the same spirit before the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) is submitted to the House?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I understand that the Motion before the House is that the Amendment be withdrawn. I hardly think the House will consent to that course. The Amendment has now been debated for two nights, and it is only at the last moment that the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) allows that he has heard very few arguments in support of it. [*Cries of* "No!"]

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY: I never said anything of the kind. I only withdraw the Amendment in deference to the opinion of some of my hon. Friends.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: That really comes to the same thing. The hon. Member admits that the arguments against the Amendment are so strong that it has been misapprehended, and that he is obliged to withdraw it. He tells us that, to a certain extent, it is disavowed by hon. Members who act with him. Nevertheless, it has been debated for two days, and it is only at the last moment that the hon. Member wishes to retreat from his position. I think that the House ought really to come to a decision with regard to it.

MR. PARNELL: The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland has entirely misinterpreted the words of my hon. Friend. My hon. Friend does not, in the slightest degree, desire to retreat from his position; but he has merely said that some of his hon. Friends would prefer to see the Amendment in a different form.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) having already spoken to the Question before the House, has exhausted his right of addressing the House.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: May I ask, Sir, for a decision in regard to the point which I raised a short time ago?

MR. SPEAKER: In answer to the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) I have to state that when a Member, having moved an Amendment, desires to withdraw it for the purpose of bringing up another Amendment, that course, by the indulgence of the House, may be allowed; but the Amendment so brought up should not differ substantially from that originally proposed. If it does so differ, it could not, with regularity, be put from the Chair.

MR. BIGGAR said, as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland was not content that this Amendment should be withdrawn, and another substituted for it which might gain a few more votes, he should make no apology either to the Government or the House for rising to speak on behalf of his constituents, who were deeply interested in the question under discussion, and who supported him in his conduct respecting it. The Irish Party included young men of great ability and perseverance. He was not a young man himself; but this he would say—that he believed some of that young Party would hold a very high political position in their own country when some of the right hon. Gentlemen who sneered at his (Mr. Biggar's) expression regarding them would fill not highly honoured graves. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to be in a great hurry; but they were mistaken if they thought their clamour would either curtail or confuse his remarks. In fact, he was at all times quite careless of the patience or impatience of hon. Gentlemen, or of their opinion of him or anything he said, so long as he felt he was doing his duty. Nothing could be more injudicious than the conduct of the Government in the matter of coercion; and so much impression had that action made upon the mind of Ireland that if there were a General Election to-morrow he did not believe that the Liberal Party would obtain half-a-dozen votes in the whole country. Her Majesty's Government had done nothing for the tenantry of Ireland. They introduced a Compensation for Disturbance Bill last year; but if it had been passed into law it would have done nothing.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD: I rise to Order. I wish to know if it is in Order for the hon. Gentleman to discuss the Bills brought before the House by the present Ministry in the last Session of Parliament?

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as those measures are relevant to the Amendment before the House the hon. Member is in Order.

Mr. BIGGAR thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his decision. He could not see how any hon. Member could imagine that the Bill of last Session was not pertinent to the question now before the House, that question being whether the landlords of Ireland should get the assistance of the police in carrying out English legislation in Ireland. The Compensation for Disturbance Bill particularly related to the question of evictions. He condemned the proceedings of the hon. Member for Kerry (Mr. Blennerhasset), who, prior to the General Election, promised to give support to the hon. Member for the City of Cork, but had now withdrawn it. As for himself and his hon. Friends, he urged that they were only exercising the legitimate functions of a minority in pressing their views on the majority. He repeated, he did not wish to waste the time of the House; but he desired to show that it would not be wise to intrust the extra powers proposed by the Government to the hands of certain of the landlords and their agents. He did not denounce all landlords; there were many good landlords even among those who had appealed to the right hon. Gentleman; but there were a great many bad ones, and they could not be trusted with coercion. He rejoiced that now the tenants all over Ireland, irrespective of religion, were united in favour of the principles of the Land League. The statements made in the declaration by the 36 Cavan magistrates were not to be depended on; and there were, at least, two forgeries in the list of names. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore (Dr. Conaty), a diocese which covered the greater part of the county Cavan, said he felt it his duty to challenge their statements, and that he failed to discover the existence of terrorism in the county. That was the opinion of a gentleman who had a better opportunity of knowing the state of the county than the magistrates. In making a charge of misconduct against certain magistrates of Cavan, he did not mean to include all, or even a majority, of the landlords of the county. There were some who were bad enough, though, perhaps, not so bad as some in Mayo and Kerry, for they cleared the land of the people and put cattle in their place. The Government, therefore, were not justified in leaving such power in the hands of the magistrates. It was contrary to the declaration of the Chief Secretary when he said he would not be a party to tyrannical measures carried out by unjust men, unless they were accompanied by other measures which would control them. But now the right hon. Gentleman allowed these magistrates full swing, and, in addition, he proposed to introduce a Coercion Bill. In conclusion, the hon. Member stated that every tenant farmer in Ireland was united in support of the principles of the Land League, and in attempting to do his duty he knew that he would have the support of his constituents.

Mr. METGE said, that he looked on the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) as a protest against the Government proposition to enforce upon Ireland laws which were most unjust; and, therefore, he should support it. It was his duty to protest against the attempt to make Her Majesty's Speech a recommendation of renewed coercion for Ireland. He appealed to Liberal Members opposite to remember that the Compensation for Disturbance Bill was passed last year by acclamation in that House —["No!"]—it was only opposed by certain landlords—and this Amendment was merely an indorsement of the principle of that Bill. The result of the failure of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill was that the Government were obliged to flood Ireland with troops; and thus it happened that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who had previously expressed his dislike for repressive measures, was now one of the first to demand the passing of a Coercion Bill. Law and order were, no doubt, very popular words in England; but in Ireland, what had been implied by those words ever since the Union but cruelty, oppression, and the gallows? The Government had now two Irelands to deal with, the one crushed and downtrodden, asking only for justice; the other in America, rich, prosperous, and rebellious, craving nothing, biding their time to strike the blow of revenge. He warned the House that the time might yet come when England's treatment of the Irish people would prove the weak point in England's brightness and England's glory.

MR. FINIGAN said, that he should extremely regret to interfere with the conduct of Public Business by the House; but he should be still more sorry not to raise his voice against what he believed to be the mistaken policy of the Government towards Ireland. He could not congratulate the Government on the union of Whiggery and Toryism, by which the just complaints of the Irish people were being ignored. The Liberal Party asked them to shut their eyes and open their mouths and see what the Premier would send them. The House ought to consider, however, what would be the probable results of the coercive policy which they contemplated applying to Ireland. If the right hon. Gentleman had been more communicative, and had accompanied his remedial measures with a temporary measure of coercion, the House would not now have been in an uncomfortable position. By his Amendment his hon. Friend (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) asked the House to comply with a very plain and straightforward demand. He denied that the feudal system had been established for Ireland. It would have been better for Ireland if it had, for the landlords enjoyed all feudal rights of trusteeship over the land, and did not fulfil any of the feudal duties, which also belonged to them, towards their tenants. The question between Ireland and England had been greatly misunderstood. What the Irish people wanted was to get rid of eviction, not only because it pressed heavily on the tenant, but because the law in Ireland should be made the same as the law in England. In this country a law of distress existed which was a sufficient guarantee for the landlord's rent. Landlords might surely be content with the Law of Distress, and not insist upon having that of eviction also, which was unknown in England. A great deal, he might remark, had been said as to the Land League and its objects; but hardly any defence had been made of its design to prevent the exaction of exorbitant rents. They had a right to demand that the government of Ireland should be in the interests of the Irish people. That debate not only affected Ireland, but England also, and the whole Empire. It was impossible for the Irish Members to permit the Government to legislate on the Land Question so long as they preceded their land measure by measures of coercion. They could not allow their hands to be tied behind their backs. The Irish Members were bound in duty to their country and their consciences, and in accordance with the principles of Radicalism, which animated many of the Members among whom he sat, to protest against coercion, even at the risk of offending that House, and raising a hostile cry against themselves throughout the country. He never would consent to the landlords of Ireland being, at the present day, permitted to carry out evictions as they had done so unfeelingly in former days. English rule had made Ireland poor, and a thorn in the side of England. He would ask leave to refer to a pamphlet, recently published by an Englishman—Mr. Spencer Jackson — entitled, *Land Monopolies in Ireland*, which gave a list of landowners in Ireland who possessed more than 5,000 acres. Most of these landowners were English Noblemen, or connected with English noble families, and had done nothing to advance the prosperity and happiness of the Irish people. But it was not the men, but the system which was to blame. It was stated, in that pamphlet, that since 1848 those landowners had evicted 246,000 families from their homes. That represented 1,000,000 driven from the land of their birth. The reason was not that they had been unwilling to pay their rent, but that they had not wherewith to pay. That House had never taken into consideration the whole question of land tenure in Ireland. He would draw the attention of the House to the Returns lately issued by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Those Returns showed that in County Clare—the county with which he was connected—during the period between January 1, 1880, and November 30, there were no cases of murder, none of manslaughter, none of firing at the person, none of assault upon the police, none of aggravated assault, none of delaying of bailiffs and process-servers, none of taking and holding possession of land, none of killing, cutting, or maiming of cattle, and only one of firing into dwellings. This county had been organized by the Land League, and its peaceful state was an excellent proof to all but Tory Members that where unjust laws were not carried out quiet and order prevailed. He was ready to vote for every possible Radical measure for the English people; and he trusted that hon. Members opposite would show an equally liberal spirit, and try to solve this question of land tenure, not by coercion, but by a measure of justice.

Mr. GILL, who spoke amid considerable interruption, said, that an hon. Member had accused the Party with which he acted of having, during the last Session, caused the illness of the Prime Minister; but he could assure the House that there was no Party that felt more sincere sorrow when the Prime Minister was indisposed than the Party to which he belonged — the Home Rulers. The hon. Member was proceeding in obvious terms to condemn the action of the House of Lords in rejecting the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last Session, when—

Mr. SPEAKER said: I must remind the hon. Member that the Question before the House is the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy).

Mr. GILL said, he had risen to support that Amendment, and he only wished to show the prejudicial effect which the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill by the House of Lords had produced.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must again ask the hon. Member to address himself to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Longford. At present he is not doing so.

Mr. GILL bowed to the decision of the right hon. Gentleman. He had been endeavouring to address himself to that Amendment, and he was sorry if he had been guilty of anything irregular. He supported the Amendment; but while doing so he felt that there would have been no necessity for it if it had not been for the action of "another place." He also supported it, because he believed it was not unreasonable, considering the present serious crisis in Ireland. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) had said that tenants ought to perform the contracts into which they had entered. But he (Mr. Gill) believed that contracts which had been obtained by physical or mental terrorism would not be regarded as contracts by a Court of Equity. And what terrorism had not been brought to bear on these unfortunate people, who signed contracts which Her Majesty's Government were now going to enforce with all the powers at their disposal? These contracts had been signed with worse than a dagger presented at the breast of the tenant—they had been signed under the conviction that the workhouse or the emigrant ship was the only alternative if they were not signed. He thought that the Irish landlords could well afford to wait. They had rack-rented their tenants for generations, and received enormous amounts of money to which in justice they had no right; and if they did not now obtain a small portion of their rents, it would be only a small repayment of the vast sums which they had already received. They had obtained their entire rents, when in many cases other creditors did not get a penny; while, again, in the matter of the income tax, they had been exceptionally favoured, seeing that they had for the past 27 years failed to pay income tax, which they ought to have paid, to the average amount of £135,420 per annum. A vast number of the evictions, for the execution of which the assistance of the police and the military was given, were evictions of poor people who found it utterly impossible to pay the present rents. There had within the last three years been an enormous decrease in the value of the potato crop in Ireland, together with a very large falling-off in the number of milch cows and pigs, the domestic animals of the poor man. Great poverty, therefore, existed, and hence the inability of the tenants to pay their rents. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had said the other day that it was dishonest on the part of the Land League to try, as they had done, to lessen the value of land. Now, he (Mr. Gill) denied that the League had ever tried unduly to lessen the value of land. They had only sought to bring it down from an exaggerated value to its real value. As for emigration, it was one of the greatest evils from which his country had suffered; and he trusted that, so far from being promoted, by aiding landlords to evict, it would be checked by the remedial measures about to be proposed.

MR. SEXTON felt that to give a silent vote on this question would be, on his part, a great dereliction of public duty. He represented a county every acre of which was scheduled under the Relief of Distress Acts, and which contained a population of thousands of tenant farmers, many of whom were of the very poorest class. It was a county which in one generation had lost half its population by eviction, carried out against the public interest by the armed force of the Queen; and he knew those tenants were now in such a condition that, unless some hope of relief and some immediate measure of protection against the power of the landlords were held out to them, the state of affairs in that county would soon become extreme and important. He denied that the Irish Members, in the action they were taking, were retarding the application of remedial measures to Ireland. What they were endeavouring to do was to prove that there was greater urgency for the salvation of the people than for the application of restrictions to their liberty; and he believed the action of his hon. Colleagues would be approved by the humblest and most oppressed tenant in Ireland. The Amendment was characterized as an unconstitutional proposal. It was, however, a recognized Constitutional principle that the Government should, when the public interests demanded it, override the law; and Parliament, on due cause shown, never hesitated to grant them a Bill of Indemnity. The exercise of the Royal Prerogative in favour of criminals sentenced to death was a similar instance of the law being overridden. Surely the quality of mercy, which England's greatest poet said became the Monarch better than his Crown, might be exercised as properly in the case of Irish tenants as in that of the most abandoned murderers; and surely an appeal for the exercise of what was ever a Divine attribute could not justly be stigmatized as an "insult to the Crown." The Irish Members did not intend any insult to the Crown, but merely wished to move the Crown to exercise its Prerogative of mercy. If this request were refused, the peasants of Ireland, who now read the proceedings of Parliament with keen interest, would conclude that there was no hope for them, and that the reform of their grievances was postponed to the distant and indefinite future. In such a case, the power which the Irish Members might wield in Ireland for the purpose of keeping the people within the Constitution would be taken out of their hands. He solemnly warned the House that the result of their taking such a course as was proposed by the Government would be to drive the humblest and the least educated of the Irish people out of legal and Constitutional courses. It was pitiable to see the great Liberal Party in the second year of its existence in such a predicament; but he warned them that, no matter how many Arms Acts they might enact, they would never prevent an Irishman finding a weapon to practise an act of vengeance when he thought he was driven to it by the severity and tyranny of his oppressors. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, in his Charge, said the amendment of the laws was a subject for the consideration of the Legislature. The learned Judge, by that remark, indicated to the Legislature that statesmen would make a great mistake if they regarded this question solely from a lawyer's point of view. It was unnecessary to bring science or philosophy to bear upon this question; it was sufficient to appeal to common sense. The Irish people were in the utmost depths of misery. Of what avail was it to them that there had been a good harvest? The harvest in Ireland had fallen far short of what the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland imagined, and it had not made much difference in the position of the Irish tenantry. The Irish tenantry were up to their necks in debt; and was it to be supposed that they would postpone the payment of their tradesmen's just claims until after those of the landlords had been discharged? The truth was that the landlords had taken one-half, and, in some cases, two-thirds of the produce of the lands, and thus the tenant had been left without the means of maintaining himself and his family. Dealing with the action of the Land League, he maintained that that association had done their best to maintain order in Ireland. The number of evictions which had taken place in the last quarter of last year was smaller than in either of the three preceding quarters, and that he attributed to the peaceful operations of the Land League. If the Government refused now to hold out to the people any hope that they would be kept in their homes, the situation would be truly desperate. He protested against the Prime Minister and the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India endeavouring to silence the Irish Members. He had profound, he would say unalterable respect for the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and he would be an ungrateful Irishman did he not acknowledge the great services that the right hon. Gentleman had rendered to his country. He appealed to the generosity of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government to consider the difficulty of their position—to consider that the Irish Members were there pleading for the lives and liberties of their own people in the midst of a foreign population. They might, indeed, consider themselves exiles in that House. It was far from their intention to insult the Crown, or to lead any section of the Irish people out of the ways of order and Constitutional reform. They hoped that even now the Government might appreciate the situation in Ireland, and, by exhorting the Crown to exercise its Prerogative to secure justice to the Irish people, would secure their being still kept in Constitutional courses, so that through this troubled period their country might pass into one of prosperity and peace. He hoped the House would bear these things in mind, and ratify the Amendment of his hon. Friend.

Mr. BARRY said, he had no intention of occupying the time of the House for any lengthened period; but, like his hon. and eloquent Friend who had just addressed the House (Mr. Sexton), he was anxious on this occasion not to give a silent vote. In supporting the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy), he wished to place on record his protest against the assumption—he might say the charge—made by the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that his hon. Friend the Member for Longford had no better reason and no higher motive for the introduction of his Amendment than of delaying the introduction into the House of Commons of the Irish legislative measures of the Government. Those who knew the full meaning and even the deadly meaning of eviction in Ireland would be the veriest cowards unless they endeavoured, by every means in their power, to urge upon Her Majesty's Ministers some measures to avert the dread of evictions in Ireland during the next three or four months. He could quite understand that the majority of the Members of that House, schooled in the policy of coercion, felt extreme impatience and annoyance that the Irish Members should occupy the time of the House in discussing these measures. But although that feeling of annoyance and impatience was manifested in the House, and was arising throughout England, the Irish Members were conscious of this—that there were thousands and tens of thousands of the poor peasantry of Ireland who were watching their proceedings with keen and passionate interest, because they were anxious to avert the dread hour of coercion. The House had been told in the course of the present debate that the number of people threatened with eviction in Ireland might be counted by thousands. The number of persons actually evicted and restored to their holdings as caretakers last year numbered 5,000. He had listened, last year, with the most profound interest to the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, when, in the debate upon the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, he described the exact position of the caretaker in Ireland. The caretaker had no further claim, right, or hold upon his farm. He was there in the position of a serf, and he could be turned out at a moment's notice. He should like to ask the House in what position would these 5,000 tenants find themselves unless there were something to stay the coercing power of the landlords? It was all very well to say that no great powers were likely to be exercised by the landlords within the next few months; but, if they were to learn anything from the teaching of the past, they knew that the power might be exercised in a harsh and remorseless manner. He intended to support the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Longford. The principle of that Amendment had already been fully and entirely conceded by Her Majesty's Government, for the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year was nothing more than a Bill to restrain and temporarily arrest the power of eviction. He had not the slightest hope that the Amendment of his hon. Friend would receive a large share of support from English and Scotch Members; but he wished it to be borne in mind by the House that when the Land Bill of the Government was added to the long list of Irish legislative failures, that they sitting on those Benches would be able to point to the fact that they had indicated the proper course to take, and that the large majority of the House blindly refused to follow it.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 37; Noes 201: Majority 164.—(Div. List, No. 5.)

Original Question again proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for the Most Gracious Speech which Her Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Dawson,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) (VOTING) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR, in moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the manner of Voting in the Election of Members of Parliament for the Universities of Scotland, explained that the object of the Bill was to carry out the recommendation of the Royal Commission which lately sat in reference to the Universities, and which recommended that the manner of voting for Members of Parliament should be assimilated to the manner of voting for the Chancellor of the Universities. In addition to that, the Bill provided that all graduates should become members of the General Council at the time of their graduation.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to amend the manner of Voting in the Election of Members of Parliament for the Universities of Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. PLAYFAIR, Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL, Mr. ORR EWING, and Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 69.]

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. MUNDELLA, Bill to reorganise the Educational Endowments of Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MUNDELLA, Mr. GRANT DUFF, and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 65.]

IRISH LAND ACT, 1870 (NOTICES TO QUIT).

Return *ordered,* "of the number of Notices to Quit served in the respective years from 1871 to 1880, inclusive, as shown by the stamps issued of the denomination required for such notices according to the provisions of the Land Act of 1870."—(*The O'Donoghue.*)

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 19*th January,* 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Local Government (Boundaries) * [70]; Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment * [71].

Second Reading — Municipal Franchise (Scotland) * [57].

TREATY OF BERLIN—MOBILIZATION OF THE GREEK ARMY.

EXPLANATION OF ANSWER TO QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I beg to be permitted to give an explanation with regard to an answer which I gave yesterday to a Question relating to Greek affairs. The hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead Bartlett) desired to know whether Her Majesty's Government could lay on the Table of the House the despatch in which they advised the Greek Government to mobilize their Army? Thinking that a false impression might be produced by that Question remaining on the Paper, I asked leave to make an immediate reply. In doing so I said that the Government, so far from being the first to advise the Greek Government to mobilize their Army, were the last to withdraw their objection to that proceeding. I was reported in two of the morning papers as having said that Papers had already been laid upon the Table of the House. I did not say so. I wish, however, to state the substance of those Papers. They consist of a large number of short, confidential telegrams. On the 28th of July of last year Her Majesty's Government were informed that objection to the mobilization of the Greek Army by all the other Great Powers had been withdrawn. Finding this to be the case, Her Majesty's Government on the 29th of July informed the Greek Government that, although the Government thought the mobilization of their forces was premature, they did not wish to impose their advice on the Greek Government. The same advice was repeated on the next day in the same words. That is the explanation I have thought it right to make.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [TENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [6th January].

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. DAWSON, in rising to move that the following words be added:—

> "That we humbly pray Her Majesty to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech from the Throne last Session,"

said, in taking this step, he was not at all unmindful of the admissions which had been made by the Government of the justice of the demand for an assimilation of the borough franchise of Ireland to that of England, and of the soundness of the principle upon which that demand was based. Notwithstanding such admissions he felt it necessary to press his Motion, because, even when introducing measures on this subject, the Government did not provide for achieving the object in view—namely, assimilation to the law as it existed in England. Besides, though time was devoted to discussion of Irish affairs, no legislation on this or any other Irish subject of importance was effected last Session. Whilst entirely abstaining from exciting language, he had, during the Autumn, been obliged to tell his constituents that every measure introduced into Parliament in the interest of Ireland met with an untimely fate; and even if it succeeded in struggling through that House, it was lost in "another place." Thus, although the Borough Franchise (Ireland) Bill had been introduced into that House last Session by the Government, it was eventually dropped, and the Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, after being much weakened here, was rejected in the other House. Another measure of justice to the Irish people, brought in for the limitation of the costs of litigation, met with a similar untimely fate. The Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill, which the responsible Government of the country felt it to be its duty to introduce, was treated in a similar manner. In short, every measure brought forward for the benefit of the Irish people, whether by their own Representatives or by the Government, was, no doubt, discussed and debated, but never made law. How different had the case been with regard to the legislation proposed last Session for England. The Malt Tax had been repealed for the relief of the English farmers. Another important Bill of a very Radical nature —the Employers' Liability Bill—had been sent up to "another place," where it was seriously tampered with; but when it came down again to this House it was restored to its pristine vigour, and ultimately passed. Again, the Ground Game Bill—the thin end of the wedge of that English Land Reform which would be pushed further as circumstances might hereafter demand—

also met with mutilation at the hands of that Assembly; but afterwards all its original elements were re-inserted by this House, and it became law. A Burials Bill was also passed which gave to the sentiment of the English people the force of law, although the charge of being sentimental frequently wrecked Irish measures. He would be sorry to see sentiment dead in England or Ireland. Its existence had done as much for England's glory as any material aid had done. Thus, he had to tell his constituents how last Session every measure brought forward for England was carried in spite of all the opposition offered to it in this House and in another Assembly; whereas every measure for Ireland, if it passed this House, only did so to be crushed in the other, with one single exception—and that was a measure which put a large sum of money into the pockets of the Irish landlords. Irish Members had been charged with wantonly worrying the illustrious Statesman to whom Ireland owed so much. He repelled that accusation. Who was it that deserted the Prime Minister in his hour of need on the Compensation for Disturbance Bill but his political Friends on his own side? And what was the punishment of some of them—removal to the Treasury Bench? Not obstruction, but quite another reason, made him press his Motion at this stage, and that was to expose a very great error committed by various Governments when legislating for Ireland? What made Irishmen, who were especially anxious to be constitutionally governed, sad, was to see that the good intended to be done by the measures which English statesmen introduced for Ireland was utterly defeated through their lamentable ignorance of the facts of the case with which they were dealing. In introducing this subject, he wished to avoid going over the same ground as had already been travelled by the hon. Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) in his annual Motion. He asked the Government to bring in a Franchise Bill for Ireland, exactly on the same lines as the English Act; and in order that the object in view might not be frustrated, they ought, at the same time, to introduce a Registration Bill and a Municipal Franchise Bill. A Reform Bill, embracing the borough and the municipal franchises, as well as the question of registration, was required in order to redress all the existing grievances, and sweep away obstructions from the political liberties of the Irish people. There would be, then, one discussion in which to reveal, and one Act to remove, the injustice and anomalies, instead of many debates and many Acts for almost one purpose. He was bound, as an employer of labour, and as one who, for many years, had intimate knowledge of the working classes in Dublin and Limerick—with an ever-increasing respect for their qualities—to come forward and to plead that they should no longer be left without the pale of the British Constitution by their exclusion from the franchise. It had been said occasionally that this was the work of the agitators—that the people themselves felt no interest in this matter. That was not so. The absence from the Queen's Speech of this important measure was at once noticed by the amalgamated builders' trades of Dublin, and they passed a resolution expressing disappointment at the omission, declaring that there was no necessity for coercion, and pledging themselves to use every means at their disposal to secure the same Parliamentary and municipal privileges possessed by their brother working men in England. He had often been pained by the inferior dwellings of the Irish artizans, and the absence of many of those comforts which tended to make a man a peaceable citizen. In England it was the reverse; and he found that, whereas in Ireland it was extremely difficult to arouse interest on this question of artizans' dwellings, in England no trouble was experienced—wash-houses, water, and gas were seen to, and other improvements carried out. Why was this? It was because the English working man had got that political power which made him an object of attraction. He had, in fact, the priceless privilege of a vote. In June, 1846, the late Sir Robert Peel, speaking on this subject of equal municipal and Parliamentary privileges, declared that—

> "There ought to be established a complete equality as between Ireland and England in all civil matters and franchises."

And he further explained that what he meant was that no unbiased eye, on comparing the two countries, should be able to say that a different rule had been applied to Ireland. Those words were as forcible now as they were 35 years ago. But, unfortunately, the curtailment and mutilation of political and civil rights which Sir Robert Peel deplored then, existed now in Ireland. The facts of the case with regard to the franchise were these. In Ireland no one had the borough franchise who was not rated to the poor at the value of over £4; practically, the figure was nearly £5. Of course, the effect of this was to exclude a very large portion of the industrial classes. Many thousands of heads of families were excluded from the vote, and the law as to details was different from England. In England the occupier of any house at any value had a vote. The Earl of Beaconsfield, in 1866, speaking of a money value, said—

> "I can imagine no scheme more injurious, I may say more fatal, than a proposition of this kind. Every man who finds himself in a position in which he cannot fulfil the conditions which may give him a constitutional right, would naturally fall back into the arms of the lowest agitators."

And it must be borne in mind that a rating of £4, giving no vote, meant, in Ireland, a rent of £10 to £15 a-year. Not only was there no money limit, but in England the overseer of taxes was compelled to rate the occupier of every separate tenement, no matter who paid the taxes or who was liable for them, under a penalty of £2 for each name omitted. No such rule existed in Ireland. Thus Ireland had, first, a circumscribed franchise, and the overseer had the power to leave off the list of voters any name he liked. They talked of the Queen's Writ not running in Ireland. Here was an instance of the Queen's justice not running in Ireland. He had lately been in Cork when the municipal revision was in progress, and he had heard many people complain that, though they had paid their rates, they had not been placed on the electoral roll. These people, who were thus deprived of their rights, had to be satisfied with an intimation from the collector that he could not understand how the mistake had occurred. In England, supposing the rate collector or overseer had omitted a name, the owner was compelled, under pain of a like penalty of £2 for each name omitted, to return the name of the occupier for whom he paid taxes. Therefore, in England there was—first, no qualification required to entitle a man to the franchise; and, secondly, he was surrounded by a double legal guard to prevent his being wilfully or accidentally deprived of the power of exercising his Constitutional rights. The Irish people had none of those safeguards. But if, in England, the owner forgot to pay the rates, the collector was compelled to give ample notice to the occupier that the rates had not been paid, and, if not paid, that he would probably lose his vote. In Ireland no such notice was given, and a man often lost his vote because the landlord, either wilfully or negligently, had failed to pay the rates, although liable for them, the occupier all the time being in ignorance of such omission. In England, in the case of compound householders, the owner was offered a substantial money bonus, varying from 15 to 25 per cent, to pay the rates in time to save the votes of the occupiers. In Ireland, if a man was a shilling short even of the qualifying rates, or of all the past rates due for years upon any tenement, even if not actually due from the occupier, he was compelled to pay them before he got the franchise. In addition to these and other disadvantages, Irish occupiers suffered greatly from the prevalent practice of issuing frivolous objections—a practice to which no penalty was attached in Ireland, while in England a frivolous objector was mulcted in costs. In Birmingham, for instance, some time ago, one of the political parties objected, without justification, to large numbers of their opponents, and the costs which they had to pay in consequence amounted to some thousands of pounds. In England lists of electoral claimants were hung in every public place, in the churches, the court-houses, the market-places, &c. Such lists, though not so full or complete, were hung in Ireland behind the bars of police offices, places which, in that country were usually reserved for rewards for information of crime, and which the people never thought of visiting in order to see that their Constitutional rights were secured. He had shown that the difficulties placed in the way of Irishmen who wished to exercise their electoral rights were very considerable; but in Dublin, the Metropolis of Ireland, the people were subjected to excessive and special disabilities. According to the law, as understood by the collectors of taxes and laid down by the Bench, tenants in Dublin who paid their rents in other ways than by the year were deprived of the franchise. In Dublin, therefore, this strange state of things prevailed, that, in a country where non-payment of rent was the greatest charge just now, the frequent and punctual payment of it was made an excuse for sweeping people in thousands from the register. Leaving the question of the borough franchise, he would ask hon. Members to turn their attention to the state of the municipal franchise in Ireland. In England the municipal franchise was extended to every householder, male and female; but in every town in Ireland, except Dublin, the qualification for that franchise, granted only to men, was £10, and hon. Members must bear in mind that in Ireland a £10 valuation meant a rent of £15 to £20, or more. For Dublin a measure had been brought in professing to give household suffrage to its inhabitants; but the concession was accompanied by the extraordinary condition of three years' residence—a condition which, in a city of operatives, must necessarily oust large numbers of respectable people from municipal existence. This was what he specially complained of—measures purporting to give relief, and not giving it. On this subject, in 1866, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said—

> "I do not think there is anything in the world that so offends the common sense and right feelings of the people, as the attempt to play them a trick—the attempt to offer them a great concession, but which is really not any concession at all."

But this was what was done with Dublin. He held that Russian villagers, in their autonomous assemblies, enjoyed greater municipal rights than the people of Ireland possessed. Facilities were provided to working men in England for placing their names upon the register; but no such facilities existed in Ireland. In every town in England of over 10,000 inhabitants, evening revision courts were held from 7 to 10 p.m. The English lodger also had privileges to which his Irish brother was a stranger. The lodger in England could make his annual claim by memorial, whereas in Ireland personal appearance was still necessary. As a consequence, artizans, who were nearly all lodgers in Irish towns, could not support their claims. Now, as the result of the various disabilities under which the people of Ireland laboured in regard to the franchise, he found that among the 900,000 people composing the borough population of Ireland there were only 57,000 electors, as against 128,000 electors in a similar portion of the population of England. Manchester had 4,000 or 5,000 voters more than all the towns and boroughs in Ireland put together. Leeds with a population of 259,211, had 43,700 electors; while Dublin, with 10,000 more population, had only 12,000 electors, 2,000 of whom were freemen, and not rated occupiers, and 2,000 property voters. He quoted figures of 1874 Return. Now, it was surely monstrous that there should be 40,000 men, an army, walking the streets of Dublin without the franchise which, were they in England, they would possess. If the Government deprived them of the arm of the ballot, it was only too likely that they would take up other arms in order to assert their rights. It would surely be much better if these 40,000 men in Dublin could look to the Legislature through their Representatives in Parliament and to the Government for the redress of any grievances of which they complained than to any other leaders. The hon. Members for Dublin, gifted as they were, would possess a far greater influence if, instead of 9,000 rated occupiers they had 50,000 voters, as in the borough of Leeds. Again, to compare Kidderminster with Londonderry. The latter had a population of 25,000, and only 2,000 Parliamentary electors; while the former, with a less population, had 3,606 Parliamentary electors. Surely the hon. Member for the maiden City would not call the 1,600 disfranchised in Londonderry "a miserable, base and ignorant residuum." If the famous City bore this imputation calmly, it was untrue to its boasted traditions. The borough of Carlow had a population of 7,842, and only 300 electors; while Woodstock, with a population of 7,400, had 1,060 Parliamentary electors. He did not see why the noble Lord below him should have over 1,000 voices to support, whilst he (Mr. Dawson), in a larger population, had only 300. But if the borough franchise was anomalous and unsatisfactory, the municipal franchise was still more so. Only 5,000 persons in Dublin had the municipal franchise out of nearly 300,000 people. But the number qualified by law, such as it was, did not get on the roll. Over 76,000 were up to the money value for the Parliamentary franchise, and only 57,000 possessed it; over 10,000 entitled by law to the municipal franchise, were also deprived of votes by the vexatious obstructions of the political "Jack Cades" who usurped their political rights, and were supported by the Carlton Club. The hon. Member was proceeding to refer to the mode of electing Guardians in the South Dublin Union, and to a state of things which, while tolerated in Ireland, would not be sanctioned in Bulgaria, when——

Mr. PLUNKET: I rise to Order. I wish to know from you, Sir, whether it is competent for the hon. Member, or whether it is in accordance with the practice of precedents of the House, to introduce such topics as the hon. Member is now discussing in a debate on the Address in reply to the Gracious Speech from the Throne.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has an Amendment which enables him to address the House upon it. If I have correctly followed the observations which the hon. Member has made upon his Amendment, I cannot say that those observations are irrelevant, and, therefore, I have not interposed. But I feel it my duty to point out to the House that although the proceeding may be, in point of form, regular, I am bound to add that if a similar course of action were pursued on the Motion for an Address, by Members of this House generally taking an interest in any particular question, I apprehend that the Address to the Crown could hardly be carried within the compass of the Session.

Mr. DAWSON proceeded to illustrate his arguments as to the inequality of the Irish franchise compared with that which existed in the English boroughs, and to point out the limited number of persons enjoying the municipal franchise in Ireland.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must confine himself to his Amendment. Although the remarks of the hon. Member might be pertinent to the second reading of an Irish Franchise Bill, they are quite out of Order on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. DAWSON would not, then, pursue that course of observation. Several reasons had been assigned for the extraordinary state of things in Ireland which he had described. It was said that with an extended franchise the Irish Catholics would be intolerant. In reply to this, he pointed to the fact that the Lord Mayor of Dublin, who lately appeared at their Bar with a Petition on this very subject, was a Conservative, and had been chosen to fulfil that office although the Liberals formed a large, majority in the Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is again travelling from the Question before the House, and is referring to the municipal franchise. The hon Member must confine himself to the Amendment.

Mr. DAWSON would, then, call attention to the fact that out of 60 Home Rule Members no less than 15 were Protestants; and he would ask the House where was there a Catholic Member who represented an English or Scotch constituency? That was a complete answer to the charge of intolerance. He would only say, if the Government, taking a statesman-like view of the situation, would drop the Coercion Bill and bring in a Borough Franchise Bill, their course would meet with the unanimous concurrence of the House, would insure the acceptance and confidence of this country, and be received with gratitude by the people of Ireland. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

At the end thereof, to add the words "That we humbly pray Her Majesty to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session."—(*Mr. Dawson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) must not suppose it is from any personal disrespect to him, still less from any want of agreement with the object which he, not in the most appropriate manner, seeks to advance to-day, if I make an immediate and brief reply to his remarks. Before doing so, I must say a word or two on what I cannot help thinking is the very inappropriate manner in which the hon. Gentleman has brought forward the subject. ["No, no!"] What I mean is this—you yourself, Sir, alluded to it—the hon. Member made a very good speech for the occasion of bringing in a Bill with regard to the Irish franchise; but, I cannot help thinking, very unfitting for a speech on the Address. We are, after all, supposed to be a practical and legislative Assembly, wishing to have Business done; and what you, Sir, stated is perfectly true, that if the course taken by the hon. Member to-day were generally acted upon, we should never get our Business done. If every hon. Member who cared about any particular subject were to bring it forward in the way the hon. Member has thought it right to do on the Address, it would be months before the Address was voted. The hon. Member seemed entirely to forget that we were on the Address. Two or three times he appeared to think that he was bringing in a Bill, or speaking on a Bill, connected with the Irish franchise. Indeed, once or twice he used the expression "bringing in" such a measure. How could we possibly get to Business, if hon. Members were generally to take that course? The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) also feels strongly on a special question. He, too, might raise that question on the Address. What has been generally understood with regard to the Address hitherto is that, while it affords an opportunity for expressions of opinion on questions of importance, the debate should close within a reasonable time, and that the House should proceed as soon as possible to the Business actually before it. It cannot be forgotten what are the circumstances under which the present Session has commenced. They are notorious. The Government, acting on their responsibility, have considered it their duty to call Parliament together a month earlier than usual for urgent reasons stated in the Address; and the hon. Member thinks it right to take a day for the purpose of moving an Amendment on the Address in relation to a subject which is not urgent. He has not attempted to adduce a single argument to show its urgency. The hon. Member is an enthusiast on this question. I am quite sure he is absolutely sincere and single-minded; but I cannot help thinking that the support he gets from other hon. Members is very much owing to the wish that the discussion of other Business should be still further delayed. ["No!"] It is quite true that the hon. Member has acted strictly within the Rules of the House in the remarks he has made; but he must remember that those Rules have been framed on the supposition that the House generally, and hon. Members on both sides, are anxious to facilitate Business and get it through, and it is quite possible so to make use of the Rules as to defeat the general object of the House. A fortnight has already been consumed on the Address; and I really put it to hon. Members from Ireland, as well as from England and Scotland, whether the time has not now come when we should endeavour to get through the Business of the Session? The hon. Member gave an eloquent, but somewhat diffuse, decription of the legislation, and, as regarded Ireland, what he called "the abortive legislation," of last Session. No doubt, the Government brought forward measures which they were unable to pass. They gave much time to them, however. The hon. Member made some remarks with regard to the Relief Bill which were scarcely correct, and he must have forgotten the facts. He said that the sole effect of the Bill was to give additional money grants to the landlords; but he ought to have remembered that many days were occupied with a view to give additional relief to the people in distress. What are the reasons for the very unusual course which the hon. Member has adopted of making a second reading speech on the Address? Indeed, a speech on the details of a Bill is not usually made on the second reading; but I have never heard a speech of the kind on such an occasion as the present. But it was not solely to the borough franchise that the speech of the hon. Member was confined. He dealt also with a Municipal Franchise Bill and a Registration Bill. But the hon. Member's Amendment never even mentioned the borough franchise or registration, and, therefore, these questions were not within its scope. It is impossible for me to enter into the matters which the hon. Member has gone into. That would be opening up a debate, not merely on the principle of the Borough Franchise Bill, but on its details, and we should never get to Business in that way. The hon. Member gave no grounds for what he proposes. [Mr. DAWSON: I gave the facts of the case.] The hon. Member said it was a matter on which legislation was required; but there are many matters on which legislation is required. There can be only two reasons for bringing forward such an Amendment. One, is the conviction on the part of the hon. Member that the Government entirely ignored the question. ["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member cannot believe that. He has the assurance of the Prime Minister on the subject, given on the very first day of the Session. Therefore, I am perfectly sure he could not join in the rather forgetful cheer raised by his Friends. Another reason for bringing forward the Amendment would be, that there were some special grounds why this question should, in preference to all others, be brought before the House The hon. Member does not for a moment make such an assertion. He alluded to a deputation on which he and other hon. Members of the Corporation of Dublin met me, and we had a very useful conversation as to the details of the measure, when the Government could bring it forward. I asked that deputation whether they wished it to take precedence of the Land Question; and I judged from the feeling in the room that nothing could be more inappropriate, and that we should not be considered to be performing our duty if we did give it precedence. All I have to state now is, that the Government have the same opinion on the subject as they had last year when they brought in a Bill. The reason why such a measure was not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is that there are some very important Irish matters before us which may so occupy the time of the Session that it may be impossible to bring it forward. If it should be possible, the Bill will be brought forward; but some time must be devoted to English and Scotch Business. We must remember that Irish questions cannot take up absolutely the whole Session, though it appears probable they will occupy a very large portion of it. The hon. Member ended with a suggestion that we should drop the other Bills which he says we brought forward and take up this Bill. I suppose he alludes to the Bills for the Protection of Liberty and of Person and Property in Ireland, which have not been brought forward; but which we are hoping hon. Members will allow us to state the grounds for bringing forward in a very short time. The hon. Member cannot, for a moment, suppose that that can be acceded to. With regard to the request of the hon. Member, when a Government, upon its responsibility, calls Parliament together because it considers the state of the country is such that for the preservation of order, for the security of life and property, and for the protection of liberty, special measures are required, he cannot for a moment suppose that that Government should, at his kind request, entirely disregard the fulfilment of that duty and bring forward such a measure as he suggests. I will only say, before sitting down, that we are still anxious, as anxious as we were and as the hon. Member himself is, to assimilate the borough franchise in Ireland to that of England at the very first opportunity that we can do it without disregard to other important Irish Business that will have to be done.

MR. GRAY said, that was the first time anything had been heard about a Bill for the preservation of liberty in that country, although a great deal had been said about measures for the curtailment of Irish liberty, The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had told them that there were only two grounds which would justify the bringing on this Amendment—one, that they must think the Government had ignored the question, and had no sympathy with it; and the other, that there was an urgent demand for the extension of the franchise. Now, he (Mr. Gray) justified the action of his hon. Friend (Mr. Dawson) on both grounds, and on the authority of the right hon. Gentleman himself. The question of the borough franchise having been mentioned in the Queen's Speech last Session, he could not understand why it had been ignored on the present occasion. He believed that there were certain Members of the Government who did not sympathize with the Irish people in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland might; but the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington), for instance, had voted against the assimilation of the borough franchise; and there were other

Ministers, he feared, whose views on the subject were equally unsound. Therefore, the Government, as a Government, were not to be trusted in dealing with it; and the Irish Members were justified, notwithstanding that it might be inconvenient, disagreeable, and unusual at that time, in bringing it forward. The urgency of their demand was questioned; but he could tell the Government that their delay had created a most unfavourable impression in Ireland, and that the belief among the Irish people was that the intention was to stave off the question till after the next General Election. He contended that they had no other course open to them but to bring forward their grievances on the Address, especially as the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon), who had had the subject in hand for some years, had his Motion blocked out of the Order Book by a trick. ["Oh, oh!"] It was all very well for the Government to ask how they were to get through their Business; but the Irish Members had an equal right to ask how their Business was to be done when such manœuvres were allowable? [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!" *and* "Shut up!"] The House of Commons had been described as a House of Business. It had also the reputation of being an Assembly of Gentlemen; and yet an hon. and learned Member above the Gangway had just asked him to "shut up." He appealed to the Speaker for protection against such observations. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) had been good enough to ask him two or three times to "shut up."

MR. WARTON: I did no such thing.

MR. GRAY: I appeal to the Chair for protection against such interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) will see the desirability of confining his remarks to the Question before the House. If any improper interruption has taken place, the hon. Member should have called the attention of the Chair to it at once, and I should have felt it my duty to take proper notice of it.

MR. GRAY: I did call immediate attention to the matter. I have not said a word, except to appeal to you, Sir, since the hon. Member cried "Shut up!"

MR. WARTON: If I may explain, I have only to say, upon my word, that I did not use that expression.

MR. GRAY: Then, I beg the hon. and learned Member's pardon for the mistake. It must have been the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Nicholson) who sits next to the hon. and learned Member for Bridport. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] The expression certainly was used, and I appeal to you, Sir, for protection against such interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) asks for protection from an interruption which, he says, has taken place. As the hon. Member has called attention to the circumstance, the matter may now be considered at an end.

MR. GRAY, resuming his arguments, said, that if that was Parliamentary usage, it seemed to him very strange; and he would take care the point raised was not forgotten. The justice of their demands had never been denied; but they had appealed to the Government in vain, and it was not easy for them to obtain a hearing. ["Oh, oh!"] In the face of the interruption to which he was subjected, it was difficult for a man of his temperament to speak with propriety; but he would endeavour to do so. The question was, whether the borough franchise in Ireland was to be lowered before this Parliament was dissolved? They had been told by Members of the Government that, in the event of the attempt at land legislation failing, they would endeavour to pass a Franchise Bill, and then appeal to the country. The Irish Members believed that that would be the case, and that the land legislation of the Government would probably not be of such a character as to conduce to the prestige and strength of the Government. In that event, the proposed Bill would simply be a County Franchise Bill, and that the Irish borough franchise would be ignored. Therefore, he felt he was morally justified in supporting the Amendment of his hon. Friend.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, that the supporters of the Amendment did not wish to alter the loyal spirit of the Address. He, for one, joined in the loyal spirit in which that Address was framed as truly as any hon. Member who sat on either of the Front Benches. Her Majesty, in her Most Gracious Speech from the Throne, promised a measure of Land Reform for Ireland, and the Amendment merely proposed to add to the Address a paragraph praying Her Majesty to cause her Ministers to submit to Parliament a measure for the purpose of assimilating the borough franchise in Ireland to that in England—a measure, in fact, promised in the Speech from the Throne last Session. If the House were not to have the liberty of discussing such a subject, without derogation from their character as loyal Members of that House, the discussion on the Address might as well be confined to the speeches of the hon. Gentlemen who proposed and seconded the adoption of the Address. He thought that both sides of the House had made, from time to time, great mistakes in discouraging the increase of the voting power in Ireland. In a Party sense, he believed that the extension of the franchise would only affect the relations of Parties to the extent of three votes in the House; but it would add about 50,000 to the body of Irish voters, and it would give a feeling of satisfaction to a much greater number. He ventured to say that his constituents would blame him if he failed to take part in the debate. In the borough which he represented there were 1,000 persons who ought to be on the register if English rights were extended to Ireland, whereas only about 300 were. In England the municipal and Parliamentary franchise in boroughs was the same, and so it ought to be in Ireland, where the people were just as loyal as they were in this country, which was proved by their great endurance under bad laws. Let justice be done to Ireland as it had been done to England, and the people would be satisfied.

Dr. LYONS said, that the effect of the present law in the City of Dublin was most lamentable. In that City only one out of every 4½ heads of families, possible voters, possessed the franchise. He called attention to the large numbers of the highly-respectable and well-educated tradesmen who were thus deprived of Constitutional rights. He also referred to the very great numbers of persons belonging to the professional classes, as well as to the artizan class, whose claim to the lodger franchise was defeated by vexatious rules as to the length of residence, removal, &c. As to the county Dublin, its condition was an opprobrium to the constituency. He had never been able, owing to frivolous objections continued over years, to get his own name on the County Register. Therefore, while agreeing that the subject was a most practical and important one, he regretted that a discussion upon it had been forced on at such a moment as the debate on the Address, as it could not now be properly dealt with. He complimented the hon. Member on the ability and exhaustive character of his facts and statements, and said that no better speech could have been made on the second reading of a Franchise Bill; and he would even now invite the hon. Member for Carlow to give his energies to the introduction of a Bill which, if worked on to the proper stage, might be afterwards taken up by the Government, as in the case of the Registration Bill of last Session.

Mr. FINIGAN said, he should be glad to follow the precedents to which reference had been made, if they could feel sure that Irish measures would meet with the same fairness as the English Bills did. This was a matter of urgency, as a Bill had been brought in every year for the last six years. One practical measure of justice to Ireland would do more to settle the Irish Question than all the protestations of the Government and the Liberals. They had been told by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland that this was an inappropriate time to discuss the question of the Irish franchise. That right hon. Gentleman could hardly understand his position as Chief Secretary. It was his duty, not to consider coercive measures against Ireland, but to endeavour to rule Ireland according to Irish opinions, as expressed by the Representatives of Ireland who sat on those (the Opposition) Benches. This was essentially a working man's question, and he was aware that the absence of legislation on the question subjected the borough which he represented to misrepresentation. He (Mr. Finigan) was told that he represented only 240 people, or, rather, a certain majority of them. He pleaded guilty to that charge; but he blamed the law. In the borough of Ennis there were some 1,500 householders, who were a trading and commercial people In the large majority of cases they occupied only small houses, the rent of which was between 2*s.* and 3*s.* per week. He was surprised, that when it was a question of personal liberty, of personal justice, of having a voice in the government of the country, one of the Leaders of the Liberal Party should deem this an inappropriate time to introduce the subject. In Ireland it was a serious and urgent question, and it was absolutely unfair to ask Irish Members not to urge it on. Irish Members asked the Government to give them a definite promise that a Bill on the subject of the Irish franchise would be introduced that Session, and be carried into law. The passing of such a measure would be a message of peace from Her Majesty to the people of Ireland. The Irish Members had been trusting to Liberal promises to carry out a measure which they outwardly asserted they were anxious to see adopted. If the franchise in Ireland were placed upon the same footing as in England, Ireland would send to Parliament men pledged and determined to ask the Government to give the country justice before coercion, remedy before force. He believed that no Member on these Benches was afraid of the extension of the franchise, or thought that it would weaken the National Party.

MR. W. H. JAMES said, that, in his opinion, judging from what had been said by the last speaker (Mr. Finigan), freedom of speech was being turned into abuse and licence. He asked why hon. Members from Ireland, who complained of the inadequacy of the franchise, did not bring in a Bill themselves dealing with the question? [*Cries of* "We did!"] They might say, as they now did, that they had done so before. That was true, and he had supported them, and probably he should do so again; and, quite irrespectively of any pledge which hon. Members might receive from the Government, many hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Liberal Benches would give such a measure their hearty support. He protested against the waste of time which had taken place in the consideration of the Queen's Speech. He was desirous of doing full justice to Ireland; but he was sent there not for the purpose of talking, but to do business; and he therefore protested against a state of things which introduced into Parliamentary affairs what really amounted to a condition of paralysis. To throw obstacles in the way of the progress of legislation was the highest offence against the Rules of Parliament. Their constituents would soon be asking him how far they were determined to prevent this waste of time. That was almost the greatest offence that could be committed in the House; but a still worse offence was, that while there might be men who were exposing themselves to peril by encouraging an abnormal state of things in Ireland, hon. Members should shelter themselves behind the Forms of the House, and make almost irrelevant speeches, and, while thus in a position of security, should prevent the full and fair consideration of the Government measures with regard to Ireland. With all frankness, he was bound to confess that such a mode of procedure was wanting in manliness, as well as in business qualities. It was cruel to the Irish people. It was Ireland which suffered, because it prevented the introduction and establishment of reforms, with regard to which he might claim quite as much as the hon. Members opposite, that he was anxious to do justice for Ireland.

MR. DILLON said, he was glad that an English Member had just broken the silence which hon. Gentlemen opposite had generally observed in that discussion. A speech in the fairness of tone and temper of that which had just been delivered would always be welcome to the Irish Members near him, because they recognized in it that towards their cause which they seldom heard in that House. He ventured to say that if the majority of hon. Members who had spoken on the question had approached it in the same temper and tone, the debate would have terminated before this, and might have had a different ending. He wished to make a few remarks in defence of the conduct of the Irish Party on that question. No doubt, the conduct of the Irish Members seemed strange and irregular to English Members; and if they were English Representatives and so acted, they would doubtless be deserving of the reprobation of the English people. But the case was very different. They were the Representatives of a people who had long suffered from grievous wrongs, with which the English people were not well acquainted; and it was only by persevering efforts, by giving accurate accounts of the state of things in Ireland, that they could succeed in forming an intelligent English opinion in favour of their cause. Some Liberal Members appealed to the Irish Representatives to have faith in the present Government; but it should be remembered that they had to deal, not only with the English Government, but with the Irish Government, and they had no confidence in that part of the Ministry which had charge of the Irish Administration. They were told that the fate of the Ministry did not depend on that question; but why was that? Because the Irish Ministers were not responsible to the Irish people, and did not depend on the votes of their Representatives. If the Irish Ministry were responsible to the Irish Representatives, as the English Ministry were to the English Representatives, its fate would not be long in the balance. In division after division three-fourths of the Irish Members had voted with his Party and against the Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out to the hon. Member that he was straying from the Question.

Mr. DILLON said, that the Irish Members were obliged to enforce their case in more detail and at greater length because it was not in their power, however much they might be dissatisfied with it, to turn the Ministry out of Office. They were also reminded that it was unpractical to bring that question forward at that stage of the Session; but he replied that that was the only opportunity they had of putting their arguments as to the urgency of that measure before the English public. They were told they might bring in a Bill on the subject; but they had done that for six successive years, and the question was still in the same condition that it was when first agitated. They were, therefore, driven by stress of experience to take the present opportunity. If the English Members would absent themselves from the division, in addition to absenting themselves, as so many did, from the discussion, and would leave in the hands of the Irish Members the decision upon a Bill on that subject—if the Government would give him a pledge of that kind, he would then advise his hon. Friend (Mr. Dawson) to withdraw the Amendment. The Irish Party considered it part of their bounden duty to point out to the Irish Government that, by acting on the policy indicated in the Speech from the Throne, they were proposing to enter into a course of policy which would result in long, bitter, and angry strife, and which would lead the people into extreme measures which would put out of sight for a long time considerations as to the condition of the Franchise. The result would be, they would have neither a Land Bill nor a Borough Franchise Bill passed that Session. He would, therefore, impress on Ministers the necessity of entirely altering the character of the Queen's Speech, or, at least, of intimating that it did not indicate what would be their policy. He (Mr. Dillon) had seen the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain) taking his stand with the minority of seven or eight Members against the tone and temper of the whole House, and obstructing—if there ever was obstruction—on the question of flogging in the Navy. The small minority which that right hon. Gentleman then led beat the majority after a week's discussion, and abolished flogging in the Navy. The Irish Members were determined to use every means to influence English opinion on the subject, and to leave no argument in support of their views unstated, even at the risk of stating it twice; and they had already the encouragement of seeing that their efforts were not wholly without result. There were Radical organs of opinion which held that the Government were not pursuing the right course towards Ireland.

Mr. SPEAKER again pointed out that the hon. Member was not addressing himself to the Question before the House.

Mr. DILLON bowed to the ruling of the Chair. The Irish Members were justified by the feeling of their constituents in the course they were taking, and those who opposed them would find very shortly that public feeling in Ireland was overwhelmingly in favour of the views of his Party. The Conservatives had opposed the extension of the Irish borough franchise, knowing that it would deprive them of a certain number of seats; but why had the marked feeling in its favour shown by the Liberal Party while in Opposition fallen off since they had come into Office? He feared the answer was that the Government and the Liberal Party were disinclined to admit that this question was one of urgency, because they knew perfectly well that if this reform was granted, the seats of the present Law Officers for Ireland and other Liberal seats would be lost to them. It was superfluous for him to go over the ground which had already been traversed by his hon. Friend who moved the Amendment. It had been said two years ago, by prominent Liberals, that it was a scandal and disgrace to the Tory Government to have the question unsettled; to have such a wrong unremedied was calculated to drive the Irish people into rebellion. But it now appeared that what the Liberal Party had formerly urged upon the Conservative Government as urgent had ceased to be urgent. That consideration had not been brought forward by his hon. Friend the Mover of the Amendment. He (Mr. Dillon) supposed he took it for granted. They could take no better course of fostering a spirit of distrust, disloyalty, and hatred among the Irish people than to declare that the disfranchisement of three-fourths of the population was not a question of urgency. The majority of the Irish Representatives—in fact, two to one of them—would vote for the measure. The Irish people had displayed great patience. He hoped it would not again be that a reason for throwing out an Irish Bill was that it was supported by the people of Ireland. If it was true, as he believed, that the opinion of England was rising against the Irish Members, yet they knew that the grateful feelings of the Irish people were rising behind them; and if the feeling of England were to be put forward, it became a question whether Ireland was to be governed at the dictation of England, or in such a way as to satisfy the wishes of the Irish people.

MR. HEALY said, that the Irish Members had been blamed for adopting an exceptional course. But the fact was, that they had no other resource open to them than to take exceptional measures. They were only a minority, and it was impossible for them to obtain proper reforms except by forcing them upon the attention of the House and the Government. It had been stated that the question of the Irish franchise had been brought forward in the last five or six years. The fact was that it had been before the House for the last 14 years—ever since 1867. He felt, therefore, that whatever inconvenience they might be causing the Government and the House, they were bound to disregard it. They had to consult the feelings and wishes of their constituencies. They did not wish to be discussing the question in that House. They would rather be elsewhere; but they had no choice. They had been promised a measure on the subject last year, but that promise had not been kept. A Government which possessed such an ornament as the Solicitor General for Ireland, a Member for a rotten borough, who would not have the slightest chance of re-election if the suffrage were extended, must be extraordinarily enthusiastic about passing this measure. So long as Government officials could only obtain seats by keeping the franchise at a higher level than it existed in England, so long would the Government try to obstruct the fulfilment of the wishes of the people. He did not believe in the intentions of the Government to pass the measure last Session, and he did not give them credit for any desire to put it in the Queen's Speech this year. The hon. Member proceeded to refer to the Parliamentary history of the question, when——

MR. SPEAKER called upon the hon. Member to confine himself to the Question before the House.

MR. HEALY said, the Bill had been rejected for 14 years, and, so far as they could judge of the intentions of the Government, it might be rejected for 14 years more. If the Irish Members, by the course they were now taking, could bring home to the minds of English Members that in rejecting Irish measures they were inflicting inconvenience upon themselves, they would soon get justice for their country. The present condition of things was a great wrong to Ireland, and it was not to be wondered at if the Irish people were driven into secret combinations and conspiracies.

MR. BYRNE objected to the course which had been taken that week and the previous week by the Government in casting blame upon the Movers of Amendments before those Amendments had been discussed. His hon. Friend the Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) had as good a right to move an Amendment as the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson). The demand which was being put forward was simply that Irish citizens should have the same rights as were possessed by their English and Scotch fellow-subjects. Last year nothing had been done for Ireland. For England the present Government had passed all the eight measures which they had promised, and the Irish Members had refrained, notably in the case of the Ground Game Bill, from obstructing the passage of those measures. Not only was the Irish franchise less extended than that of England, but difficulties were cast in the way of registration in Ireland which did not exist in England. The Revising Barrister, with his assessors, offered every facility for registration, sitting often as late as 10 o'clock at night, to give the working classes an opportunity of registering their votes; whereas if the Irish applicant was not ready at a particular time and place, he lost his vote. The mind of the right hon. Gentleman was poisoned by the officials of Dublin Castle; and so long as Ireland was governed by those Jacks in office, she would never be governed well.

Mr. LEAMY said, that the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) had not taken his present course upon his own responsibility. He acted in this case as the spokesman of the Irish Parliamentary Party, which had the sympathy of the great mass of the Irish people who would be enfranchised if the Bill became law. He came to the conclusion that the omission of the Franchise Bill from the Queen's Speech was due to the fact that the Government shrank from mentioning the subject at the same time with a Coercion Bill. Hon. Gentlemen opposite should recollect that for the last 50 years the Irish vote had kept English Liberals in Office, and it might be as well that the Irish people should be taught that they had put too much trust in English Liberals.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he rose for the purpose of making a suggestion which might have the effect of bringing the debate to a close. He did not suppose he was now in high favour with Her Majesty's Ministers, but he made this suggestion in a spirit friendly to them. If any Member of the Government would give a promise that they would bring in a Borough Franchise Bill this Session, and push it through, they might come to a compromise. The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) made a speech which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary considered unusual; but the present state of things was altogether unusual. The Chief Secretary for Ireland seemed to draw a subtle distinction between the actual Regulations of the House and some kind of unwritten law of propriety and order borne about apparently in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman himself. But he thought that when they were acting in accordance with the recognized Rules of the House they were fairly entitled to be exempted from the censure of the right hon. Gentleman, and not bound to recognize him as a censor of debate, and to adapt their course to his ideas of propriety. He was bound to justify the course taken by his hon. Friend who proposed the Amendment. If he had not taken that opportunity of bringing up the subject, no other opportunity would have been left him of calling attention to it. What his hon. Friend wished to press upon the Government was, that if they brought in coercive measures, those measures should not be unaccompanied by others of a remedial character. It was all very well to say that his hon. Friend might have brought in a Bill. What chance would it have of getting a second reading; and if it did get a second reading, what chance was there of any private Member carrying it through? It was not merely six or eight years, but 17 or 18, that this question was before Parliament. When the great wave of popular agitation which carried the English Reform Bill swept over this country, Ireland was left out of the current. The Irish measure came on at a time when a strong spirit of re-action against reform was setting in. The English Reform Bill was passed in 1867; the Irish Reform Bill was to have been introduced in the same year. Pledges and promises were given by eminent statesmen, Members of the Government, that the whole scheme of reform would be disposed of in the one year. But when they got through the English Reform Bill, the Earl of Beaconsfield suddenly intimated that the Government would not concern themselves that Session with a scheme of Irish Parliamentary Reform; and one reason he gave was that the condition of Ireland was then somewhat troublous. Mr. Chichester Fortescue brought forward a Motion on the 22nd of June, calling upon the Government to take up the question of the Irish Reform Bill and re-model the Irish franchise during that Session. The Government opposed any idea of the kind, and Mr. Chichester Fortescue was induced to withdraw his Motion. The Reform Bill for Ireland was brought in next year; but so poor was it in every sense, that the Leaders of the Liberal Party stated that they would take the Bill only as the mere foundation of a Reform Bill. Since that time nearly 13 years had passed, and all that Ireland had got was that miserable Bill. Ireland still saw no chance of anything being done. Therefore, it was but reasonable, before those vehement and protracted debates upon coercion with which they were threatened should come on, that they should have a distinct promise from the Government that they were about to complete the system of reform for Ireland which, 14 years ago, their leading Members demanded as essential to the good of the country. Even if his coercive measures were delayed, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) would have the consolation of knowing that of late there had not been a single outrage which could render a measure of coercion necessary.

MR. BIGGAR said, he had some experience as to waste of time during recent years, and he could say that the greatest waste of time took place in arguing and re-arguing questions about which there was no room for controversy or discussion. The question before the House was exactly one of that character. All the hon. Member for Carlow proposed was that the law of Ireland with regard to the Borough Franchise should be the same as that of England. More time had been occupied over that question than would have been required to settle it three times over. The right hon. Gentleman contended that the circumstances of the country were not such as to allow a Bill of this kind to be brought in by the Government. But the fact was, the right hon. Gentleman knew nothing of the circumstances of the country, for he was earwigged by the permanent officials of Dublin Castle, whose prejudices and feeling were opposed to those of the Irish people. The argument of the right hon. Gentleman was that the measure was not urgent. It might not be urgent for the Members of the Government; but it was urgent for a very large class of the Irish people, who wanted to have their rights. In Ireland a large number of householders were unenfranchised who would have votes if they lived in England. In Ireland, too, the difficulty of registration was greater than in England, for a man could not be put on the electoral roll unless he attended to the matter personally, and lukewarmness prevented many from taking so much trouble to obtain the franchise. He and his Colleagues had been charged with delaying the introduction of the remedial measure promised by the Government; but the fact was, that the people of Ireland had no confidence in any Bill proceeding from the present Ministry, which seemed disposed to perpetuate the vicious system introduced by the Tory Government. He thought that the Chief Secretary should have consulted the majority of the Irish Representatives as to how the measure for Ireland ought to be introduced, as he thought it would have facilitated the progress of affairs. He contended that the way in which the Government had treated Irish Business last Session was a disgrace to the Administration. [" Oh, oh!" *and cries of* "Divide!"] If hon. Members thought they could put down an Irish Representative by clamour, perhaps they were right to make these noises.

MR. SPEAKER hoped the hon. Gentleman would confine his observations to the Motion before the House.

MR. BIGGAR said, he was always ready to bow to the ruling of the Chair; but thought he ought not to be put down by clamour when he attempted to reply to the question raised by the right hon. Gentleman. He considered the speech of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) unanswerable; but, nevertheless, he would even now withdraw his Amendment if the Prime Minister would only give him the assurance that he would use all his exertions to get a Bill passed placing the Irish on the same level with the English constituencies in regard to the franchise.

MR. DALY said, that the Irish Members had reason to complain of the course pursued by the Government in omitting from the Royal Speech all mention of the Borough Franchise, which was quite as important a question to Ireland now as it was at the commencement of last Session. He maintained that, in the absence of a promise by the Government that a Bill to assimilate the two franchises would be brought in this Session, the Irish Members were perfectly justified in arguing this subject on the Address. He hoped that a measure on the subject would be introduced during the present Session; and, if so, it would be carefully considered by the Irish Members. The matter was one of grave and serious importance to the English and Scotch as well as to Irish Members, and he trusted, therefore, that the Government would see their way to deal with it.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that, in his judgment, the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) was perfectly justified in bringing forward the Amendment. It was notorious that great inequalities and injustices existed in Ireland with regard to the franchises of the people. He believed the Irish people would not be content to remain in a position of inferiority in this or any other matter.

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES BILL.

On Motion of Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE, Bill to appoint a Commission for the alteration of the areas of Local Government in certain cases, and for the re-arrangement of Boundaries, *ordered* to be brought in by Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE, Mr. PELL, Mr. JAMES HOWARD, and Mr. YORKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 70.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. MACDONALD, Bill to amend "The Employers' Liability Act, 1880," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. BROADHURST, Mr. BURT, Mr. PEDDIE, and Mr. O'CONNOR POWER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 71.]

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 20th January, 1881.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 20th January, 1881.

MINUTES]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Edinburgh, *v.* Duncan M'Laren, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

SELECT COMMITTEE — Printing, *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Coroners (Ireland)* [73]; Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2)* [72].

Second Reading—Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) [66]; Judicial Committee [67]; Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment [68].

QUESTIONS.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) ACT.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it a fact that Henry Adair, esquire, J.P., of Langhanmore, county Antrim, is at present building a wall round his demesne by contract, the payment to be paid from money borrowed under the Relief Bill; and, if so, what number of people are employed on this wall?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, Mr. Adair was not building a wall by contract to be paid for by money borrowed under the Relief Act. That Act did not apply to the county of Antrim. He had borrowed money on the ordinary terms on which landlords were enabled to borrow money for some time past. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) did not know the number of men he was employing on the wall.

IRELAND—THE CONSTABULARY—ARREST OF CHILDREN AT CASTLECOMER.

MR. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the conduct of the constabulary in the Petty Sessions district of Castlecomer, in the county Kilkenny, in arresting in the dead of the night in their beds four children under sixteen years of age, bringing them several miles to barracks in this inclement weather and detaining them until released on bail next day, instead of issuing summons in ordinary course?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had communicated with the authorities in Ireland with reference to this matter, but had not yet had any reply in consequence of the state of the weather. He would probably be able to answer the Question to-morrow.

CRIMINAL LAW—ASSAULTS UPON WOMEN AND CHILDREN—LEGISLATION.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is his intention to bring in a Bill for the repeal of existing Acts relative to the infliction of corporal punishment, with a view to its total abolition; if not, whether, in view of the prevalence of aggravated and felonious assaults upon women and children, he will introduce a Bill this Session for the purpose of amending the provisions of the Act 26 and 27 Vic., c. 44, so as to extend the punishment of flogging to persons convicted of such assaults, thereby rendering them liable to the same punishment as that inflicted under the said Act on persons committed for assaults with intent to rob?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: No, Sir; it is not my intention to propose any change in the existing state of law on this subject. The hon. Member will be glad to know that the class of crimes to which he refers have been gradually and rapidly diminishing during the last few years, so that in 1879 the number of this class of crimes was one-third less than in the year 1875.

LAW AND POLICE—FIRE AT THE CUSTOM HOUSE.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any investigation has been made into the circumstances attending the fire at the Custom House on the 8th instant, and whether there is any ground for supposing it to have been the work of an incendiary?

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH: Sir, a personal investigation was made on Monday and Tuesday, the 10th and 11th instant, by the Commissioners of Customs, into the circumstances connected with the fire which occurred at the Custom House on the 8th instant, and the result of the inquiry left no doubt on their minds that the fire was the work of an incendiary. The matter was subsequently placed by the Board in the hands of the Criminal Investigation Department; but the Report from that Department has not yet been received.

COUNTY LUNATIC ASYLUMS—JOINT COUNTIES ASYLUM AT ABERGAVENNY.

MR. WARTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the fact that, acting under the advice of the Lunacy Commissioners, such advice being supported by the report of a medical superintendent of asylums, he declined to sanction the enlargement of the Joint Counties Asylum at Abergavenny; whether he did not subsequently reconsider his decision, being influenced so to do by the advice of Dr. Gover, the Medical Inspector of Prisons; and, whether the recommendation of the Lunacy Commissioners was set aside in consequence of the opinion of a medical man unconnected with their body?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: There has been a long correspondence on this subject. The effect of it appears to be that a Committee of Visitors to the Asylum wanted to enlarge the existing building; while the Commissioners of Lunacy thought that there ought to be a new site and a new asylum. There being this difference of opinion on the question, the Commissioners desired that the Secretary of State should settle the point at issue. That being so, when I came into Office the matter was, with the assistance of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick (Mr. Arthur Peel), carefully investigated; and finally it was reported that, although a new building on a new site might be ideally the more perfect thing, an additional building on the old site would do well enough. Consequently, I declined to force the local people to go to unnecessary expense; and I desire to say that, considering the heavy burden of rates at present, I cannot consent or desire to use the central authority to compel the local authorities to enter upon an expenditure which is deemed to be unnecessary, and which cannot be proved to be necessary.

POST OFFICE—THE NEW MONEY ORDERS.

MR. GRAY asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been called to the inconvenience occasioned by the regulations in Ireland with regard to the new Postal Money Orders, whereby, if crossed to a bank, as is a common practice, the Department will not cash them, and bankers will not receive them, owing to the regulation that they need not be paid until sent to London for verification for an indefinite term unless the banker gives an indefinite guarantee; and, whether he will so modify the rules as to make the system workable or return to the old system?

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, as the Question of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) is somewhat similar to that of which Notice has been given by the hon. Member for Dublin City (Dr. Lyons), it may be convenient that I should reply to both together. It will be remembered that, when the Postal Orders Act was under the consideration of Parliament, the Post Office wished to make no distinction, so far as bankers are concerned, between the cashing of these postal orders and the old money orders. At the instance, however, of my hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), who, it was stated at the time, represented the views of the bankers on the subject, a clause was inserted in the Bill by which bankers were exempted after receiving payment from the Postmaster General from all liability to him in respect to postal orders, whereas no such exemption from liability exists with regard to the old money orders. It therefore became necessary to make a regulation under the Postal Orders Act, empowering the Postmaster General to examine the postal orders presented through bankers before paying them. The same regulation, however, enabled him to make express arrangements with bankers, whereby the delay caused by examination can be avoided. That arrangement consists of a guarantee furnished by the banker that, in the event of notice being given to him within 10 days after the cashing of the order, that such order is informal or invalid, the amount thereof will be made good. A considerable number of bankers have adopted this arrangement, and others are following the example. If, however, bankers are of opinion that the effect of the section inserted on their behalf in the Postal Orders Act is to cause inconvenience, and if they will bring in a Bill to repeal it, I shall be prepared to consider their proposal favourably.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—TELEGRAPH CLERKS.

MR. J. COWEN asked the Postmaster General, If it is correct that the officials at various Post Offices are endeavouring to prevent the telegraph clerks from making their grievances known to the public; if the officials at Sheffield and Cardiff have threatened to suspend any one taking part in calling meetings of clerks; and, if orders have been given to destroy any correspondence addressed to the staff?

MR. FAWCETT: I believe it is just possible that, in order to prevent the agitation among the telegraphists passing beyond legitimate bounds, in some instances undue restraints may have been put on their methods of making their grievances known. I am not aware of these instances; but if my hon. Friend will direct attention to them they shall at once receive my consideration. So far as the general subject is concerned, I think it will be seen from the public Press that the complaints of the telegraphists have received a wide publicity. In regard to the two towns specially referred to in the Question, I have made inquiries since the Question appeared on the Paper, and I have received the most positive assurance that no such threats have been used, nor has it been intimated that correspondence addressed to the staff will be destroyed. I can only say that the complaints of the telegraphists are receiving the most careful consideration; and no effort will be spared to arrive at a conclusion, with the least possible delay, on the subject.

NAVY—ADMISSION OF BOYS FROM WORKHOUSES.

MR. DALY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is true that on Tuesday, the 11th inst., thirteen boys from the Cork Union Workhouse sought admission to the Navy, and for that purpose proceeded on board Her Majesty's Ship "Revenge" now stationed at Queenstown; whether it is true that no objection was raised to the education or physical condition of those boys as candidates, but that they were refused admission by the Captain of the

"Revenge" on the ground that they were workhouse boys; whether it is true that the father of one of those boys had died in Her Majesty's service; and, whether, in such refusal, the Captain of the "Revenge" was justified by the rules of the service?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, there is no rule against admitting into the Navy boys who have been in a workhouse. The case stands thus:—The Admiralty reserve to themselves absolute discretion as to bestowing admissions into our training-ships, which are an object of ambition to large classes of our people. If a proof were wanted of this, it is afforded by the fact that since, in the October of last year, the present Board of Admiralty determined to encourage recruiting in Ireland, 47 boys have been entered in the *Revenge* from the counties of Cork, Waterford, and Kerry. The ordinary recruiting is going on in a most satisfactory manner in the South of Ireland, and we are getting boys as fast as we want them, and of just the sort that the Service requires. On the 11th of January, Captain Buckle, of the *Revenge*, writes thus to Rear Admiral Hamilton—

> "Sir,—This day a schoolmaster from the Cork Union Workhouse came on board your flagship with 13 boys out of the Union, dressed in the workhouse clothes, and stated that he had been ordered by the Cork Board of Guardians to bring the said boys on board for entry; and that the order was the result of a resolution passed by the Board of Guardians to that effect at their last meeting."

Sir, this is one of those occasions on which the Admiralty, acting through its officers, thinks best to exercise its discretion. If the boys had been entered under these circumstances, Boards of Guardians throughout the Three Kingdoms would claim to send boys in great numbers on board Her Majesty's ships, and I do not see how the claim could be resisted. The letter of Admiral Hamilton is as follows:—

> "With reference to the boy whose father had died in the Coastguard, I had received a letter from a parish priest at Cork nearly three weeks before, asking if a boy named Joseph Crowley, whose father had died on the 5th of August, 1867, in the Coastguard at Moville, would be received, when I directed my secretary to reply in the affirmative, and sent 1*s.* to pay the boy's passage down. This boy was one of the 13, and had he acted according to the instructions sent to the parish priest, and brought my secretary's letter with him to my office, he would have been entered if eligible. This boy has again presented himself to-day with his papers, and having been found physically fit, will be entered. (Signed) R. V. HAMILTON, Rear Admiral commanding, Queenstown."

MEDICAL REFORM.

MR. ERRINGTON asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether he will agree to the appointment of a Select Committee to continue the inquiry commenced in 1878 into important questions of Medical Reform?

MR. MUNDELLA, in reply, said, the Government did not see any probability of a Medical Bill being passed this Session; and, therefore, they had no intention of introducing it. Some advantage might, however, result from the continuation of the inquiries begun by the Select Committee of 1878, and the Government had now the whole question under consideration, and should be very glad to confer with his hon. Friend on the subject.

ARMY—REPORT OF LORD AIREY'S COMMITTEE.

COLONEL ALEXANDER asked the Secretary of State for War, When the Report of Lord Airey's Committee will be laid upon the Table?

MR. CHILDERS: In reply to the hon. and gallant Member I have to state that I have felt much hesitation as to my duty with reference to laying the Report of Lord Airey's Committee on the Table, because, first, it was not a Royal Commission, or even a Departmental Committee, but only a Committee composed exclusively of military officers invited to advise the late Secretary of State for War on certain military questions; secondly, because I am aware that it was not the intention of my Predecessor (Colonel Stanley), who appointed the Committee, to lay the Report, or at least the whole of it, on the Table; and, thirdly, because the Report goes far beyond the official instructions of the Secretary of State for War, and, indeed, deals with certain detailed questions of pay, as to which Parliament is very jealous of the action of military officers. On the other hand, I find that, by what means I do not know, a great part of the Report has found its way into the Press, and has been printed in certain newspapers verbatim; and, if I now declined to present it to Parliament, I should raise suspicions for which there would really be no foundation. I have, therefore, decided to lay the Report on the Table as soon as I have an opportunity of explaining to the House the measures which I propose to introduce with regard to the organization of the Army. I will take care that it is circulated immediately after I have moved the Army Estimates. I propose, at the same time, to present some additional Papers on the subject, and to reprint the Report of the Militia Committee of 1877, over which the late Secretary of State for War presided, and certain Papers of 1872 and 1873 on the subject of linking regiments.

CYPRUS—FLOODS AT LIMASSOL.

Mr. RYLANDS asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether his attention has been directed to a letter from the Cyprus Correspondent of the "Daily News," in which the writer, referring to the recent serious floods at Limassol, says that

> "the general opinion among the native population is that these inundations were in a great measure due to the road to Patras and Trodos having been constructed by the Royal Engineers through the old beds of watercourses, and to the road to Polymedia, which is said to have been made too high;"

and, whether he is able to give the House any information upon the subject?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Sir, the chief streets of Limassol are, I am informed, mainly watercourses, and in very many instances the houses have been built across these watercourses. In the late inundations much of the water appears to have come from the village of Aïa Phyllia, about three or four miles from Limassol. Here there is a regular river bed, which, however, is mostly ploughed up and cultivated. In ordinary seasons the little water collected in the channel suffices only to irrigate this land. As the river bed approaches Limassol it widens out, till at last the banks are no longer apparent, except by a slight undulation. The whole bed is laid out in fields, which are banked up and terraced so as to retain the moisture, and thus the torrent was continually obstructed, until it gained such a head as to burst all bounds. On approaching Limassol its course carries it into the little river Garilis; but at the point of juncture a massive stone wall exists, apparently built many years ago for embanking the river, and the stream was thus headed back to the town, upon which it burst, with the result which we all know. This is the substance of what we have heard up to this time; but it may, of course, be modified by further Reports.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — GIPSY CHILDREN.

Mr. T. C. THOMPSON asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether his attention has been called to the number of gipsy children growing up without any education; to the difficulty of enforcing their attendance at our public and elementary schools; to the objection which the labouring population have to the mixing of gipsy children with their children; and whether he proposes to take any steps in the matter?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, my attention has been frequently called of late to the number of so-called gipsy children who are growing up without education. I believe the greater part are not gipsies, but children of persons of wandering habits, who attend races, fairs, and similar places of resort. It is quite true that the presence of these children is very often objected to; but the difficulties of enforcing attendance are considerably diminished by the Act which came into operation on the 1st of this month. Under that Act byelaws everywhere exist; and, instead of their applying to the parish only, they extend throughout the Union, so that they are not so easily evaded as formerly. Moreover, it is not now necessary to prove "habitual neglect;" the local authorities can proceed against the parents for a single absence, so that if local authorities will do their duty this class of children can be much more easily reached than formerly. If, as is suggested, anything more is to be done, such as registering travelling carts, vans, &c., it must be done, as in the case of the canal boats, by the Local Government Board.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT) — TELEGRAPH CLERKS AT LIVERPOOL.

Mr. WHITLEY asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is true that the clerks in the Telegraph Department at Liverpool have had deductions made from their overtime payment for compulsory half-holidays on Saturday; and, whether it is true that such clerks have to perform Sunday duty without pay?

MR. FAWCETT, in reply, said, that it was quite true that some time since the telegraph clerks in Liverpool had to work out the hours lost by the Saturday half-holiday during the rest of the week; but the practice now had been entirely discontinued. With regard to Sunday labour, the clerks at Liverpool were exactly in the same position as in any other Provincial town where the office was open on Sunday. They were engaged to work 54 hours a-week, and a portion of that work was done on Sunday.

THE ALKALI ACTS—LEGISLATION.

MR. WILBRAHAM EGERTON asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether, in the present state of public business, he would consider the propriety of introducing a Bill for the amendment of the Alkali Acts in the House of Lords?

MR. DODSON, in reply, said, that he had had this matter under his consideration, and it had been determined to introduce a Bill on the subject in the House of Lords. The Bill would, he hoped, be ready shortly.

POST OFFICE—RE-DIRECTED LETTERS.

MR. CARBUTT asked the Postmaster General, If he is aware that letters in Switzerland and France which arrive after the owner of them has left the place to which they are addressed are forwarded free of charge to any other address to which he may have departed; and, if he will state why the same convenience cannot be accorded by the English Post Office? He also asked whether letters sent to that House could not be forwarded free of cost to hon. Members when they had gone into the country?

MR. FAWCETT: It is the case, Sir, as stated by the hon. Member, that in Switzerland and France letters are re-directed to any address without charge. I am informed that the only reason why that is not done in this country is the trouble and expense. Letters are re-directed and forwarded to any part of the same town without charge. With respect to Members of Parliament, I believe I am correct in stating any letters directed to this House are forwarded to any address in the country, when necessary, without charge.

SOUTH AFRICA—MILITARY OPERATIONS IN BASUTOLAND.

MR. RYLANDS asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government are in possession of information, confirmatory or otherwise, of the intelligence given in the "Times" that on the 14th instant Colonel Carington had a desperate engagement with 5,000 Basutos, on which occasion 950 Burghers, mostly Dutchmen, deserted; and, whether there is any reason to believe that, as stated, sympathy with the Transvaal influenced the action of the deserting Burghers?

MR. GRANT DUFF: In reply to my hon. Friend's first Question I have to say that Sir George Colley has informed us that what he describes as the precipitate retreat of the Burghers broke the formation of the Yeomanry, and might have caused disaster but for the Cape Mounted Rifles. In reply to his second Question, I have to say that some of the Burghers behaved well; and no information that has reached us enables me to say that the precipitate retreat of the rest was resorted to from political rather than from prudential motives.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AMENDMENTS TO THE ADDRESS.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the hon. Member for Eye, Whether, considering the state of Public Business, he did not think it better to take off the Paper the Amendment to the Address of which he had given Notice, and defer to some more convenient opportunity the discussion of the very important subject to which it referred?

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, that in deference to the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman he would not proceed with his Amendment.

MR. GORST asked the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, Whether, in the present state of Public Business, he thought it necessary further to prolong the debate on the Address by proposing to add thereto a request to Her Majesty to act at the Cape of Good Hope in accordance with the intentions which Her Majesty had already expressed in Her Gracious Speech?

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, that when last a Question was put on this matter, he understood the Prime Minister to inform him that there would be an opportunity to raise this question on the Address; and he also understood, from the nature of the right hon. Gentleman's reply, that it would probably be impossible to raise it at any other time. As, in his humble opinion, he thought it a matter of urgency that something should be done to bring the war in Basutóland to a close he had given this Notice. But when he came down to the House, the Speaker was good enough to inform him that, as he had spoken on the first night of the debate on the Address, he would not be at liberty to move the Amendment. The Speaker also informed him that he was perfectly at liberty to do so on Report. That was a step he intended to take, because he believed it was a matter of urgency. If, in the meantime, Her Majesty's Government should be able, as he was sure they would be happy to do if they could, to state that any practical steps were being taken to put a stop to the bloodshed in Basutoland, that, of course, would alter his intention.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, there was one point in the reply of his hon. Friend with regard to which he should not wish to be misunderstood. He was not aware that he had conveyed to his hon. Friend any opinion upon the question whether it would or would not be practicable to find an opportunity for discussing the subject apart from the Address. He did not think he did. He certainly did not intend to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he was sorry if he misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman; but that was his impression.

Mr. PARNELL said, that with the permission of the House he would ask the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle a Question. It was, Whether, in the event of any other Member who has not spoken on the Address, or any of the other Amendments moved to the Address, undertakes to move the Amendment which stands in the name of the hon. Member for Carlisle, he will consent to such a course and give his support to such Amendment so moved? He might state in explanation that, as he thought the war in Basutoland was a matter of considerable importance, he should not think it desirable the opportunity of debating it should be lost; but he should not undertake such a course as he had mentioned without the concurrence of the hon. Member for Carlisle.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he certainly should prefer to move his own Motion; but he had no control over hon. Members. As he had stated, he could not move the Amendment on the Address; therefore, he should move it on the Report.

INDIA—COMMITTEE ON MILITARY ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES.

Mr. BUXTON asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether he can state to the House the names of the members of the committee which, by his despatch, No. 73, to the Government of India, dated November 4, 1880, he

> "Has deemed it his duty to appoint, to inquire into the system of Military Account and Estimate in India, and as to the relations existing between the Military Account Department and the Comptroller General, and to report whether any defects exist therein; and, if so, the best mode of remedying them;"

Whether that committee will sit in London or in India; and, whether their report will be laid upon the Table of the House?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, the following are the Members of the Committee on the Military Account and Estimate:—Hon. Edmund Drummond, Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Council of India, formerly Auditor General in India, and Secretary to the Government of India in the Financial Department; Sir Thomas Seccombe, Assistant Under Secretary of State for India, formerly Financial Secretary to the India Office; Sir George Kellner, formerly Military Accountant General in India; Mr. Welby, Assistant Financial Secretary to the Treasury; Mr. White, Accountant General to the War Office; and Mr. Harrison, formerly Comptroller General in India. The Committee sat in London and has recently made its Report; but the evidence has not yet been received. There will be no objection to laying the Report on the Table of the House with the evidence, after it has been considered by the Secretary of State in Council and communicated to the Government of India.

TREATY OF BERLIN—TURKEY AND GREECE.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any, and, if so, what steps are being taken by Her Majesty's Government, with or without the concert of the other Powers, to avert war between Turkey and Greece?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the Powers have been, and are still, in active communication with a view to secure a peaceful solution of the Greek Question. A proposal that Turkey and Greece should agree to submit to arbitration has been abandoned. A fresh Note has been received from the Porte; but it is impossible for me at present to state to the House what further steps will be the result of the deliberations of the Powers.

AFGHANISTAN—THE BLUE BOOK.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether a statement which appeared in one of the morning newspapers that day, to the effect that a Blue Book relating to the affairs of Afghanistan was issued yesterday, was correct? He observed in the same newspaper that a summary was given of what purports to be the contents of the Blue Book, and he should like to ask, when it would be delivered to the House; also, whether he would take steps to prevent the practice, now on the increase, of allowing the publication of the contents of important Blue Books in the newspapers several days in advance of their delivery to the Members of the House?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I was informed by the printers that the Blue Book on the affairs of Afghanistan would be distributed yesterday, and I believe that some copies of the Book were distributed. I have inquired this morning why the distribution was not made completely yesterday, and I have not yet received any satisfactory reply; but I am informed, like many other matters, to some extent the delay was caused by the state of the weather. I have not seen the statement made in the newspaper to which my hon. Friend refers; and, therefore, I cannot say whether the summary it contains is correct or not. I quite agree with my hon. Friend it is inconvenient and objectionable that newspapers should obtain copies of Papers before they are presented to the House; and, so far as it is in my power, I will endeavour to put a stop to the practice.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

DR. LYONS asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, When he can lay upon the Table the Second Report of the Royal Commission appointed in January 1878 to inquire into, amongst other things, the claims of the officers of the Registry Deeds Office, Dublin, to an increase of pay and improvement as to their status and emoluments generally?

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH: Sir, the Report of the Registry of Deeds Commission (Ireland) has been drawn up and signed by the Commissioners; but it cannot be presented without an Appendix, which is now in course of preparation, and which will, it is hoped, be very shortly completed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∞0∞—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [ELEVENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [6th January].

And which Amendment was,

At the end thereof, to add the words "That we humbly pray Her Majesty to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session."—(*Mr. Dawson.*)

MR. THOROLD ROGERS: I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask your opinion, Sir, whether any Member of this House can bring before it a Motion expressed in terms which ask Her Majesty to submit a measure to Parliament? I wish to know whether any hon. Member can address Her Majesty with a request of that character? I venture to think that the language of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) is inaccurate and unconstitutional.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Southwark, having called my attention to the form in which the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carlow is put, I am bound to say that it is, technically speaking, inaccurate in its phraseology; and, in consequence of this informality, it could not be put in its present form from the Chair. It is not a proper expression to pray Her Majesty to submit measures to Parliament. It is clearly not the function of Her Majesty to submit measures to this House. Therefore, my attention having been called to the matter, I am bound to rule that the Amendment is irregular.

MR. DAWSON: As my Amendment only requires a verbal alteration, may I ask you, Sir, whether I may be allowed an opportunity of making that alteration, so that the Amendment may be submitted to the House in a regular form?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member ask leave to withdraw his Amendment for the purpose of bringing it up in another form? Is that what I understand the hon. Member to say?

MR. DAWSON: If that be the ordinary course I shall ask permission to do so. I ask the permission of the House to withdraw the Amendment for the purpose of being enabled to bring it up in an altered form.

MR. SPEAKER: That can only be done by leave of the House. I will therefore put the Question to the House. Is it your pleasure that the Amendment be withdrawn? [*Cries of* "No!"]

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: I should like to know, Sir, whether you have decided that the Amendment in its present shape cannot be submitted to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes; the hon. Member is quite correct. In its present form the Amendment cannot be properly submitted to the House. I understand that the hon. Member for Carlow desires to ask the leave of the House to withdraw the Amendment for the purpose of bringing it up in a more correct form. I ask the House therefore—Is it your pleasure that the Amendment be withdrawn? [*Cries of* "No" *and* "Yes!"]

MR. HERMON: If the House permits the Amendment to be withdrawn for the purpose of amending it, I presume that hon. Members who have already spoken in the debate will not be allowed to speak again.

MR. GORST: May I ask you a question, Sir? Suppose the House should refuse to allow the Amendment to be withdrawn, would you, Sir, then put from the Chair an Amendment which you yourself have ruled to be disorderly?

MR. SPEAKER: If the House refuses to allow the Amendment to be withdrawn it falls to the ground.

MR. PARNELL: I would ask you, Sir, with your permission, whether the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for the Borough of Carlow has not already been put from the Chair, and whether, consequently, it is not already before the House? I apprehend, Sir, that a debate could not have arisen on the Amendment of my hon. Friend unless the Amendment in question had been first put by you from the Chair, and had become a question of discussion. Unless it were so all the discussion which has taken place upon the Amendment would have been irregular. I was not able to be in my place in the House yesterday; but I apprehend that, following the universal custom, you, Sir, put the Amendment of my hon. Friend from the Chair, and that, consequently, it came before the House. Therefore, the point of Order which has been raised by the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) is raised too late. As the matter now stands, it is not so much one for your jurisdiction as for that of the House. I apprehend that, previous to the Amendment being put from the Chair, you had full and perfect authority; but that now it has been debated during one Sitting of the House, and is now on again for discussion in another, that it comes more especially within the cognizance of the House. I make these observations, Sir, without intending the slightest disrespect to you or to the House, and without any desire in any way to controvert your ruling; but I certainly do think that the matter is now not so much within the jurisdiction of the House as one for the House itself to decide. I think my argument is supported by what has taken place, because you, Sir, in asking the House whether it was the pleasure of the House that the Amendment should be withdrawn, clearly intimated that it was a matter within the cognizance of the House whether it should be withdrawn or not. The House not having agreed with unanimity that the Amendment should be withdrawn, I submit that the Amendment is still before the House, and must necessarily remain before the House until the House has come to a decision upon it. My point, Sir, is this—that the objection of the hon. Member for Southwark comes too late, seeing that the Question has been put from the Chair, and the matter is now solely within the jurisdiction of the House.

MR. GLADSTONE: I hope we shall pass away from the argument just placed before the House by the hon. Member for the City of Cork in the mode which, under the circumstances, appears to me to be the most expedient and desirable—namely, that we should permit the withdrawal of the Amendment, and not inquire too nicely as to the matter of form. I think it is somewhat hard on the part of the hon. Member (Mr. Dawson) that we, having allowed the Question to be put from the Chair whether the Amendment should be withdrawn as if it were a regular Amendment, should be rebuked by the hon. Member for Cork, and held bound to the admission that it is a regular Amendment. I entirely differ from the arguments of the hon. Gentleman. He appears to be desirous of putting words of wisdom into your mouth, Sir, of which I very much doubt the necessity; but I humbly and respectfully suggest that the Amendment should be allowed to be withdrawn, and that the debate should go on. That would be convenient to all parties; but I hope, also, that what has fallen from the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hermon) will be taken notice of by the House. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to raise the point, because no one would avail himself of his own wrong, and having already spoken to an informal Amendment, would not wish to address the House again on the same subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Question has been finally put I wish to say that my attention having been drawn to an informality, I am bound to decline to put the Question to the House, seeing that there is an informality in it. With regard to the observation of the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hermon) I have no hesitation in saying that Members having already spoken on the informal Amendment will not be entitled to speak again on the formal Amendment. As the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) has already spoken to the Question before the House, he is not entitled to bring it up again in an amended form; but any hon. Member who has not spoken to the question is at liberty to do so. I will now put the Question formally—Is it your pleasure that the Amendment be withdrawn?

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "And we humbly assure Her Majesty that, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that when he rose last evening to address the House on the Amendment he did not intend to occupy many minutes of time, nor would his observations now extend to any undue length. The existence of a grievance in regard to the franchise in Ireland had been conceded by the Government, and yet they were practically denied redress. Last Session they came within measurable distance of reform on this question; but this Session it had entirely eluded their grasp. The refusal to afford redress for this grievance was an important factor in the present discontent in Ireland, and an element of disturbance. It would, he contended, greatly conduce to the stability of matters in Ireland and the preservation of the public peace if, instead of compelling those Irishmen who were entitled to vote to have recourse to public meetings and agitation for the purpose of influencing the political affairs of their country, they should be permitted to give effect to their political opinions at the polling booths. The argument by which Irish Members were met was that this matter was not urgent. Well, it seemed to him that in the opinion of the Government nothing was urgent in connection with Ireland except coercion. They had recently heard a great deal about a policy of exasperation. To his mind, the suspension of the Constitution was the real policy of exasperation. ["Question!"] The hon. Member was proceeding to make further observations on the subject of coercion, when——

Mr. J. W. PEASE: I rise to Order. Is the hon. Member in Order in discussing the question of Order upon the Amendment now before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is bound to confine himself strictly to the Question before the House.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he would readily obey the ruling of the Chair. He had been endeavouring to show, when interrupted, why it would be better for the Government to accede to the suggestion of the Amendment before the House than to have recourse to repressive measures restrictive of the rights and liberties of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound to draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the Amendment before the House relates exclusively to the Irish franchise.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN would say no more except this—that he believed every topic he had touched upon had been opened by the speeches of hon. Members opposite; and he thought it hard that when the Irish Members were assailed by speeches intended to influence the opinions of the House they should not be allowed to reply. He considered the extension of the borough franchise would be a more healing measure than the proposed suspension of the Constitution; and he thought that a week lost in discussing the question in that Assembly would be a week gained for freedom in another part of the world.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS wished to say a very few words—to do more would be to show a great want of taste, this being the 14th day since the publication of the Royal Speech—by way of protest to prevent possible misunderstanding. He drew the attention of the House to the fact that not a single speech had been made on the Amendment before it by Members of the regular Opposition. What he desired to explain was that Conservative Members who abstained from speaking on this question out of regard for the progress of Business must not be understood to admit that the proposed alteration in the Irish franchise was merely a question of time. They reserved their right of protesting against the alteration on a future occasion.

Mr. PARNELL said, that, so far as he was concerned, he regretted that a division had not taken place yesterday. It had been the intention of the Irish Members to take a division, and he was afraid that he was personally responsible for that intention not having been carried out. He came down to the House in time to divide, and found it had been determined, in consequence of his absence, to carry the discussion on to that day. He had not been able to get to the House in time to prevent that determination from being carried out; and he wished to express his regret that in consequence of his absence any Members of the House should have been inconvenienced by the division not having taken place yesterday. He did not, however, see any reason why a division should not be taken now upon the Amendment. He wished to explain why the Irish Members had found it necessary to bring forward this Amendment. There was a very general belief in Ireland—a belief not altogether unjustified by the circumstances of the case—that Her Majesty's Government were not in earnest with reference to this question of the borough franchise. As a matter of fact, the Solicitor General for Ireland would not represent the constituency which he now so ably represented if the borough franchise were enlarged; and if a similar measure were passed respecting the county franchise his right hon. and learned Colleague the Attorney General would find himself in a similar disagreeable position. Such circumstances as these must weigh on any Government. It was not in the nature of the case to suppose that the Government should feel any desire or eagerness to consummate a reform of this character when they knew that it would be attended by many losses to themselves of their supporters in Ireland. When they came to examine the Queen's Speech they found still further ground for this belief. Last Session Her Majesty's Speech referred to the desirability of assimilating the borough franchise in Ireland to that of England; but before the Session was a month old the measure was shelved by the withdrawal of the Bill, and not a single measure desired by the people of Ireland was passed by Parliament. The only measure of any importance passed for Ireland was to take £750,000 out of the pockets of the Irish people and transfer it to the pockets of the Irish landlords. Two small Bills which did not give rise to any discussion were passed without opposition by the House, and were contemptuously rejected by the House of Lords. When they came to consider Her Majesty's Speech this Session the Irish Members naturally expected that Her Majesty would have attempted to carry out her promise of last Session before she proceeded to make fresh promises with regard to Ireland; but, instead of any reference to the Irish Borough Franchise Question, there was merely a promise to bring in a County Government Bill, a measure involving so many important considerations, and so closely connected with county government in England, that it would tax the undivided energies of Parliament during the greater part of an entire Session. As the questions of coercion and Land Reform must come on first, what could the Irish people think of the *bona fides* of Her Majesty's Speech when it referred to county government, the Ministers knowing quite well that it was perfectly impossible that the promise could be fulfilled. The Irish Borough Franchise Question had been ripened by discussions during the last Parliament, and was a matter in regard to which no second opinion was entertained in that House. It could have been disposed of, as far, at least, as regarded a second reading, in a single Sitting. The Irish Members, therefore, had a right to complain of an apparent want of *bona fides* on the part of the Advisers of the Crown. The Irish people could think nothing else but that Her Majesty's Ministers were not sincere in their promises. If they looked to the fact that the Government did not know their own mind on the Land Question, which they plainly showed by shrinking from stating what measure of Land Reform they intended to propose, the only possible inference which the Irish people could draw was that the only measure intended for them was the brutal, the worn out, and the useless measure of coercion which was to be forced down the throats of the Irish Members. He regretted that the Government should have yielded to the Conservative Party and adopted the policy so persistently preached by the Conservative organs of opinion. He regretted extremely that the Government had allowed themselves to be dictated to by the Party of re-action; that they should have forgotten the great wave of Liberal opinion which placed them in power, and which expected them to carry out a policy of governing Ireland by goodwill and affection, rather than by the bayonets of the police.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 36; Noes 274: Majority 238.—(Div. List, No. 6.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. O'KELLY, in rising to move as an Amendment the addition of the words—

> "And we humbly pray Her Majesty to guarantee to the people of Ireland their constitutional rights of public meeting,"

said, that the importance of the subject prevented him from offering any apology for bringing it forward at that late period. The condition of the Irish people was such that even the right to complain was withheld from them. The Irish people, instead of being in the condition of a free people, were in that of the French under the rule of the First Napoleon. Their right to meet in public for the purpose of discussing their grievances was at an end. Before they could meet to discuss their grievances in such a manner as to call the attention of Parliament to them, they must first obtain the permission of a class in the country whose interests were opposed to the removal of those grievances. They were altogether at the mercy of any two magistrates, and of any persons who might choose to swear falsely that riot or tumult was likely to result from the holding of the meeting. That this was no idle danger was amply proved by the number of meetings which had been proclaimed, while in no single instance had riot or tumult resulted from those meetings which had been held. Thus in Ireland men were no longer permitted to discharge the duties or to exercise the rights of free citizens within the law. Even in Russia, as long as the subject conducted himself lawfully and did no act which was outside the pale of the Russian law, the subject was permitted to exercise his rights. But that was not the case in Ireland. In Ireland they had reached that state that men, supposed to be living in a free country, to be ruled by a free Constitution, could no longer exercise the rights supposed to be guaranteed by that Constitution. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had admitted in that House that, in his opinion, any two magistrates in Ireland had the right to forbid any public meeting. That statement was made nakedly and boldly. He believed that in theory the people of Ireland were regarded as freemen—that they were supposed to enjoy all the liberties and privileges of Englishmen; but the reverse was the case. He would appeal to the English Radical section of the House to say whether such things were in accordance with their ideas of liberty—whether they would be a party to sustaining in their own country, or what they claimed as part of their own country, a law which was so unjust and unequal. What would be the feelings of hon. Members if they were told by the Home Secretary that the English magistrates could forbid a public meeting in England? In the case of Ireland the objections to the exercise of such powers were still greater than in the case of England, because the Irish magistracy belonged to a special class—a class whose interests and feelings ran counter to the interests and feelings of the Irish people. They mingled only with landlords' society, and were imbued with their prejudices. They took every opportunity of straining the law so as to deprive the people of Ireland of even that scant liberty which was afforded to them under existing laws. The Irish magistracy exercised, by virtue of reading a proclamation, a power which a King would not dare to exercise—that if he did exercise he would risk his head. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh; but he would like to see the English King who would, of his own accord, order the troops to fire on the people. Even in France, under Napoleon, the people were always warned by the beating of the drum before firing. He begged to call the attention of the House to the importance of the Amendment, because if they expected the people of Ireland to obey the Constitution, if they really wanted to conciliate them and to put an end to that tendency crime and outrage, which some hon. Members affected so much to deplore, they must begin by making the people of Ireland understand that this country wished to treat them as, and place them on an equality with, the other constituents of the Empire. They must, in short, stop all police interference with the liberties of the Irish people. In conclusion, he wished to ask the House, and more particularly the Government, whether it was by them deemed advisable, in order to strengthen the existing law, to pass measures which were, in fact, the creation of that Party in the House which had no sympathy either with Liberalism or with the Home Rule Party?

Mr. SMITHWICK seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "and we humbly pray Her Majesty to guarantee to the people of Ireland their constitutional rights of public meeting."—(*Mr. O'Kelly.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I rise for the purpose of saying what will not detain the House more than two or three minutes. The hon. Gentleman has made a Motion which undoubtedly involves matters of the greatest importance; but I wish to state, upon the part of the Government, without at all attempting to limit the discretion of the House, that we do not think it becoming or expedient for the public interest that we should enter, on the present occasion, into a debate upon this Amendment. In the first place, I think that a question of so much gravity and importance to be brought before the House should not be brought forward without adequate and proper Notice; and, in the second place, I say that there is no cause for renewing the discussion to-day, which the hon. Gentleman himself introduced by one of those inconvenient and irregular Motions made at the time of putting Questions on one of the first days of the Session—more especially when we bear in mind what happened on that occasion, namely, that the hon. Member and his Friends occupied three hours in the discussion of this very subject. It is perfectly plain that at that time their opinion was that no substantive decision was required upon the subject, because, if they thought that a substantial expression of opinion was necessary, all that had to be done was to give Notice of an Amendment to the Address, but instead of that they took the highly inconvenient course of raising a discussion on the adjournment of the House; and we cannot consent to renew it on the occasion of its re-introduction in this manner, which is also highly inconvenient and not befitting the importance of the subject, and also without any Notice at all. But, Sir, without using any words of warning, but eschewing them altogether—for I consider it highly expedient to avoid them—I have, in a single sentence, to state on my own part, and on the part of my Colleagues, that the reason for our declining to enter into a general discussion of this question now is that it would be highly inexpedient in the present state of Public Business. It is not necessary for me to give any opinion further than this—that I think by prolonging the debate I should aggravate the position in which we are placed; and as I am not willing to take any lot or part in aggravating that inconvenience and resistance from which grave consequences may result, for these reasons, and not from any personal disrespect, I must decline to follow the hon. Gentleman into a discussion on the important subject he has introduced.

MR. HEALY had no doubt the inconvenience to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred was very much felt by the House; but the irregular and inconvenient discussions had taken place owing to the conduct of the Government. As long as the Government permitted armed forces to disperse meetings in Ireland, so long must the Irish Members bring the facts before the House. They cared nothing for considerations of the kind mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman. They cared nothing for the state of Public Business, and they cared nothing for the question of certain Rules of procedure in the House, when matters which, in their opinion, were of much greater importance were entirely disregarded by those responsible for the conduct of Public Business. The right hon. Gentleman apparently thought it a trivial matter that a meeting of 10,000 persons should be exposed to the buckshot of the Irish Constabulary. The right hon. Gentleman wished to avoid discussion on the subject; but he told him straight that if he did not govern Ireland constitutionally he must expect those irregular discussions to spring up again and again. The Irish Members would carefully watch every occasion of interference with the right of public meeting in Ireland, and bring it under the notice of Parliament. If the Prime Minister wished to get rid of the inconvenience thereby caused, he had only to get rid of them. They were quite willing to get out of the House at the very first opportunity, and they had no desire to intrude upon the time of the House if the Prime Minister would only carry the measures they wished.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, he regretted that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland had left the House; but he attributed his departure to a disinclination to state the law with regard to public meetings in Ireland. The Chief Secretary was not a lawyer; and, therefore, it was no disparagement to his eminent qualities to say that they did not look upon him as a very high legal authority. However, in the absence of the hon. and learned Solicitor General, he hoped the Chief Secretary would rise and tell them on what ground peaceable citizens assembled for a lawful purpose could be dispersed by armed force, so that they might know what to expect in the future. Judging from the tactics adopted by the magistrates and military in Ireland, there was a substantial difference between the law in the two countries. In England the magistrates had power to prohibit public meetings; but they could not disperse a prohibited assemblage until a riot occurred, and until the Riot Act could be read. In Ireland, on the contrary, if a prohibited meeting was attempted to be held, they were liable to be at once fired upon by the military and police.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, it seemed to him that without any Coercion Act whatever the right of public meeting was now perishing in Ireland. In the county which he had the honour to represent, a meeting was called simply for the purpose of forming a local branch of the Land League. There was but one sentence in the notice convening the meeting on which any hold could be taken, and it was one merely asking the people to assemble in their thousands. But for several days before the day of meeting notice was given—even in the chapels—that no demonstration and no thousands were required; and yet, at the instance of a large landed proprietor in the neighbourhood, informations were made and forwarded to Dublin Castle to the effect that a breach of the peace was to be apprehended if the meeting were allowed to be held. The landed proprietor to whom he referred, perhaps, thought he would be denounced because he knew he deserved to be denounced; but, be that as it might, the meeting was prohibited. In spite, however, of that fact, and of the presence of a large force of military and constabulary in the town, the branch of the Land League—the sole object of the meeting — was formed. Under existing circumstances, what meetings could be held in Ireland? Most landlords and land agents were magistrates, and carried out some evictions, and had reason to fear, in their own inner consciousness, that their acts would be remembered, and their dealings would be censured by the people. So straightway they laid their informations before the Crown, and the right of public meeting perished in Ireland. He had lately remarked that after the General Election, while Her Majesty's Ministers were fresh from contact with their constituencies, they had some feeling and ear for statements of that kind; but Office seemed to be hardening their hearts, and now Irish Members pleaded to deaf ears when they spoke of the grievances of Ireland.

Mr. T. C. THOMPSON said, he had been in hopes that some Member of the Ministry would have risen to state that the law in Ireland as to public meetings was not exactly what it had been represented to be. He had hoped that there was no such thing in the United Kingdom as inability for men to meet together to express their grievances. It would be a pity that it should go forth to-morrow to the public that Her Majesty's Ministers were in favour of restricting the right of public meeting. It had been a great argument that Ireland was to be treated in the same way as England; but what would be the feeling in England if public meetings could be suppressed? There must be some mistake in the suggestion that Ireland was under such a grievous despotism. If she were, it was high time that some steps should be taken to alter the state of affairs; and he knew no way in which that step could be taken more speedily than by praying in the reply to the Address to the Throne for relief from the grievances under which the hon. Members said they laboured.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that this was not a question of the right of free speech, but of life or death to the Irish people. He was really astonished that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland did not rise at once to give an answer to the representation just made, as it indicated that the Radicalism below the Gangway was breaking loose from the Ministerial chain. The tone of the Prime Minister contrasted favourably with his needless heat the other day; and as long as the right hon. Gentleman maintained his moderate tone, the subject might be discussed with self-restraint. But what was the good of giving Irish Members time to lay their grievances before the House, if no practical result followed in the shape of redress? They wanted the Chief Secretary for Ireland to declare that the right of public meeting was not abrogated, and that the people were not at the mercy of any two Orange magistrates, with the right hon. Gentleman as a mouthpiece. If an English King, on his own responsibility, attempted to disperse a public meeting in England, as the Chief Secretary for Ireland was now occasionally doing in Ireland, it would cost him his head. The English people had shown their feelings on this subject in 1866, when the railings of Hyde Park were thrown down. On that occasion, Liberal Members supported the people in asserting the right of public meeting, and the event had a beneficent influence on the destinies of the country, for if it had not occurred we might have been tinkering away with the suffrage up to this day. In the great social revolt against landlordism which was now taking place in Ireland, there was upon the one side the Irish people, and upon the other that despotic, hungering, and wicked minority of landlords whom British rule planted on Irish soil, and whom British rule was now endeavouring to preserve, when the Irish people had it in its last gasp. In that great war the landlords had not only the armed forces of England behind them—they had not only the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary of a Liberal Government at their back; but they themselves occupied the magisterial bench, and held the scales of justice in their own favour, robbing and slaying the Irish people. The Chief Secretary for Ireland ought to offer a stern resistance to the machinations of the magistrates, instead of allowing them to dictate to him his policy and to raise false cries of danger to peace. The way in which the magistrates abused their power was shown by the proclamation of the Brookborough meeting, which passed off peaceably with an Orangeman in the chair, and demonstrated the community of feeling between Orangemen and Catholics. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had been invited to attend a meeting which was to take place at Drogheda on Sunday; but it was proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant, on sworn information that it was to be held "for the purpose of denouncing and intimidating certain of Her Majesty's subjects." He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) knew that paragraph in the information was utterly without foundation. He had seen the resolutions to be proposed, and there was not a single word in them that could have given rise to the proclamation. Yet, in order to prevent the mowing down of the people by the soldiery and policemen who were present to prevent the holding of the meeting, he advised the crowd to disperse and assemble elsewhere, and there was not anything in the speeches made to that assembly that could at all justify the conduct of the Government in the matter. The fact was the Irish people lived under the rule of a despotic Government. How different was the state of things in Ireland from that which ruled in this country! In England the right of public meeting was not only acquiesced in, but upheld by, the Government; but in Ireland it was both denied and trampled upon. Every day that he had lived in England, breathing a free atmosphere, he became more and more indignant at the manner in which his country had been treated by the English Government. In fact, the freedom which existed in England, the liberty of English institutions, and the liberty of public meeting, only brought into deeper relief and stronger contrast the negation of all these rights in the case of Ireland. Yet it was a Liberal Government that attempted to tamper with Liberal principles. If Government attempted to put down the right of public meeting in this country they would bring about a repetition of the Peterloo massacre; and that was what any Administration of the day, be it Whig or Tory, would shrink from. It might, perhaps, be said that he spoke with warmth, but certainly not with a warmth disproportionate to the importance of the question; for, if the system of suppressing public meetings continued, English politicians had better take the advice of Mr. Froude, who said England had the choice of allowing Ireland to govern herself and of ruling her despotically. If the Government were going to govern Ireland despotically, for goodness sake let them say so; but they should not keep up a sham of Constitutionalism, and, at the same time, deprive them of every right of the Constitution. He contended that the Chief Secretary for Ireland had proved himself to be unequal to the situation in which he was placed. They found at the present moment respectable traders in towns dragged off to police cells and refused bail; public meetings were suppressed on flimsy pretexts; and the lives of the people were threatened with soldiers and police. In the face of all this the Government had the audacity to come forward and ask for a further suspension of Constitutional rights. He would guarantee that the discussions in that House by Irish Members would be brought within reasonable limits, if only the Prime Minister would undertake to treat Ireland as England was treated. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had been the means of leading the right hon. Gentleman astray. On the head of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, then, the responsibility must rest of having betrayed the Liberal Party, and of having formed direct designs against the liberties of the Irish people. If report spoke true, he had not hesitated even openly to avow this; proving that of all who ever held power the most dangerous was the weak man when he got the reins of the State within his grasp.

MR. BYRNE supported the Amendment, as he considered the lives of the people of Ireland should no longer be left in the hands of the Irish police, who thought they were commissioned to do as they liked. Instead, however, of being protected from the insolent tyranny of that force, they were now threatened with coercion, loss of liberty, and official ascendancy. Matters had come to a grave crisis in Ireland when persons under 21 years of age were taken possession of by the police and taken to Dublin without the knowledge of their parents. He argued that the House ought to legislate for the whole Kingdom, and not for one section of it. The late Government allowed people in Ireland to starve and die without lifting a hand to save them, and now this Government were taking from them their rights and liberty. As to the outrages reported in Ireland, which had been exaggerated one hundred-fold, the poisoner, William Palmer, of Rugeley, committed more murders than had been committed in Ireland in the course of an entire year. Before, then, they pronounced a verdict against Ireland on this point, he held that they were sitting in that House as a jury, and that they ought to have the most reliable evidence before them that they could get. The name of Judge Fitzgerald having been mentioned, he thought that Judge should be summoned to the bar of the House, so that they could have his evidence, and cross-examine him; but he did not think he should hang anyone on the evidence manufactured by the police.

Mr. SPEAKER here reminded the hon. Member that he was not speaking to the Question before the House, which was the right of public meeting.

Mr. BYRNE said, that England was a Republic in everything but name, and it was only in Ireland that they found that the British Constitution did not exist. The right of public meeting was not restricted in England, or in any part of the British Empire; and he protested strongly and most emphatically against the right being withheld from the Irish people whenever bad legislation required that they should hold such meetings.

Mr. SEXTON begged to return his heartfelt thanks to the hon. Member for Durham (Mr. T. C. Thompson), who had made himself so honourable an exception to the body of English Members by interposing at a critical time, and endeavouring to recall the minds of Her Majesty's Government to the statesmanlike measures they should resort to in dealing with the grievances of the Irish people. The Irish Members had appealed to the House against coercion; they had asked the House to intervene so as to moderate the acuteness of the crisis in Ireland as regarded eviction, and in both attempts had failed. The Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Dawson) now proposed to preserve to the Irish people the right of public meeting, a right so sacred in England that no English Minister could "dare" to attack it without insuring his own expulsion from power. He could challenge the history of all public agitations to produce a series of meetings at a time of such excitement and public suffering marked by such an extraordinary character of self-repression and good order as those which had been held in Ireland. In the course of the last two years 450 public meetings had been held in Ireland, in all its Provinces, to promote the endeavour to procure the safety of the people from the territorial despotism which drove them into the earth; and, at an average of 5,000 for each meeting, that would give a total of 2,500,000, or about half the population of Ireland, who had assembled in an orderly and peaceful manner to demand the redress of their wrongs. The attendance at those meetings involved a great amount of hardship, young men and old often walking to them from a great distance without food; and, such had been the extraordinary self-restraint of the Irish people in this movement, under the influence of the high emotions and strong public principles which guided them in it, so honourable had been their course of conduct, that even the magistrates (who were opposed to it) had not deemed it necessary, except on very rare occasions, to take away from them the temptations to excess which existed in open public-houses. At a great meeting in the County Cavan, he (Mr. Sexton) observed, while his hon. Friend was speaking, a police-constable in the crowd openly taking notes, and, with a want of restraint which often marked the conduct of the police in such cases, exchanging angry and irritating remarks with the people. Foreseeing that a breach of the peace might occur, he invited the constable to come on the platform and take his notes. The constable complied, was courteously received, and the meeting proceeded in unbroken peace. The moral of that was, that if the people of Ireland were allowed, without needless irritation on the part of the agents of the Crown, to hold their meetings, always necessary, and in the present case vital, it would be seen that they were capable of exercising that right in a manner consistent with public order and the interests of the whole community. On the other hand, if that right was interfered with, he ventured to say that the results would be such as would cause the Government to rue the day they ever interfered, and as would greatly increase the extraordinary tension which at present existed with regard to the state of Ireland. Reference had been made to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland; and he (Mr. Sexton) desired, at a time when passion ran so high and there was danger of hasty words being spoken under great irritation, to refer to the right hon. Gentleman in language not exceeding in the slightest the tone which he considered due to the occasion. When the right hon. Gentleman came to Ireland he was received, if not with cordiality, at least with respect, as a man who had made his mark by honourable achievements in the field of peaceful reform in England. He (Mr. Sexton) had sympathy enough to feel sorry when a great reputation was wrecked; and he felt that sorrow now when he considered the position of the right hon. Gentleman, who had fallen under an influence which had always proved fatal to every English statesman who had taken part in the government of Ireland—the fatal influence of the Castle. The official class in Ireland were by family and social ties bound up inextricably with the landlord class, and under their influence the right hon. Gentleman had fallen. He regretted to see the spectacle of the right hon. Gentleman returning, after a brief period, to that House, a man morally transformed, no longer devoted to those great principles of justice and of popular right which had always marked his previous career, but returning as the agent of the prejudice and the panic of the landlord class in Ireland—the wild, unreasonable panic — and returning there also as the mouthpiece of what, he dared say, they would presume to dignify as their ideas. The right of public meeting was sacred in England; and he regretted to see, in the language of the Most Gracious Speech, that there was danger of its being interfered with in Ireland. One of the Predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman, Earl Grey, had lost power in 1835 by interfering with that right. Ireland at that time was in a dangerous condition, and there was an important difference of opinion among the Members of the Government as to the prohibition of public meetings. Earl Grey, however, remained obstinate, and, in the end, the result was that he had to retire from power. He respectfully invited the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it was now more necessary than in 1835 to abridge the liberties of the people. He wished also to call attention to the various pretexts on which meetings had been prohibited. In one instance the meeting had been prohibited on an anonymous information that had been traced to the Orange Party; in another, the prohibition had been issued, far more justifiably, on the ground that a meeting held near Dublin might affect the course of the trial now proceeding in the Four Courts; and, in a third case, a magistrate, being asked why he had prohibited a meeting, replied—"I have no authority, and I will show none; but if you refuse to disperse I will shoot you down." Now that he had mentioned some of the reasons that had been given for the prohibition of meetings, he hoped that either the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, or his Legal Adviser, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland, would let them know what was the precise and exact state of the law with regard to the right of public meeting. The authorities had acted on various pretences, and had made it difficult for the people to know when meetings might be held and when they might not. He claimed as a right the full exposition of the law upon the subject; and if the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland gave the required explanation, the House would be able to understand what necessity there was for the people to appeal to the Government not to proceed any further in repressing the right of public meeting. If the ordinary law turned out to be sufficient, the House ought certainly to assent to the Motion of his hon. Friend. But, whatever might be the case as to the sufficiency of the ordinary law, he trusted that in this stage of a crisis that was becoming more and more acute every day, the House would use its influence with the Government in impressing upon it the necessity of exercising a wise discretion in not interfering with the right of public meeting. The anger of the people, if not allowed free expression, would take a more dangerous form, and might even result in action of an unconstitutional kind, which, to say nothing of the embarrassment in which it would involve the Government, would unquestionably end in disaster to Ireland.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he did not rise for the purpose of giving any exposition of the Constitutional law with regard to the right of holding public meetings, but to point out that Questions had been asked with regard to almost every meeting that had been prohibited, and an answer had been given in every case. His hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) had, in reality, stated, in a former debate, what he believed to be the state of the law on this question. He also hoped the House would not suppose that he rose with the object of replying to any of the personal attacks that had been made upon him either by the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) or by the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). The hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Sexton) had not engaged in any personalities. He thought hon. Members would find it difficult to make any personal attacks, whatever the amount of their absurdity or bitterness, to which he should reply. After the remarks made by his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister as to the manner in which this debate had been raised, he should not have thought it necessary to say a word had it not been for the few words which fell from his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Durham (Mr. T. C. Thompson). Those words ought not to be passed by altogether without reply. He thought his hon. Friend could not have been present during the days which they had been sitting in this hitherto short Session, or he would have known that the right of holding public meetings in Ireland had not generally been interfered with when the object of those meetings had been to advocate any Constitutional scheme, however extreme. He might almost say also that his hon. Friend must have paid very little attention to what had been going on in Ireland for the last few weeks or months. The hon. Member who just now addressed the House had answered his hon. Friend, who seemed to fear that the right of public meeting, or of meeting together to express a wish for a change of law, or even to denounce the Government or the authorities for not changing the law as was desired, was interfered with more in Ireland than it was in England. Surely his hon. Friend must have seen that day after day meetings had been held; at some of those meetings the language had not been particularly measured; but there had not been the remotest attempt at interference. Four hundred thousand Irishmen were said to have attended those meetings. [Mr. Sexton: 2,500,000.] Really that ought to be some comfort to his hon. Friend, and he hoped that from it his hon. Friend would see that the right of public meeting had not been altogether done away with in Ireland in the way in which some sympathetic minds seemed to suppose. It had been charged against the Members of the Government that they were more Orange than the Orangemen themselves. As to that, he would remind the House that some of the Land League meetings had been held under the protection of the police and the military, in order to prevent their being interfered with by Orangemen. The fact was that the meetings which had been prohibited had been prohibited only on one or the other of these three grounds. In one case, and certainly not in more than two cases, on the ground that the authorities feared a breach of the peace and loss of life if the meetings were not prohibited; secondly, on the ground that there was a reasonable expectation that individuals would be in danger; and, thirdly, one meeting was prohibited on the very sufficient ground that it was apparently intended to interfere with the trials which were going on in Dublin.

Mr. CALLAN challenged the statement that meetings had been prohibited only on the three grounds mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster). The Curriehill meeting announced to be held on Sunday, the 19th of December, was suppressed under these circumstances—Mr. Owens called on the right hon. Gentleman in Dublin, on Friday, the 17th of December, and, after vainly trying to induce the right hon. Gentleman to suppress the meeting, said he would have his will drawn up with the following statement in it:—"Whereas I have met my death in consequence of the refusal of the Chief Secretary to suppress the meeting."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER observed, that there was no truth whatever in that story.

Mr. CALLAN said, he was not responsible for the story, which was, perhaps, too good to be true. The right hon. Gentleman had not, however, denied that he held an interview with Mr. Owens on Friday, the 17th of December.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER remarked, that he did not see Mr. Owens on that day.

Mr. CALLAN said, that, at all events, on the Saturday evening, after dark, a proclamation was issued prohibiting the meeting, which was to have been held on the following morning. Not one of these meetings had been suppressed by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Ireland. It was an insult for the Chief Secretary to say he would not have spoken but for the observations of an English Member. He (Mr. Callan) knew that a meeting had been suppressed against the unanimous wish of the magistrates at Drogheda, on the authority of Mr. Clifford Lloyd, of Cavan, the brother of the Mr. Lloyd who led the "Boycotting" expedition to Lough Mask. He had no hesitation in saying that a more orderly or a better conducted meeting was never held than the one at Drogheda to which he had referred. When the second gentleman came up he kept his identity a mystery. He commenced by ordering the meeting to disperse, and as the chairman was going away from the meeting he said to him—"If you meet again I will fire upon it." The answer given by the chairman was that Mr. Forster would not permit such arbitrary and such unconstitutional conduct in Bradford. In that remark he fully agreed. The fact was that an unprecedented course had been adopted by the present Government towards perfectly legitimate gatherings in Ireland.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 34; Noes 173: Majority 139.—(Div. List, No. 7.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed*, to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution:—Mr. Stuart Rendel, Mr. Slagg, Mr. Gladstone, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Secretary Childers, Mr. Bright, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Courtney, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and Lord Richard Grosvenor:—Three to be the quorum:—To withdraw immediately:—Queen's Speech *referred.*

BURIAL AND REGISTRATION ACTS (DOUBTS REMOVAL) BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*The Judge Advocate General.*)

[BILL 66.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it consisted of two clauses. The purpose was to correct a clerical error in the Burials Act, in one of the clauses of which the word "that" appeared instead of "this." The right hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Osborne Morgan.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 67.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James), in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that it came from the House of Lords, and consisted almost of one sentence. When the Lords Justices were appointed originally, there were only two, and they were made Members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Since that time, by two Acts of Parliament, four additional Lords Justices of Appeal had been appointed. But there was an omission made. They were not made Members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and the object of the Bill was to make all the Lords Justices of Appeal, six in number, Members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—an arrangement which was necessary in the public interest, for the good working of that body. The measure would not interfere with the other duties of the Lords Justices of Appeal, who would sit on the Judicial Committee only when their services could be spared from the Court of Appeal. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

AUGMENTATION OF BENEFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[*Lords.*]—[BILL 68.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that it also came down from the other House. By the 26 & 27 *Vict.*, power was given to the Lord Chancellor to sell certain small livings, and a fund was formed, to be applied to their augmentation, not only by means of money, but also to apply £500 to the building or repairing of the parsonage house. One of the objects of the Bill was to extend that power of the Chancellor, if the fund could afford it, to expend more than £500 upon a parsonage-house, provided the incumbent in possession of the living would spend an equal amount for that purpose. Another object of the Bill was to enable the Lord Chancellor, at his discretion, to increase the existing limit of £1 to every four persons, that sum being found inadequate in some instances; but the total amount for a small living would not exceed £200. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

MR. RYLANDS pointed out that the Bill had been delivered to hon. Members only that morning, and suggested that if the second reading were now postponed it would not interfere with the future progress of the measure.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE urged that the Bill was a very simple one. It only removed existing limitations, which prevented the Lord Chancellor spending money efficiently. He, therefore, trusted that it would now receive its second reading.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in answer to the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), promised to give ample Notice of the Committee on the Bill.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

THE ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.—REPORT.

Report of Address *brought up,* and read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Address be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Stuart Rendel.*)

MR. GLADSTONE said, the Motion having been proposed from the Chair that the Resolution be read a second time, he wished to draw the attention of the House to the actual circumstances in which it was placed. Owing to the state of Public Business, the Government was disposed to make this Motion to the House without any delay, so that they might make all the progress in their power. At the same time, it was within the knowledge of the House that the usual practice had been to take the Report of the Address into consideration on the evening after that Address had been agreed to; and he would, therefore, only proceed with the Report of the Address provided the House was of opinion that, under the circumstances, it was best that that should be done. If no objection was taken, the Government would propose to go forward with the Report now. It was only with the full knowledge on the part of the House, and for public convenience, that they deviated from the usual course of proceeding.

MR. PARNELL said, he had intended to move an Amendment on the Report of the Address to the following effect:—

> "Humbly to assure Her Majesty that, pending the proposal of the Government measure with regard to the ownership and occupation of land in Ireland, it is necessary to take immediate steps to suspend ejectments in Ireland where the landlords are unable to prove to the satisfaction of the county court that the rent is a fair and reasonable rent."

That would have raised——

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out that the Motion is, "That the Address be now read a second time." It would not be in Order for the hon. Member to move his Amendment until the House has disposed of that Motion.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not desire to oppose the Motion after the remark of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that it was important, in the interest of Public Business, to have the Report agreed to that night. He supposed, as he should not proceed with his Amendment, that it was not the intention of the right hon. Gentleman to proceed with the discussion of the Motion with regard to Public Business, and also that it was not intended by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland to take the first reading of the two Bills with regard to Ireland.

MR. GLADSTONE: No.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The two Bills have been already postponed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is, "That the Address be now read a second time."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Address read a second time.

SOUTH AFRICA—BASUTOLAND.

RESOLUTION.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON, in rising to move, as an Amendment, to add the following words:—

> "And we humbly pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps, either by communication with the Government of Cape Colony or by proposing mediation between the contending parties, to prevent further destruction of life and property in Basutoland,"

said, he was quite sure that the House would believe him when he said that he had no wish to cause any delay in the prosecution of Public Business. He fully sympathized with his fellow-Members who thought that the House had been very long in the discussion which had arisen on the Address, and which had been very wearisome. His excuse—or, at least, his justification—for bringing that question forward was that it was perfectly clear, from the state of Public Business, that if he did not, he would have no opportunity for a long period of doing so. He thought he could prove that the matter was worthy of the consideration of that House—worthy of its consideration even in discussing the Address; because, in one of the sentences in the Gracious Speech from the Throne, they were told that measures would be introduced for the protection of life and property. It was true that that sentence referred to Ireland, and that a state of things existed in Ireland which all must deplore. But there had been of late only seven agrarian murders in Ireland; whereas, in Basutoland, at that moment, hundreds of the inhabitants, who were equally subjects of the Queen with themselves, were being destroyed. He believed that whenever there was a disturbance approaching to a rebellion or insurrection in a country there must always be some cause for it. People made rebellions because they had a real grievance, which they—very likely foolishly—thought they could get rid of. He remembered that Mr. Burke said that—

> "In all disputes which people have with their rulers, the presumption is at least upon a par in favour of the people."

The Basutos had good ground for complaining of the manner in which they had been treated before they took up arms. He would mention some of the principal events in the history of the Basutos. That history, so far as it was known to us, did not go very far back—not further than 1833, when French Missionaries settled among them. During the time those Missionaries lived in the country he believed that a greater improvement had been made than was ever made by a savage race in a like period. The year 1861 marked a period, as the people were governed by a great Ruler of their own, and he was anxious that his people should become subjects of the Queen, they remaining in possession of the land. In 1868, Sir Philip Wodehouse stopped the cruel war between the Boers and the Basutos, and proclaimed the latter people British subjects. In 1871, there was annexation of Basutoland with the Cape Colony; but in the Instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson it appeared that the power of making laws for that country was vested in the Governor, an official from this country. In the following year a responsible Government was established in the Cape. According to Lord Kimberley, that step affected the Governor's position in regard to the affairs of Basutoland; but the Basutos received no formal notice of any alteration in the position and power of the Governor. They were not consulted as to the Act of Annexation of 1871, and were never officially informed of its passing; and his (Sir Wilfrid Lawson's) belief was that they did not know that the Cape Government had any power over them, but that they believed they were the subjects of the Queen, and that the laws and regulations came from her or her Government. After the Annexation Act of 1871 they appeared to have lived peaceably and happily under the Government till 1879. Up to that date they were governed by magistrates in the way in which such tribes were dealt with by our Colonies. Mr. Arthur Barkly, a magistrate in the district of Masupa, who was one of the Chiefs engaged in the present insurrection, wrote, on the 12th of November, 1877, that nothing could bear stronger testimony to the law-abiding and orderly disposition of the Basutos than the singular absence of crimes of violence from among them. This was the more remarkable, inasmuch as the amount of supervision exercised was exceedingly small. The general good conduct of the people seemed to be due, in the first place, to the prohibition of the sale of liquor in the territory; and, next, to the natural love of order which seemed to be one of the most striking traits of the Basuto character. Such a people were not likely to break out into open rebellion against us without a cause. What were the causes? Colonel Griffin, the Agent General of Basutoland, said they were—First, the appropriation of the large sum of £12,500 which was levied on the territory; secondly, the disarmament of the Basutos; thirdly, taking from the Basutos the land which was occupied by Moirosi; and, fourthly, doubling the land tax. It appeared that Moirosi quarrelled with this country; that we went to war with him; that the Basutos assisted us in putting him down; and when he was put down we parcelled out his land among the White men. Now, we had no right to do so, as the land belonged to the people, and should not have been given to the White men. He did not think, however, that any of the causes he had mentioned would have led to the war without the disarmament. That was the last straw, so to speak, that broke the camel's back, and led to the war. The question was, how did the Natives get these arms? It was simply that when they worked for the White men in the Diamond Fields they were paid in warlike weapons—indeed, were forced to take them instead of money. Then came the order that they should give them up. Besides this, they regarded any attempt to disarm them as a kind of insult. In proof of this he quoted from the evidence of the Governor of Basutoland in 1878, an opinion that disarmament would lead to war; that there was no other cause that would give occasion to war, and that any proposal of that kind would be insanity, and might raise other Black races against us. Sir Garnet Wolseley had emphatically condemned the measure, telling us that such a step would raise the whole of South Africa against us. The belief of the Basutos was that when they were disarmed the Europeans would take their land. That notion lay at the bottom of the whole trouble, and he was not at all sure that it was groundless. Mr. Sprigg, the Prime Minister, was reported to have said what was tantamount to this—that when the struggle should be over, the Colonists would be given the spoils of war. The speech in which the Earl of Kimberley said a month or two ago that Mr. Sprigg had no right to use such words, was described in the Cape newspapers as "startling and serious;" and it was prophesied that this announcement that the Colonists would not have the spoils of war, in other words the land, would have a most serious effect upon the cause. Authorities who understood the country were of opinion that if more time had been given—if matters had not been hurried on—the Basutos might ultimately have submitted to be disarmed. Unfortunately, this policy of delay had failed to recommend itself to those in power. How, he asked, had the war been carried on? One newspaper likened it to a hunt, saying that the great question was not to fight in accordance with the humanitarian ideas of the 19th century, but to fight in such a way as to make the discomfiture of the enemy certain. The war seemed to be a religious war, for the Wesleyan Missionaries advocated it. One of them had said, in reference to it—"Only by the action of the sword can Christianity make its way among the dark races of the African Continent." The fierce spirit in which the war was carried on was well exemplified in the following occurrence:—In a camp about to be abandoned by the Colonial troops a pit was dug and filled with dynamite, in the expectation that a band of Basutos would soon appear upon the scene and be blown up. The officer in charge of the expedition witnessed the explosion from some distance, and saw four Basutos in the air at the same time. If any enemy had done such a thing in warfare with us, what invectives would have appeared in the newspapers! But surely the lives of Basutos were of some value, and surely they should be treated as other soldiers would be. Lord Kimberley said that the Basutos were rebels against the Queen. But they did not themselves think so. They believed they were under the protection of the Queen, and were only fighting against Mr. Sprigg and the Colonists. They called themselves the Queen's children, and at heart desired to be as loyal as any other of Her Majesty's subjects. But if they were rebels, surely it was the duty of this country to help the Colonists in putting them down. It would be as legitimate as arranging matters with the Albanians and Montenegrins, and people of that sort. If they were not rebels, surely this country ought to protect them. If the Government would follow neither of these courses, might they not mediate between the parties? The fact, however, was that the Government were doing worse than nothing—it was virtually "keeping the ring" while the two combatants were engaged in a deadly struggle. The Colonists, too, he asserted, had always been led to understand that if they really got the worst of the struggle they had a reserve power at home, and that our troops would, sooner or later, come to help them. He perfectly recognized the good spirit of the Instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson, and of the reference to the war in the Queen's Speech. He had, in fact, very little difference with the Government on this matter. They said they would "take" an occasion for mediating in the interest of peace. He wished them to make an occasion. No one could pretend to say that if they did desire to stop the war they could not do it; and it was to save the British name from the danger and discredit of further bloodshed that he begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

MR. W. FOWLER seconded the Amendment. The Basuto War, it seemed to him, was an illustration of the saying that one great mistake led to another. It was the outcome of the unreasonable scare about the Black people which was generated by the Zulu War, and the Basuto Chief, Letsea, was very near the truth when he said that he only knew of one fault on his part, that of his having a black skin. He (Mr. Fowler) considered that no people had ever been more injured in any of our Colonies than were the Basutos at the present moment. According to all testimony, they were the most harmless, the most industrious, and the most energetic of all the Black races. They had been constantly loyal, and as the reward of their loyalty we turned round upon them and inflicted upon them all the horrors of war. It was difficult to account in any reasonable way for the apprehension with which they were regarded by the Colonists. When Morosi rebelled, Letsea, the supreme Chief, actually sent a force to our assistance. The French Missionaries, in the Petition they had addressed to the English Government on this subject, said—

> "The country, which our Missionaries had found in 1833 nearly desert, as a consequence of dispersion caused by war and famine, has been re-peopled, and the ravenous animals which kept the wretched inhabitants in constant terror have entirely disappeared. The way to close, peaceful, and beneficial intercourse between the Basutos, the Colony, and the English Government was opened. Commerce and agriculture have made such progress that Basutoland, by its importations and exportations, has become a most valuable province. Thirteen stations or centres of worship and primary instruction were founded by our Missionaries. They have also created 70 subsidiary outstations. . . . Some 120 young men and 30 young women received instruction in two large normal schools. . . . Among the many thousands who daily acquired a greater knowledge of the Gospel, more than 6,000 have received it, and become Christians by rejecting the superstitious and evil practices of their ancestors, besides about 20,000 Natives who were regularly instructed. Such being the condition of Basutoland at the time the war arose, Her Majesty's Ministers will understand the anxiety with which the Paris Committee and the French and Swiss Churches we represent behold its present disorder and desolation."

Sir Philip Wodehouse said he was certain there were no more loyal subjects of the Crown than the Basutos. In fact, there never was a word said against them until they were told to disarm. Then, again, there was the despatch, which had been referred to by the previous speaker, of Sir Garnet Wolseley, which stated—

"That the Cape Colony is endeavouring to take the arms from its Natives, regardless of whether they had or had not been previously loyal, is a species of news that soon spreads far and wide beyond our frontiers, and is calculated to raise the bitterest of feelings against our rule. I may possibly attach too much importance to the effect which this disarmament policy will have upon the Native mind generally, but I am sure that it is at least fraught with danger to the peace of our Colonies.

"If it were possible to disarm all the Natives of South Africa, it might possibly be worth while to incur no little risk to secure that end, but to incur the risk of war as we are now doing in the Cape Colony for the purpose of obtaining say 20,000 or even 30,000 guns from the loyal Basutos, whilst hundreds of thousands stand of arms are still left in the hands of the neighbouring tribes, and of the tribes in and around Natal and the Transvaal is, in my opinion, incurring a most serious risk for an incommensurate object."

Sir Bartle Frere contended that because they rebelled they must previously have had rebellious intentions; but that surely was a *non sequitur* unworthy of Sir Bartle Frere's logical mind. As far as the causes of the war were concerned, he thought that much more of terror than of greed had to do with it. Sir Bartle Frere was not likely to desire the land of the Basutos; but he had shown great fear of the Natives. As to the nature of the war, if they read the newspapers they would find that in the encounters which were described the losses of the Colonial Forces were always much smaller than those of the enemy; and the war, in his opinion, might be characterized as a series of massacres. The Basutos had been encouraged to buy arms; and was it to be wondered at that they were unwilling to give them up? He could not help thinking that if the Basutos had at once submitted to the disgrace which it was proposed to inflict upon them they would have proved themselves to be wanting in the spirit which became a manly character. The wish of those who held opinions in accordance with those of the opponents of his hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle seemed to be to drive the Black men back into savagery from the condition of semi-civilization to which they had attained. It was all very well to say that the miserable war in which they were engaged was the work of the Cape Government, and that they were solely responsible for it; but the war had been waged with the approval of a Governor appointed by the English Crown, and he could not help thinking that the good name of England had been sadly injured in reference to this business, and he hoped that the Instructions which had been given to Sir Hercules Robinson would have the effect of putting an end to this wretched and miserable war. A more disgraceful business could not be found in the history of our Colonies; and he called upon Parliament to let the world know that they regarded it as unworthy of a Christian people and a great and free nation.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the said Address, to add the words "And we humbly pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps, either by communication with the Government of Cape Colony, or by proposing mediation between the contending parties, to prevent further destruction of life and property in Basutoland."—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir HENRY HOLLAND said, that his excuse for troubling the House with some remarks upon this question was that he had had the honour of serving in the Colonial Office before and during the time when the annexation of Basutoland took place, and also when responsible Government was granted to the Cape Colony. In the first place, he confessed that, looking to the terms of the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, and comparing those terms with the paragraph in the Queen's Speech relating to Basutoland, he was unable to see what good object could be attained by bringing forward this Amendment at a time when it was not only inconvenient, but inexpedient, to raise a discussion, considering that Her Majesty's Government had promised friendly action in the matter. The hon. Baronet would hardly advance his case much by obtaining from the House an expression of regret that this war should have broken out, as there could be no doubt that not only every Member of this House, but every person in this country, must deeply regret that there should be war with a tribe hitherto loyal and peaceful, and rapidly increasing in civilization. Nor, again, could he expect to force the Government, who had announced, through Her Gracious Majesty's Speech, their desire "if a suitable occasion should present itself, to take friendly action," to proceed to take immediate steps, without consideration whether there was or was not a favourable opportunity for intervening. There were one or two points of importance which he (Sir Henry Holland) thought should be distinctly brought under the notice of the House with reference to this question. In the first place, the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle appeared to think that the Basuto Chiefs had no idea that they were to be annexed to a Colony, but believed that they were always to be under the Administration of the High Commissioner. This was, however, an entire misconception of the facts of the case. From the very beginning the Basuto Chiefs were aware that their ultimate destination was to be annexed to a Colony; and, with the permission of the House, he (Sir Henry Holland) would prove this very shortly. In 1862 Moshesh requested that he and his subjects might be recognized as subjects of the Queen. Sir Philip Wodehouse, then Governor of the Cape Colony, sent up Commissioners to Moshesh, to explain to him fully the change which this would make in his independent position. That negotiation, however, fell through. In 1865, and in 1866, Moshesh again requested to be taken into the hands of the Queen's Government; but again the application was refused. And it was to be noted that again, in 1866, he applied to the Colony of Natal to be annexed to that Colony, which offer was, of course, refused. That showed that he was prepared for annexation. In December, 1867, however, when there was a prospect of renewed and serious hostilities between Moshesh and the Orange Free State, which might endanger the peace and welfare of Her Majesty's Possessions in South Africa, the Duke of Buckingham, then Colonial Secretary, authorized Sir Philip Wodehouse,

> "Whenever a fitting opportunity may occur, to treat with Moshesh for the recognition of him and his tribe as British subjects, and for the incorporation of their territory with Natal."

Therefore, Sir Philip Wodehouse, by letter of January 13, 1868, informed Moshesh that he and his tribe would be received as subjects of the British Throne, and that it was Her Majesty's pleasure that Basutoland should, if practicable, form part of the Colony of Natal. He added that he would visit Basutoland in April and discuss the details of the arrangement. Moshesh, in his reply of the 26th of January, 1868, says—

> "It matters little to us to know to what Colony Basutoland is to be annexed so long as we are under British protection and rule. Since the Queen has decided that Basutoland should form part of the Colony of Natal, it is all right; we are content."

And in a letter to Mr. Brand, then President of the Free State, Moshesh says—

> "His Excellency (Sir Philip Wodehouse) is coming up to make arrangements necessitated by the annexation of my country to a British Colony."

Basutoland was made British territory by Proclamation of March the 12th, 1868; and in April Sir Philip Wodehouse went to Thaba Bosigo, and had several interviews with Moshesh and the Basuto Chiefs and a large concourse of the tribe. He

> "Informed them of the intended annexation to the Colony of Natal, and explained at the same time that this step must necessarily be deferred until we had brought to a close our negotiations with the Free State."—[*Despatch of May* 2, 1868. *Cape of Good Hope Paper*, 1869.]

There could be no doubt that Moshesh then decidedly objected to be annexed to Natal, and that he disclaimed ever having seriously made the proposal in 1866; but he urged that all their relations had been with the Cape; and he said that to detach them from the Cape would be "like to separating a child from a mother." It must also be admitted that Mosesh strongly preferred that he and his people should depend on the High Commissioner alone, and that Basutoland should be made a "Native reserve," where Natives alone should be allowed to dwell; but it was quite clear that Sir Philip Wodehouse never held out any hopes to him that that would be done. Sir Philip Wodehouse had, indeed, no power to assent to such a proposal in face of the special and clear instructions of the Duke of Buckingham. That fact was confirmed by Mr. Keate's independent account of the very last interview with Moshesh in the same month of April. Moshesh again remonstrated against annexation to Natal; and he was told, in reply, that the question as to what Colony Basutoland was to be annexed would be settled after full consideration of whatever might be urged for the benefit of all parties. That statement showed that though there was a question as to which Colony Moshesh desired to be annexed, no assent was given to his proposal to be permanently placed under the High Commissioner.

It was afterwards thought by Sir Philip Wodehouse that an immediate union with either the Cape or Natal was not desirable; and the Duke of Buckingham consented that the territory should for the present be under the control of the Governor as High Commissioner. In the year 1870 Lord Kimberley pointed out, in a despatch of October 17, to Sir Henry Barkly, that Basutoland was—

> "A district in the position of an inchoate Crown Colony waiting for annexation to one of its neighbours, and in some degree dependent upon one (the Cape) for order."

And he added—

> "It is clear that the territory should be annexed as soon as possible either to Natal or the Cape."

Accordingly, in 1871, Sir Henry Barkly, at the opening of the Cape Parliament, urged upon them the annexation of Basutoland. He pointed out that it was tranquil and contented, and that the Cape would get the full benefit of its trade and labour. He pointed out, however, the obvious impracticability of bringing its inhabitants at once under the full scope of Colonial law, and suggested that the Governor should be empowered by an Annexation Act to carry on the existing system of management which he had, as High Commissioner, pursued. The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle was wrong in supposing that full effect was given to this suggestion by the Annexation Act; but it did provide that Cape Acts should not extend to Basutoland unless specially mentioned, or unless extended to that territory under Proclamation of the Governor, and, to that extent, Basutoland was protected from the ordinary Cape laws. In November, 1871, Basutoland was annexed to the Cape. There was no trace, so far as he (Sir Henry Holland) could discover in the Blue Book, of any previous communication having been made to the Basutos of the impending change. Probably it was assumed, and not unreasonably, by Sir Henry Barkly, who had, as High Commissioner, gained the esteem of the Basuto Chiefs, and advanced the prosperity of their country, that the Basutos were well aware that they were to be annexed, sooner or later, to the Cape; and that they knew the consequences of such annexation. But he (Sir Henry Holland) was disposed to think that it would have been fairer to the Basutos, and more prudent, to have followed the example of Sir Philip Wodehouse in 1862, and to have desired the Government Agent expressly and fully to explain to them their position in the future. This, perhaps, was the more desirable, as the territory had been since March, 1868, administered under the direct control of the Governor as High Commissioner. He (Sir Henry Holland) thought that the statement of the above facts would be sufficient to convince the House that no unfair hardship was inflicted upon the Basutos by annexation to the Cape Colony; that they were, from the first, informed that annexation to a Colony would take place, though for various reasons it was delayed at first. And now he (Sir Henry Holland) would proceed to point out to the House what was the relative position of the Home Government and the Cape Government with respect to Basutoland—a matter of great importance in considering this case, but which had been either overlooked, or insufficiently appreciated, by the Mover of the Amendment. Responsible Government was granted to the Cape Colony in November, 1872; and Basutoland became, thereupon, subject to the same control of the Central Colonial Administration as the rest of the Colony. The position was clearly defined by Lord Kimberley in a despatch to Sir Henry Barkly of November 17, 1871; and there could be no doubt that the administration of the government of the territory rested, after 1872, with the Colonial Government. This was not the time to discuss the question whether responsible Government should, or should not, have been granted to the Colony; but the position of Her Majesty's Government since then had been as follows:—They could tender advice, and require the Governor to urge it upon the Colonial Ministers; but they could not enforce it so far as regarded the internal administration of the Colony. Take, for example, the disarmament policy. They could urge the impolicy of the measure; they could remonstrate against the way in which it was carried out; and they could require the Governor to use his just influence in upholding the views of Her Majesty's Government. But they could do no more, as it was purely a matter of internal administration. He (Sir Henry Holland) would observe, in passing, that it was for this reason that he considered it useless to discuss here the question whether, in the opinion of this House, the Cape Government had acted wisely or unwisely, and, moreover, highly inexpedient to raise such discussion, when the Colonial troops were gallantly fighting against the rebels. Take, again, for an example of the relative position of Her Majesty's Government and the Cape Government, the question that had arisen as to the Quthing district of Basutoland. The Colonial Government proposed to deal with the land in that district in a manner that did not commend itself to the Secretary of State for the Colonial Department. He (Sir Henry Holland) heartily concurred in the view taken by Lord Kimberley in his despatch to Sir Bartle Frere of the 20th of May, 1880—a view which was put forward by Mr. Griffith, the Governor's Agent in Basutoland, who had most ably administered that country, and earned the confidence of the Basuto Chiefs and people. But Lord Kimberley did not, as the hon. Mover said, write out that he would not allow the Colonial Government to act as they desired. His Lordship fully recognized that the immediate responsibility of dealing with Natives within the borders of the Cape must rest with the Colonial Ministers, and only justified his interference on the ground of the importance of this question, and the peculiar relations in which, as High Commissioner as well as Governor, Sir Bartle Frere stood with respect to the question toward the Crown; and then he stated the various arguments

> "Which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, should be fully considered by your Ministers before deciding upon their course of action. . . Her Majesty's Government cannot think it opportune to carry into effect the measure which your Ministers have had in contemplation, and I request you to urge upon them its re-consideration."

These examples served to show how absolutely the internal administration of the Cape Colony rested with the Colonial Ministers, and how far in such matters the Home Government could properly interfere. As regarded, however, the ultimate disposal of the whole Basuto territory after the rebellion was crushed, he (Sir Henry Holland) was glad to see a carefully guarded reservation of power made by Lord Kimberley. In a telegram of the 20th of September, 1880, Mr. Sprigg, the Cape Premier, stated that the Colonial Government

> "Accepts the consequences of its own policy, whatever they may be, on the distinct understanding that the Colonial Government is in no way to be interfered with in the settlement of the country."

To this Lord Kimberley replied that—

> "Her Majesty's Government cannot pledge themselves beforehand with regard to the settlement of the country, which must depend upon the course of events; but they will give due weight to the opinions of the Colonial Government, which is primarily responsible for the good government of the Colony."

That was a wise reservation of power, inasmuch as the final disposal of the territory might, under certain conditions, involve serious consequences, and create complications and dangers outside the Colony. If, for instance, very large tracts of land were confiscated and given up to White settlers, the Basutos might be driven to desperation by being thus ejected in large numbers from the land; and the consequences might be serious, not only to the neighbouring Colony of Natal, but to the Free State and other Native Tribes beyond the borders of the Cape Colony. He (Sir Henry Holland) would conclude by expressing his strong belief that the House might well rest satisfied with the assurance in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech of the intention to take friendly action should a suitable occasion present itself, and that the present Amendment, if pressed to a division, should be rejected.

MR. DONALD CURRIE regretted extremely that the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle had thought it proper to bring forward this question for discussion at this critical time, alike as respected affairs in Ireland, and the great interests of this country in South Africa. He, or any other Member, might with equal justification have brought before the House, in the debate on the Address in answer to the Gracious Speech from the Throne, the question of Afghanistan, or the affairs of Greece, or of the Transvaal. But the hon. Member had taken the Basuto Question, and this at a critical moment when telegraphic communication between Natal and the Cape Colony was interrupted, and news of the debate might reach the Basutos of what they did in that House, and what Her Majesty's Government might decide. Whilst refraining from discussing the merits of the question of disarmament, he (Mr. D. Currie) must say that an arrangement more suitable to the position of the Basutos, and more agreeable to them, might have been carried out. The question, however, was not whether it was right or not, The Cape Government's answer to that question was that the British Government told them to protect themselves, and they had taken the plan for frontier defence which they considered necessary for their self-protection. The Tribes around them and within Cape Colony, they said, were disarmed, and that the Basutos, although they had rendered great service in Zululand, ought to be disarmed also. The hon. Member for Carlisle said that Her Majesty's Government ought to mediate. But why should they show to Basutoland and the Cape Colonists division in presence of the danger of complications in the Orange Free State and along the border of the Transvaal, in addition to the rising in the Transvaal itself? Why should they add to the danger by expressing doubt as to the policy of the Cape Colonists in a war in which they were doing what they judged to be right in their own interests, because they had the right to judge as they had responsible power? Why should this House, by a vote of virtual censure upon the policy of the Cape Parliament, and by inference upon the action of Her Majesty's Government here, interfere with the expression in the Queen's Speech, of Her Majesty's just regard for the people of Basutoland and of the Cape Colony? What is the Basuto Question? In 1828 the Dutch farmers crossed the Orange River from the Cape Colony to seek for a home in that part of the Continent. In 1845 the struggle which had been carried on between the Basutos and the immigrant farmers continued, and a British Resident was appointed. Sir Harry Smith visited the country in 1848, and proclaimed British sovereignty. In 1852 Sir John Cathcart fought for British authority in Basutoland as High Commissioner of the country. But Sir John Cathcart abandoned the country; and President Brand, elected President of the Orange River Free State, was, in 1864, at war with the Basutos. The Basuto Chief Moshesh, with his people, were driven at last to Thaba Bosigo, their mountain stronghold. It was the last gathering of the Basuto people. There were not more than 10,000 souls upon the mountain, and of fighting men there were probably not 1,500 left. Moshesh, who was brave and crafty, applied for protection to Sir E. P. Woodhouse, Her Majesty's High Commissioner, at that time in the Cape Colony, offering himself and tribe to British protection, and the British Commissioner occupied Basutoland with our troops in 1868, saving Moshesh from destruction. The Dutch farmers, under President Brand, were very indignant; but finally it was agreed that they should have that part of the territory of the Basutos to the north and west of the Caledon River, now a part of the Orange River Free State, while the English retained the country now known as British Basutoland. In coming under the Crown of England, the Basutos did not reserve any rights; but they declined to join Natal, and they insisted on joining the Cape Colony. They did not wish to join Natal, because if they did so they would not be allowed to carry arms; and, therefore, they joined the Cape Colony for better or for worse. In 1872 a Liberal Administration gave the Cape Colony responsible Government; and now the House of Commons was asked virtually to vote that the responsible Government of the Cape should cease to be responsible. He remembered a few months ago in that House it was advocated that they should interfere in the Basuto Question; and he (Mr. D. Currie) felt greatly troubled, because he knew that that very night the Cape Parliament were judging the question of disarmament themselves, and that a telegram might go the following day to sway the division which was about to take place. He considered the question to be the simple one—"Was it right or wrong of the Imperial Parliament to the Colonial Parliament?" The debate, however, went on, and the result at Cape Town was that the disarmament policy was carried by a majority which was relatively equal to that now wielded by the present Prime Minister in the Imperial Parliament. That result would surely lead the House to think twice before they interfered with responsibility in the Cape Colony. He thought it would be much better, seeing that responsible Government existed at the Cape, that they should leave the Colonists to their responsible Government, and that they should not try to decide affairs for them which they understood better than we did. It was said that the Colonists were glad to have wars; but he did not know that anyone could rise in that House and say that the Zulu War was brought about by the Colonists, or that the Gaika and Galeka or the Transvaal Wars were due to the action of the Colonists. The Cape Colony had responsible Government, and they were now paying for the war. From 15,000 to 16,000 volunteers and burghers had gone to Basutoland with the fire of their own Colonial spirit as strong as that which burned in the breasts of either Englishmen or Scotchmen, and they had left their farms and gone forward to fight for what they thought was just. It might be right or it might be wrong, but it had proved their resolution; and we would paralyze their exertions if we said one word to interfere with the control of the Cape Government over their levies. We did no harm to the Basutos, who were, for the most part, willing to obey the Cape Government; but they were led by an active and discontented party, and we should leave them to settle their affairs with the Cape Government. He was greatly interested in the prosperity of the Basutos; and while he sincerely wished them well, he earnestly asked the House to leave the Cape Parliament to deal with them, and not to allow its influence to be used for the advantage of any political Party at the Cape. He exhorted the Government to think of one thing only—namely, what was best for the great future of South Africa? He hoped that the Government would, at the present moment, boldly, clearly, and distinctly steer a cautious and careful course to the advancement of South Africa.

MR. GORST regretted that the question should have been brought before the House at this time, when it could not be completely discussed, and when an imperfect discussion was an inconvenient interruption to important Public Business. He quite agreed with what had fallen from the hon. Baronet the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland), that the Basutos had no right to complain of being annexed to the Cape Colony. But in the following year the Colonial Office granted responsible Government to the Cape; and it was an extremely dangerous and critical matter to confer responsible Government on a Colony which had any considerable number of the Native race among them. He should not be surprised if this was the origin of the difficulty. The fact was that a Native would very readily render submission to one whom he feared, like the Queen of England, because she was distant, and her power mysterious and invincible; but when asked to obey laws made by the White man, he did not see why the privileges of the White man should be denied to him, and he was inclined to resist laws in the making of which he had no share or part. It was very desirable that the House should on some proper occasion fully consider this question. If a Colony had the government of a Native race, it ought to be distinctly understood that the Colony bore all the risk and cost of insurrection. This was the arrangement in regard to New Zealand, which consequently admitted Natives to a share in the representative Government, with the most satisfactory results to the peace of the country. In the Cape Colony the Natives had not been admitted to this privilege, as there had been, unfortunately, no clear understanding that the Colonists should pay the expenses of Native wars. There was such an understanding now; but the Colonists were slow to believe in the assurances they received from the Colonial Office, their experience of the softness of the Mother Country leading them to believe that they would not be left to bear the entire cost. Even in this matter of the Basuto War the Colonists believed that if they got the worst of it they would have the purse and the Army of the Mother Country to fall back upon. Having given the Colonists the power to conduct their own affairs the Home Government ought not to interfere with them in the exercise of that power. He had left his mind completely open on the question of the war, and he did not at all know that when all the facts were before him he should be disposed to lean to the side of the Colonial Government. But with all his desire to criticize Her Majesty's Government, he was unable to suggest anything which they should have done, and had not done. In the presence of the objects for which Parliament was called together, it was the duty of the Opposition, and still more so of the supporters of Her Majesty's Government, not to raise discussions which could have no possible practical result.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR was understood to say that the object of disarming the Basutos was to prevent war, and every precaution was taken to induce that people to consent to disarmament. Men of that nation who had come to the Cape knew of the measure resolved upon, and went back to their own country fully content. They induced a large portion of their people to consent to disarmament; but a party rose up which seized the arms that were about to be delivered up. Not a single arm was taken from the Basutos without full compensation being paid; and, therefore, it was wrong for the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) to say that they were not compensated. With regard to Sir Garnet Wolseley, he was only adding to the difficulties of the Cape Government by sending the letter which had been alluded to. Nothing could be more injudicious than the Amendment of the hon. Baronet, for its tendency was to increase an opposition which was already dangerous to the Government of the Cape Colony. As regarded the question of expenses incurred, it was quite clear that whatever expenditure might be incurred in the future in carrying on wars in South Africa, the Cape Colony was bound to make good the money expended in their conduct.

Mr. GRANT DUFF: So much has been said on both sides of the House upon this subject that my task will be an easy one. I regret that my hon. Friend should have thought it his duty to propose this Amendment. The words in the Address which relate to the Basutos express most clearly the desire of this House to see Her Majesty avail herself of any suitable occasion which may present itself for friendly action on Her Majesty's part with a view to the restoration of peace. What would be gained by adding to these words the words proposed by my hon. Friend? Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to assure us that she is looking for a suitable occasion to take friendly action for the restoration of peace, which restoration of peace will, of course, prevent further destruction of life and property in Basutoland. Does my hon. Friend, by the introduction of the word "immediate," wish us to pray Her Majesty to seize upon an unsuitable occasion? Or is the point of the Amendment to be sought in the words "by communication with the Government of Cape Colony, or by proposing mediation between the contending parties?" If so, I should wish to submit to the House one or two considerations as to the language used. If that language means to refer to anything different from the course set forth in the Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, which are in the hands of hon. Members, I should strongly object to it. Her Majesty communicates with the Government of the Cape Colony through the Governor whom she has appointed to represent herself in that Colony, and in no other way. She has already directed that Governor to look out for a suitable occasion for bringing about peace. What more can she do? Further, Her Majesty, although she may propose to mediate between foreign Powers, does not propose to mediate between the Government lawfully constituted for the administration of one of her Colonies and any subjects, White or Black, who may be in arms against that lawfully constituted Government, although she may, by virtue of her supreme authority, intervene between the combatants. I am sorry my hon. Friend should have brought forward his Amendment, and I am sorry he should have made his speech. Lord Granville once said, with great truth, that there was no problem in government more difficult than the government of Colonies; and in the government of Colonies there is, I am sure, no problem more difficult than to keep the balance straight between the rights of the Natives and the rights of those of our countrymen who have gone forth to found new homes in foreign lands. We must take the greatest possible care lest, in our zeal for the Native, we make the White man think that we are his enemies. I entirely agree with my hon. Friend that the Cape Government made a great mistake in policy when they issued the Proclamation for the disarmament of the Basutos. The late Secretary of State warned them, the present Secretary of State warned them, but in vain; all that must be freely admitted. I doubt, however, whether any good is done by reiterating it. We shall not make the Cape Government more willing to listen to our advice by reproaches in Parliament or out of it. The Home Government will be in a far stronger position, should a favourable moment for the Governor's intervention arise, if it keeps to the attitude of a friend to the party which is vindicating the law, although one thoroughly interested in the welfare of both parties, and attempts as little as possible to assert any rights which may lead to controversy. What is true of the Home Government is true also, I venture to think, of independent Members of Parliament. It is the moment rather to put forward what is to be said on the side of the Cape Government than to scold them for a mistake which is now past praying for. Let it, then, not be forgotten that for some years back all reasonable men in South Africa have seen with great uneasiness the accumulation in the hands of the Natives of vast quantities of arms, which could by no possibility be used either for the advantage of themselves or of their White neighbours. Natal has no less than 10 laws directed against the use or possession of arms by the Natives. In the Orange Free State, so ably presided over by President Brand, the restrictions are very severe; and the mind of a civilized man who could contemplate with equanimity the position of some 500 Whites in Basutoland among 128,000 Blacks, of whom a vast number were armed, must be oddly constituted. Of course, it was desirable, most desirable, that the Basutos should cease to carry arms; but a wise end may be obtained in an unwise way. What the Cape Government should have done was, first to constitute a Basuto Militia, and then, having got the *amour propre* of that body on their side, to have gradually made the carrying of arms in Basutoland by ordinary persons so expensive and inconvenient as to have caused it to become obsolete. Much has been said by my hon. Friend about the loyalty of the Basutos, and the Secretary of State has on more than one occasion paid a tribute to the loyalty which they exhibited before this war broke out; but it must be remembered, after all, that only 12 years have elapsed since the Basutos were saved from utter destruction at the hands of the Boers of the Orange Free State. That was the beginning of their career as liegemen of the British Crown; and a loyalty which is only 12 years old, and has succumbed to the very first temptation, is not, perhaps, of the very best quality. What would my hon. Friend say if an enthusiastic advocate of the Permissive Prohibitory Bill succumbed to the temptation of the first glass of whisky that came in his way? The Cape Government would have been very unwise in presuming too much upon the loyalty of the Basutos. It is hardly in human nature that the Black man, who sees the White man gradually becoming his master in all places where they meet, prevailing with the slow resistless power of a natural force, can be just yet of a loyalty which is above all temptation. Where the Cape Government went wrong was not in their diagnosis of the disease, but in their treatment of it. They were quite right in thinking the position in Basutoland dangerous; but they were most unwise in treating it in the way they did. People at home, however, must not blame them too much. They are face to face with dangers which we only know by report. Besides, the cause of all the mischief that has lately afflicted South Africa was an imported cause: it was a passion for putting everything there to rights in a hurry, which was of purely English birth. A friend of mine lately reminded me, when speaking of this subject, that a wise man used to say that "half the calamities of life had their origin in people not being able to sit still in a room." If Lord Carnarvon had had this power, if he had not been so terribly zealous, or if he had remembered that South Africa is a country in which it is far easier for a statesman to extinguish himself than to distinguish himself, we should have been saved most of the troubles which have recently afflicted us in that part of the world. The Transvaal would not have been annexed in 1877—["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members opposite cry "Oh, oh!" but I am stating a mere matter of fact when I say——

LORD JOHN MANNERS rose to Order. He wished to know whether it was in Order, in a discussion on the Basuto War, to introduce the subject of the Transvaal?

MR. GRANT DUFF: I am not introducing the Transvaal; I am merely answering an interruption. If it had not been for Lord Carnarvon, whose motive I do not impugn, the annexation, the mention of which is so unpleasant to hon. Members opposite, would not have occurred; the Zulu War would not have taken place in 1879; the fighting which is now going on in the Transkei would not be going on; and the

Basutos would be living in the Queen's peace. There was a moment in which "the forward policy" was in favour alike in Asia and Africa. Our Governors and Viceroys went out with the words, if not ringing in their ears, at least impressed upon their minds, "above all things pluck; pluck is the order of the day;" and so to several regions of the earth, where rest was commanded by all maxims of sound policy, and among them to the Cape, went a Governor who, with all his merits, was precisely what was not wanted—a stimulant instead of a sedative. It has been said that if the present Government had recalled Sir Bartle Frere as soon as they came into Office the attempt to disarm the Basutos would not have been made. The first page of the Blue Book which was circulated the other day sufficiently answers that allegation. The Proclamation of Disarmament was issued on the 6th of April, and Her Majesty's present Advisers came into power at the end of the month. In common justice, too, to Sir Bartle Frere, it ought to be observed that, although he was strongly in favour of the disarmament of the Basutos, he acted, not as a spur, but as a bridle to the Ministers. That is proved by the Correspondence between them, which immediately follows the Proclamation in the Blue Book. The feeling of the majority of the Cape Parliament in favour of disarmament was, undoubtedly, very strong. Even after the Opposition at the Cape, and other persons who disapproved of the disarmament without forming part of the Opposition, had set to work every engine here and at the Cape which they could set to work to prevent it, its expediency was affirmed by a majority of eight, which, having regard to the number of the Cape House of Assembly, is equivalent to a majority of 80 in this House. It is only fair to say that since the war began the Cape Government have accepted the situation with great spirit and firmness. They have put into the field a very large number of men, and have made efforts which will try them most severely. If they succeed in putting down the Basuto rebellion by their own strength, or if, which is the same thing in another form, the Basutos speedily submit and place themselves in the hands of the Governor, as representing Her Majesty, a very long step will be made towards the attainment of that end which has been desired for many years by both political Parties in this country—that the Cape Colony should be self-depending as it is self-governing. If that end is once attained we shall see the commencement of the close of our South African troubles. Thus far I am bound to say no information has reached us which leads us to suppose that the Cape Government has the very slightest desire to make a vindictive or unjust use of its victory when it is obtained. As to what may have to be done after the rebellion is over, Her Majesty's Government has expressed no opinion whatever beyond that which is contained in a passage of Sir Hercules Robinson's Instructions, which is in the hands of hon. Members, and it is too delicate a matter for me to say more about at present. If we go one whit beyond these Instructions; if, whether actuated by a generous zeal for the weaker party, or any other motive, we throw difficulties in the way of the Cape Government, it will be at our own peril—we shall be back again in all the troubles of that wretched state of things, which we trust has now ceased, when the Cape Colonists brought about wars which the Imperial Government fought out and paid for. Thus far, for the first time, so far as I know, in our history, we have, in connection with this Basuto rising, not paid a shilling for a Cape War.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, that the right hon. Gentleman had argued that the present Government were not responsible for the Basuto War, because the Proclamation of Disarmament had been made at a time when nothing they could do could prevent its taking effect. He ventured to remind his right hon. Friend that the matter had been debated in the first week of the opening Session of the present Parliament, when the Prime Minister had taken the opportunity of saying that it was not the intention of the Government to recall Sir Bartle Frere. It might, therefore, very well be maintained that as the Government had continued Sir Bartle Frere in office for two months longer, they had made themselves responsible for his policy, and could not claim to be wholly unconnected with its results. However, the policy of Sir Bartle Frere was undeniably permitted by Her Majesty's late Advisers. He hoped that the attention of

Sir Hercules Robinson would be called to all the facts, and that he would be directed to call the Cape Parliament together on his arrival in the Colony. His right hon. Friend had said that the majority in the Cape Parliament in favour of Mr. Sprigg's policy was very large. The Appendix to the Blue Book showed it to be 38 to 29. This did not seem to him very decided, especially as Mr. Sprigg was supported by all the influence of the late Governor The order for disarmament was a great mistake, and the Cape Parliament should again discuss the question. He would appeal to the House to do what they could to put a stop to this war, and he thought this would best be done by asking Sir Hercules Robinson to call the Parliament of the Cape together. It was to be regretted that the Government of the Cape had been entrusted to a gentleman who had thought it necessary to take the severe measures against the Basutos stated by him in the Blue Book. He hoped, however, that a milder spirit would in future characterize our government in that country towards a loyal and unfortunate people.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, he hoped that his hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle would, after the statement of the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, see fit to withdraw his Amendment. He thought the hon. Baronet had, practically, got all he had asked for. He took it that Sir Hercules Robinson would, immediately on his arrival, take measures with a view to the settlement of this unfortunate war. He must take exception to the tone in which the Under Secretary for the Colonies had spoken of the Basutos as of men whose loyalty gave way at the first temptation. He had forgotten that before the disarmament the projected confiscation of Moirosi's territory must have justly alarmed and alienated the Basutos. However, having regard to the excellent spirit which pervaded Lord Kimberley's instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, and to the assurances of the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, he hoped the Motion would be withdrawn. Under Sir Hercules Robinson, doubtless, a milder spirit would prevail in the government of the Cape. He thought, however, his right hon. Friend had scarcely done the Basutos justice in saying that the Basutos were advocates of the Permissive Bill, who yielded to the first temptation to an over-indulgence in whisky.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, that his only desire in bringing forward the Amendment was to urge the Government to protect the Natives in Basutoland; and as the instructions that had been, or would be, sent out to the new Governor, would have the effect of leading to a satisfactory conclusion of the war, he would assent to the appeal made to him and ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Address *agreed to*:—To be presented by Privy Councillors.

MOTIONS.

SUPPLY.

Resolved, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolved, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HEALY, Bill to amend the Law relating to Coroners in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HEALY, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. BARRY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 73.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. MACLIVER, Bill to amend "The Employers' Liability Act, 1880," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MACLIVER and Mr. MORLEY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 72.]

PRINTING.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the Printing executed by Order of this House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for Printing, Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of Motions made by Members of this House:—Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH, Mr. PARNELL, Mr. HERMON, Mr. MASSEY, Mr. PEASE, Sir CHARLES RUSSELL, Mr. WILLIAM HENRY SMITH, Mr. STANSFELD, Mr. SPENCER WALPOLE, Mr. WHITBREAD, and Mr. ROWLAND WINN:—Three to be the quorum.

And, on January 21, Mr. RAMSAY *added.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 21*st January*, 1881.

IRELAND—PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY—LEGISLATION.

OBSERVATIONS.

EARL FORTESCUE, in rising to call the attention of the Government to the encouraging precedents afforded by the Act for the Better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland, introduced into that House in 1871, as compared with the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, introduced into the House of Commons in 1870, in respect of the number of days' debate on them respectively in that House, said: I need only ask your Lordships' indulgence for a very few moments. I would just remind your Lordships that, according to the wholesome Rules of this House, a Peer has no right to a reply upon the Answer given to a Question put by him, however unsatisfactory that Answer may be. I remember wondering much, when I first got into Parliament in 1841, at the arguments and illustrations occasionally used, especially in reply, by some veteran Debaters, arguments of whose fallacy, and illustrations of whose inapplicability, such acute and practical intellects could hardly have been unconscious. I soon learnt, however, *Nil admirari*, and saw that those Debaters were wise in their generation. By the time the gilding had been rubbed off the brass farthing, it had done its work, it had had a certain circulation, and, meanwhile, public attention had been called to something else. The suggestion which I made the other day, and have indicated in my Notice for to-day, did not seem to me to require precedents for its justification, seeing that I founded it solely on the unprecedented state of affairs this Session. Carefully to seek precedents for dealing with the unprecedented certainly never occurred to me. If it had, however, I should decidedly not have gone back to what may fairly be called the musty one of nearly half a century ago—Lord Grey's Coercion Act of 1833—nor to Sir Robert Peel's Bill of 1846, more than a quarter of a century ago, and then stopped there. Sir Robert Peel's Bill was an Arms Bill, and was successfully opposed, I well remember, on two grounds especially—First, that it could not be considered very urgent by the Government which had allowed it to remain in the House of Commons unadvanced at all for months; secondly, by the one urged by Lord John Russell, if I mistake not, that, taken singly, it would irritate without intimidating, whereas the suspension of the Habeas Corpus would intimidate without correspondingly irritating. By the way, Mr. Gladstone was a Member then of Sir Robert Peel's Cabinet, and so was early accustomed to that dilatoriness in repressing lawlessness and outrage in Ireland, of which he has given several examples as Prime Minister. It was the suspension of Habeas Corpus which Lord John Russell subsequently carried with such promptitude through both Houses. I can only hope, from the Government giving Notice simultaneously of a Peace Preservation Act besides, that their Bill for the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland may prove as effective as Lord John Russell's did. Having been led to search for precedents, I searched for recent ones, and found among them the two mentioned in my Notice. I must ask leave to describe the progress of these two Acts a little in detail. The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act of 1870 was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Chichester Fortescue on the 17th of March; the Second Reading was taken on the 21st, and adjourned to the 22nd of the same month; the Committee was taken on the 24th and 25th, and the Report and Third Reading were taken on the 26th. Thus there were six days of separate debate on the Bill in the House of Commons. The Third Reading was taken in their Lordships' House on the 31st, the Standing Orders having been suspended for that purpose. Now, let their Lordships contrast with that the progress of the Act of 1871, which was not mentioned in the Queen's Speech, but was introduced by Lord Kimberley on the 27th of April. It was read a second time on the 2nd of May, the Committee and Report were taken on the 4th, and the Bill was read a third time on the 5th. When it went down to the House of Commons it obtained a First Reading *sub silentio*, as was usual with Bills going down from their Lordships'

House. That was on the 8th of May; three days were given to the Second Reading, the Committee was taken in one day, and the Third Reading and the Report was taken on the 9th of June. That made only five separate days' debate, as contrasted with six on the other Bill. The nearly five weeks which elapsed during its passage through the House of Commons was occasioned by other Government Bills, such as the Army Regulation Bill, the Customs Bill, and the University Test Bill, being pressed on during those five weeks, in spite of protests and complaints from several Members, and especially from that sagacious and experienced statesman, Mr. Henley. As a proof of the little urgency attached to the complete enactment of the Bill by Mr. Gladstone and his Government, it did not receive the Royal Assent till the 16th of June. When I remember that Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister in 1870 and 1871, and that all three of his Colleagues who spoke in this House on the Address held also very high and confidential offices in his Government, it is difficult to believe that the present Cabinet was quite unacquainted with these precedents; or that the reason alleged of the speedier progress to be expected for Mr. Forster's Bill from its introduction into the House of Commons was the only, if it were the chief, reason for the Government's obstinate adherence to that course. I think I have made out from these, the latest precedents, both of them under Mr. Gladstone's previous Government, that time would have been saved by introducing this measure, which has, doubtless, been quite ready for at least a week, probably more, into this House at the beginning of this week under the then unprecedented circumstances of the case. For even a day's gain, much more a week's, is of importance, when all information, public and private, from Ireland seems to agree that lawlessness is spreading day by day, and week by week, from one parish in Ireland to another, with correspondingly increasing despondency and suffering among the loyal and law-abiding. I have already said that I considered the Government's original proposal to submit a Bill of such a nature first to the elected Representatives of the people the wisest and best. But when more than a week had elapsed without any early prospect of Mr. Forster's being able to bring in that sad but much-needed measure into the other House, being delayed, to the indignation of an immense majority of its Members, by the unprecedentedly long debate on the Address, kept up by a small minority, I would not believe that the reasonable Members of that House would have failed to approve of this step being taken in no spirit of disrespect at all to them, but the contrary—a step which, if adopted last Monday, would, by next Monday, have placed the Bill in that House one step in advance of that which Mr. Forster will endeavour, I hope successfully, to obtain for it on that day—a step which would have saved, at least, one day in the House of Commons, irrespective of the short time which, with every facility afforded by this House, its coming up here must entail. An overwhelming majority of the loyal and law-abiding of the Queen's subjects are by this time satisfied of the melancholy but absolute necessity of some stringent Act being passed beyond the ordinary law, for the protection of life, liberty, and property in Ireland. And I will not believe that any of that vast majority of the House of Commons, which so decisively rejected Mr. Parnell's Amendment, would, in the present emergency, when every day adds to the power of the disaffected, and to the suffering and despondency of the loyal, allow their sense of what is justly due to the Representatives of the people, and under less extraordinary circumstances, neither ought to be nor would be withheld, to prevent their welcoming any course, not in itself unconstitutional, which could accelerate, even by a day, the enactment of a Statute so urgently required.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, we have so little Business in this House at present that I should feel grateful to any noble Lord who introduced matter for us to consider; but I must say that I am a little puzzled to know why my noble Friend has thought it necessary to address to your Lordships' House the observations which we have just heard. He rather boasted the other night that he made his suggestion without the concurrence of anybody, and he seems to have been encouraged by the fact that no person on either side of the House then supported him in his proposal, because he comes back now to the same question. It is rather a melancholy thing for us to consider that the noble Earl has passed 39 years of his public life in utter astonishment at the want of logic in official replies. He told us what an excellent unofficial rejoinder he might have made to us if he had not been precluded from doing so by the Rules of the House, and, possibly, if he had searched for precedents. But he now refers us to precedents which I may be permitted to say do not seem so convincing as he seems to regard them. The noble Earl showed us that the Bill which originated in the House of Commons took six days to go through that House, while that which was introduced here only took five, so that there was in favour of the latter a gain of one day; but he altogether ignores the fact that the latter Bill was one of only 12 clauses, while the former was a Bill of 41. The noble Earl will therefore see that the result of the comparison is not so conclusive as he appears to suppose. Your Lordships must feel that it is not only the wish, but the strongest interest of Her Majesty's Government, having made up their minds that exceptional legislation is necessary, to get through it as soon as possible; and after carefully considering the suggestion of the noble Earl, we have arrived at the conclusion that it would not facilitate that object.

Viscount CRANBROOK: I do not want to enter into any discussion on the subject; but perhaps I may ask why, if the Government are so anxious to accelerate the progress of this measure, they have not availed themselves of this free night in the House of Commons?

Earl GRANVILLE: I think the noble Viscount must see that it would be very inconvenient to me to be required to explain the procedure of the House of Commons.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873.

Minutes of meetings of a Council of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature held on 27th November and 29th November 1880, under the Act: *Presented* (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 21*st January*, 1881.

MINUTES]—New Member Sworn—Francis Sharp Powell, esquire, *for* Wigan.
Select Committee — Printing, Mr. Ramsay *added.*
Public Bill—*Ordered—First Reading*—Distress for Rent* [74].

QUESTIONS.

CRIMINAL LAW—PUNISHMENT OF WHIPPING.

Mr. PENNINGTON (for Mr. Hopwood) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of E. Calnan, sentenced at the recent Surrey Sessions as an "incorrigible rogue" to twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour and twenty strokes of the birch rod; whether his attention has also been called to two previous cases of like sentences for like offences at the Surrey Sessions, the one on April 8th last to twelve months' imprisonment and flogging with the birch rod, and the other to imprisonment and flogging with the cat or the birch rod as the surgeon might think suitable or preferable; whether the punishment of whipping, under the statute 5 Geo. 4, c. 83, has not become practically obsolete at all other Quarter Sessions; whether there is any especial reason justifying its revival at the Surrey Sessions; whether the above sentence to the rod is not novel and illegal; and, whether in fact if whipping be inflicted, the sentence should not be "to be publickly whipped in the market place in , in the county aforesaid?"

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I have made inquiry into the case, which, there can be no doubt, is a bad one. The man's age is 34, and he has been—according to the accounts which I have received—60 times in prison. With reference to the question as to whether the punishment of whipping is obsolete, I cannot officially say that an Act passed so late as the reign of George IV. is obsolete. I certainly see no special reason for the employment of this punishment at the Surrey Sessions. I have taken some pains to inquire; but, so far as I can learn, it is not a punishment which is ordinarily employed by other magistrates for offences of this description. It is, of course, a matter for the discretion of the magistrates whether they should employ this particular form of punishment or not, if the law permits them to do so; and I think that the magistrates have wisely abstained from ordering whipping except for brutal offences. The character of the offence in this case was incorrigible begging, which, of course, is a great evil to society. If the hon. Member asks my own opinion on the subject, I would say that I agree much more with those magistrates who do not employ the punishment of flogging than with the few who do.

STATE OF IRELAND—PUBLIC MEETINGS—LIMERICK CENTRAL LAND LEAGUE.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true, as stated in the "Times" of the 17th January, that a head constable and another constable on the 15th of January entered a room in a hotel in Limerick where a meeting of the Limerick Central Land League was being held; and that the head constable, on being asked by the chairman by what authority he presented himself, grounded his right on the fact that the room was part of licensed premises, into which the constabulary had a general right to enter; whether the chairman informed the head constable that he had no objection to the constabulary knowing all the proceedings, and that the objection to their presence arose because he believed that they were sent there to intimidate the farmers; whether any act of an illegal, unconstitutional, or seditious character is alleged to have been done by the Limerick Central League; and, if not, whether he will direct the constabulary not to avail themselves of powers conferred on them for the purposes of the Licensing Laws in order to intrude on legal meetings?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I may answer at the same time with this Question that which the hon. Member for the County Limerick (Mr. O'Sullivan) has given Notice of to the Solicitor General for Ireland, and which is one on the same subject. I am informed it is true that a head constable and another constable entered, on the 15th of January, the room of a hotel in Limerick when a meeting of the branch of the Land League was being held. It is also true that they claimed their right to do so, as they were licensed premises. I believe that after some conversation with the members of the Land League present, the head constable and the other policeman were invited to remain, and did so. The policemen in question took this step in consequence of information that had reached them that one of these assumed Land Courts was about to be held. The Constabulary are perfectly aware that it is no part of their duty to interfere with legally-constituted meetings, and I do not consider it necessary to issue any instructions to them on the point.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the second last paragraph of my Question, which asked whether any act of an illegal, unconstitutional, or seditious character is alleged to have been done by the Limerick Central Land League?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I thought I had answered that portion of the Question when I stated that the reason the police went into the room was because they had reason to anticipate that an illegal act would be committed by the holding of an assumed Land Court.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: The right hon. Gentleman has not yet answered my Question. I want to know whether it is alleged that such an illegal act was committed?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I have no information that any such act has been committed. There was a reasonable expectation that an illegal act might have been committed.

MR. DAWSON: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would inform the House whether there is any line to be drawn at which public meetings in Ireland—[*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The Question of the hon. Member for the City of Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) has been put and fully answered, and it is quite out of Order for the hon. Member to continue the subject.

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—KILLALA HARBOUR.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he is now in a position to state what decision has been arrived at in reference to the proposed Harbour works at Killala, county Mayo; and whether the Board of Works have modified the original plans so as to enable the Killala Harbour Committee to avail themselves of the Canadian grant?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, the hon. Member makes a mistake in supposing that the Board of Works had anything to do with this matter; it was the Pier and Harbour Committee. I very much regret that it is impossible to make the harbour at Killala, in consequence of local support to the project not having been given. I shall be glad to show the hon. Member the correspondence that has passed on the subject. I think the Pier Committee did all they could to get the work done. They gave time for the completion of the contract, and when that had elapsed, their engineer advised them that the plans ought not to be modified, and they were reluctantly obliged to appropriate the money for the construction of piers in other places. There is no doubt that the harbour is wanted badly at Killala; and I am very sorry the inhabitants of the district did not support it properly.

NAVY—LIFEBOATS—THE HARWICH LIFEBOAT.

Sir HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether, having regard to the loss of seventeen lives, and the great suffering of the remainder of the crew of the "Indian Chief" on the Long Sand on the 5th instant, in consequence of the Harwich and other lifeboats having failed, in a series of gallant efforts, earlier to reach the wreck, and to many other casualties of a like nature, and to the reported loss by the capsizing of the Harwich lifeboat on the 18th instant, in a fresh attempt to rescue another shipwrecked crew, the Admiralty will station at Harwich, either as tender to the "Penelope," or otherwise, a suitable steamer, capable of rendering assistance (at a time when a few hours is a question of life or death to a ship's crew) by towing the lifeboat for the distance of eighteen or twenty miles, commonly required, and enabling the crew of that boat to carry out the humane duty of saving life, for which that boat is specially maintained, but which, for want of such assistance, its crew are too frequently unable to perform?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the tenders to coastguard ships are not, and cannot be, vessels of a nature to perform the service so humanely suggested by the hon. Gentleman. They are employed in various duties of importance—in drilling the Naval Reserve, in the gun drill of the seamen in the first Reserve, in watching the fisheries at certain seasons, in revenue work on occasion, and very largely in conveying Coastguard men and their families from point to point on the coast. For these purposes they require to have considerable accommodation on board, and old gunboats are mostly utilized for this service, for which they are very well suited. A ship of the type which the hon. Gentleman suggests—a vessel of the horse-power of the *Sampson* or the *Malta*—would cost £27,000 to build, and would be quite useless for the purposes for which the tenders for the guardships are wanted. Whether the nation should undertake the task of providing steam-power round our coasts for the purpose of saving life and property is a question, not for the Board of Admiralty, but for the Cabinet. All I can tell the hon. Member is that steam vessels of the sort which he indicates would have to be provided over and above the tenders to our guardships.

POST OFFICE—FEE FOR "LATE POST."

Mr. HEALY asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is the fact that, while letters can be posted for the "late post" at the chief post offices in London for an hour after the closing of the ordinary letter-boxes with an extra fee of a half-penny, the late fee in Dublin is a penny, and the interval allowed for late post is much shorter than in London?

Mr. FAWCETT, in reply, said, that it was the case, as the hon. Member alleged, that letters could be posted in London for the late post an hour after the closing of the ordinary letter-boxes; but it was not the case, as he asserted, that the fee for late postage was higher in Ireland than in England. Since last

March the charge had been uniform—a halfpenny in both countries. The reason why late letters could be posted so much longer after the shutting of the ordinary letter-boxes in England was because those boxes were left open in Ireland much nearer to the time at which the mail leaves than in England.

MEXICO—DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.

MR. SHERIDAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, seeing that France has renewed diplomatic communications with the Government of Mexico, and that the present Government of Mexico, it is reported, has declared itself favourable to some adjustment of its foreign debt, there is any objection on the part of Her Majesty's Government to receive communications, with a view to the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Her Majesty's Government and the Mexican Republic?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: There is not, Sir, and never has been, any objection on the part of Her Majesty's Government to receive communications with a view to the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Her Majesty's Government and the Republic of Mexico. Any such communications would be carefully considered by Her Majesty's Government with an earnest desire to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement for the renewal of relations.

STATE OF IRELAND—COUNTY CLARE.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the county of Clare has been reported by the Police authorities to be in a highly unsatisfactory state; and, if so, what steps have been taken to protect life and property in that county; how many persons are at present receiving Police protection within the county; and, is it considered that the present Police Force is sufficient; and, if not, what steps have been taken to supplement that Force?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am sorry to say that the County Clare is in a very unsatisfactory state; so much so, that on the 15th instant the Lord Lieutenant felt called upon to proclaim it to be in a disturbed state. By that Proclamation an additional Police Force was appointed to the county, and will be sent there as soon as possible. As a further measure bodies of troops have been sent to Clare Castle, Kilrush, and Ennistimon. In reply to the other portion of the hon. Member's Question, there are 10 persons under special protection at present in that county; and there are in addition 23 others whom the police are expected to look after.

STATE OF IRELAND—PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, or, in his absence, the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, having regard to the tone and language recently adopted in Ireland and elsewhere by members of the Irish Land League, including assertions of the forces arrayed against the Government of Her Majesty, and boasts of the supreme reign of the Land League over parts of the Country, together with threats of serious resistance to prevent the legislation indicated by the Government from being carried out, Her Majesty's Ministers will take into consideration the question of a once (pending the necessary legislation) adopting stringent precautionary measures over certain portions of Ireland (for which they might subsequently be indemnified by Parliament) in order temporarily to protect, meanwhile, the peaceable and law-abiding inhabitants in that Country?

MR. DILLON: Sir, before the right hon. Gentleman answers this Question, I would ask you whether it is in Order to make general accusations of the kind contained in the Question without referring to the particular language or acts of which complaint is made?

MR. SPEAKER: I have examined this Question, and there does not appear to me to be any reason for not allowing it. It is not out of Order in point of form.

MR. GLADSTONE: In reference to this Question, Sir, the hon. Member and the House will feel that I could not answer it except within very narrow limits. In the first place, I can assure the hon. Member that it will be the first care of the Government to pay close attention to all that has taken place in Ireland from day to day, both in regard to events and to language. But with respect to the gist of the Question, it contemplates a contingency in which the hon. Member suggests that it might be the duty of the Government on its own responsibility to adopt measures beyond the law, and subsequently to apply to Parliament for an indemnity. Now, subjects of that kind are not convenient for discussion by anticipation, and I hope that the hon. Gentleman will not think that I am showing any disrespect if I put it to his good sense not to press his Question further.

INDIA — THE DISTURBANCES AT KOLAPORE.

MR. OTWAY asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether he has received any information of a conspiracy at Kolapore, in which some thousands of persons of different religions and castes were involved to murder the entire European community while in church, and to set up a deposed Prince, who was supposed to be still living, in the place of the present Rajah?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope) asked me a Question on this subject the other day. I have received no information respecting it in Reports from the Government of India; but in reply to a telegram which I sent to the Government of India, I have received the following:—

> "From Viceroy, Calcutta, January 16.—Bombay Government telegraphs that certain persons arrested for dacoity made statements regarding conspiracy, which, though open to suspicion, Political Agent thought should go before a magistrate, afterwards before Sessions Court of Kolapore. Bombay Government allowed law to take its course, although apparently not regarding the occurrence as of serious importance. No facts known here beyond the details that are now being elicited by judicial investigation. The case originated entirely under Bombay Government without previous communication to Government of India. Reports have been called for and are coming."

MR. OTWAY presumed that the Reports would be laid upon the Table?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It would be better to wait until they arrive before I enter into that question.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, as stated in a telegram that has appeared in the "Times," the leaders of the Boers in the Transvaal have asked Her Majesty's Government to send out a Royal Commission to arrange all matters in dispute; and, whether, if so, Her Majesty's Government intends to accede to this request?

MR. GRANT DUFF: No, Sir, we have received no communication at all from the leaders of the Boers in the Transvaal. I think the telegram to which my hon. Friend alludes relates to the proceedings of a meeting in the Cape Colony.

LIFEBOATS—THE "ABRAHAM THOMAS."

MR. GOURLEY asked the President of the Board of Trade, If his attention has been called to the gallant efforts of lifeboat crews made during the recent snowstorms to rescue shipwrecked seamen, and more especially to the loss of life caused by the capsizing of the lifeboat "Abraham Thomas" at Yarmouth; and, whether, in order to encourage and reward men who thus from time to time risk their lives, he will cause a special pension grant to be made for the maintenance of the widows and orphans of the "Abraham Thomas," out of the large funds now annually appropriated by the National Exchequer, being the proceeds of unclaimed wages of deceased seamen?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, his attention had been called to the extraordinary and very gallant services rendered during the recent gale by the lifeboat crews, and especially to the case particularly referred to in the Question. He had written to the National Lifeboat Institution to ascertain the facts of the case, and had received a letter in which the following passage occurred:—

> "Crews manning the boats of the institution are paid according to the liberal scale mentioned in the regulations, and they frequently receive extra pay. When a calamity like that at Yarmouth occurs, the institution votes a handsome addition to the local subscriptions, which have hitherto been so largely and liberally responded to as to make every provision for the families of the deceased. In a pecuniary sense, they are frequently placed in a superior position to that which they occupied during the lifetime of their husbands and fathers."

He, therefore, did not think it necessary for the Board of Trade to interfere in the matter. One point in the Question required to be corrected to prevent misconception. It stated that large sums were now annually appropriated by the National Exchequer from the wages of deceased seamen. Now, those sums were annually appropriated in redemption of a fund which was taken over by the Board of Trade some time ago in connection with the pension fund for mercantile seamen. The sum which had been paid out of the Exchequer for those pensions amounted to £1,460,000, while the sum received for the effects of deceased seamen was not more than £240,000; so that up to this time the balance was very much against the Exchequer.

IRELAND—DISTRESS.

MR. A. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Irish Government have received any reports from the Local Government for Ireland as to the distress prevailing amongst the labourers in certain districts; if he could state briefly what the nature of such reports are, if any exist; and, what steps the Government intend to take in the matter?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, this Question was only put on the Notice Paper last night, and I have not been able to communicate with the President of the Local Government Board with reference to the matter; therefore, I am not able to answer it as fully as I should wish to do. I am sorry to say that considerable distress does prevail in Ireland at present, and it is attributed mainly to three causes. The first is the partial failure in some districts of the potato crop. I do not mean the failure of the champion, but of other potatoes. Another cause is the want of employment, arising from the inability of landlords to expend money in some parts of the country. Another cause, and one which I hope will disappear quickly, is the great severity of the weather. We have found it necessary already in some Unions to avail ourselves of the provisions of the Relief of Distress Act of last Session with regard to outdoor relief, and a large number of extraordinary presentment sessions for instituting public works were convened in the month of December. I hope the result of those sessions will be in some degree to alleviate the distress. I trust also, that as soon as the weather alters, the landlords may spend a good deal of the money granted to them as loans.

CRIMINAL LAW—THE FIRE AT THE CUSTOM HOUSE.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any Report has been received from the Criminal Investigation Department as to the late fire at the Custom House; if so, whether he can state to the House the nature of the Report?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he had been informed that Mr. Howard Vincent, the head of the Criminal Investigation Department, and Captain Shaw, the chief of the Fire Brigade, had investigated the matter, and had come to the conclusion that the fire had been caused accidentally, and was not, so far as they could judge, the work of an incendiary. Further inquiry was, however, to be made into the circumstances.

MR. RITCHIE asked, as this opinion was opposed to that given on the authority of the Commissioners of Customs, that it might be forwarded to them.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes.

POLICE ACT (METROPOLIS)—REMOVAL OF SNOW.

MR. H. EDWARDS asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he is aware that a regulation exists binding householders in London to clear away the snow and dirt on the pathways in front of their houses, and that poor as well as rich are subject to a fine for neglect of this duty; and, whether he is aware that many of the public offices in London occupying considerable frontages in many leading thoroughfares are left with accumulations of snow in front of them, causing serious inconvenience, and, in some cases, accidents to the public?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said, his attention had been called to the matter. He had communicated with the authorities of the departments referred to, and he had been assured that their obligations in this respect had been carried out on Wednesday morning, which was as soon as it could be accomplished owing to the state of the weather.

Mr. GIBSON asked the hon. Gentleman the Member for Truro, whether he could not make representations to the neighbouring Vestries occasionally to sweep the street crossings in the neighbourhood of that House?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG, in reply, said, that the work of sweeping the crossings did not rest with the Board of Works. Some Vestries made arrangements for the purpose, and he would make the representations of the right hon. and learned Gentleman known to the authorities who had control of the streets in the neighbourhood of the House.

STATE OF IRELAND—PROCLAMATION OF COUNTY SLIGO.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state particularly the nature of the grounds which induced the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council of Ireland, as appears by Proclamation in the "Dublin Gazette" of Tuesday last, to declare four baronies of the county Sligo, covering three-fourths of the area of that county, to be in a disturbed state, and to require an additional establishment of police?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member gave Notice of this Question last evening. If he will ask me again on Monday or Tuesday, I shall answer him.

Mr. SEXTON: I gave Notice of the Question yesterday.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I may explain to the hon. Member that I am very anxious to give full and direct answers to all Questions with regard to what is being done in Ireland. Notice of this Question was given yesterday evening, and that has not enabled me to get the necessary information by the next morning.

Mr. SEXTON: I shall ask the Question again on Monday, and also a further Question on the same subject.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION ACT, 1879—RECOVERY OF SMALL DEBTS.

Mr. CARBUTT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a statement made by Mr. Paget, the stipendiary magistrate, to a cabman who had obtained an order for the paymen of a fare, and who had lost several days work because the summons could not be served, although the defendant was seen in the neighbourhood frequently; that there was a remedy in the old Law, but the Legislature had thought fit to alter it; and, whether he could hold out any hope that a remedy would be found for that cabman's grievance?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, it appeared the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, did take away the prompt remedy for the recovery of fares. Cabmen now stood on the same footing as everybody else as to the recovery of small debts. He did not see his way to introducing a special law in their behalf.

STATE OF IRELAND—PUBLIC MEETINGS—THE LIMERICK CENTRAL LAND LEAGUE.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If it is true (as reported in the "Times" of this morning) that two constables entered a room in the city of Limerick on Saturday last, which room they (the constables) were informed by the chairman was engaged by the Limerick Land League; and, if so, is it a fact that the constables refused to leave on the grounds that they were entitled to enter and remain on licensed premises at any hour they chose; and, if so, will he inform the House under what Act of Parliament Irish constables have got such powers? The hon. and learned Gentleman would find that the Question was quite different from that of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): Sir, the transaction is the same as that referred to in the Question of the hon. Member for the City of Limerick; the occasion is the same, the place is the same, and the only difference that I am aware of is that the hon. Member for the county of Limerick suggests in his Question that the police refused to leave on certain grounds. So far as I can ascertain they did not refuse to leave. They were invited to remain, and they did so. The powers were exercised by invitation of the meeting, and not under any Act of Parliament.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, with respect to the course of Business next week, it may be, perhaps, for the convenience of the House if I state what we intend to propose. On Monday the first Business will be—the necessary Motion for postponing the Orders being made, if there should be Orders in the way — the Motion of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland, of which he has given Notice, for the introduction of a Bill for the Better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland. I propose to move on Tuesday, at half-past 4, the Motion which I have already placed on the Paper, and which now stands No. 8 for Monday, on the Business of the House—

> "That the introduction and the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill and the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill, have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise Order.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Does the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland propose to bring in the second Bill on Monday night?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Yes, Sir, supposing I get the first one brought in.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

SOUTH AFRICA—ANNEXATION OF THE TRANSVAAL.

RESOLUTION.

MR. RYLANDS, in rising to call attention to the state of affairs in the Transvaal, and to move—

> "That this House is of opinion that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjustifiable, and would view with regret any measures taken by Her Majesty's Government with the object of enforcing British supremacy over the people of the Transvaal, who rightly claim their national independence;"

said, that at the outset he craved the indulgence of the House in the performance of what he deemed to be his duty. He had been deprived of the assistance of his hon. Friend the present Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Courtney), from whose wise counsels on former occasions he had greatly benefited, and with whom he had expected to be in alliance in making the present Motion, and in asking the attention of the House to it. But he begged that he might not be misunderstood. He believed his hon. Friend was in no sense precluded by the views he had taken upon the Transvaal Question from giving his services to a Government in whom he had, necessarily, the highest confidence. It would be utterly impossible to expect that all Members of the Liberal Party should take exactly the same views of public policy; and he (Mr. Rylands) only hoped that his hon. Friend, in his new position, would endeavour to the best of his ability to uphold the views he maintained when he sat in another part of the House. Objection had been taken in the public Press to the terms of his Motion, inasmuch as it did not recognize the Native question in connection with the Government of the Transvaal. Now, he (Mr. Rylands) wished to say that he did not in any way depreciate the importance of the Native question; but he thought that question was one which belonged rather to South Africa generally, than to any particular part of South Africa; and in order to meet it, it would be necessary that the White inhabitants should join together and lay down a policy that would be just and fair towards the Natives. But he could not think it desirable, in this question of the Transvaal, that they should include in the Resolution matters connected with Native policy, because he did not doubt that in the future, whatever might be the result of the present struggle, the protection of the Natives would be secured as far as possible by the influence of Her Majesty's Government; and he would remind hon. Gentlemen who were anxious to secure the best interests of the Native population, that their experience of the way in which the Native population had been treated in Cape Colony did not give them absolute assurance that if they were placed under the Cape Colony, they would be dealt with in a just, fair, and equitable spirit. Of course, if it could be shown that under the Transvaal Government the Natives must necessarily suffer great injustice and great cruelty, and that it would be impossible for the British Government to do anything in their favour, and if it could be shown that by withdrawing them from the Transvaal they should place them under a humane, peaceful, and just Government, then he should say that that would be a consideration that must be borne in mind. He could only remind the House that, so far from that being the fact, the very excuse that was made for taking possession of the Transvaal was that it was in the interests of peace and to protect the Zulus; and yet, by the annexation of the Transvaal, they had one of the most wicked and one of the most destructive wars that was ever levied by the Cape Colonists, or the Government at the Cape. They knew also that, under the Cape Government, there was at present a very unjust and cruel war going on; and, certainly, the excuse given for it by the Cape Colonists did not encourage them to believe that, from their administration, they could safely rely upon justice being done to the Native population. He did not propose to go into the history of the Boers in South Africa; but hon. Gentlemen must be aware that there were many instances in that history which could not be looked upon by Englishmen without some shame and regret. The Cape Government had continually taken the course of driving these people from one part of the country to another, driving them from their homesteads, and very often inflicting serious cruelties and injustice upon them. Having driven them across the Vaal, and having passed through various struggles with the Dutch Boers, at length in 1852 they entered into a Treaty; and the starting point he wished to take was the recognition, by the Treaty, of the independence of the Transvaal. He was not one of those who were superstitious in regard to the sanctity of Treaties. He believed that many Treaties had been made that might have been more honoured in the breach than in the observance; but this engagement between this country and the Boers could not be honourably broken without the full consent of the other parties to the Treaty. The Treaty of 1852 was entered into between W. S. Hogge and C. M. Owen, Her Majesty's Assistant Commissioners of the one part, and General Pretorius and a deputation of 15 members from the emigrant farmers of the other part. By that Treaty we recognized the independence of the Boers. By the 1st clause of that Treaty, the Boers were guaranteed in the fullest manner the right to manage their own affairs without interference on the part of the Queen's Government, and the British undertook that no encroachment should be made on the territory North of the Vaal River. The policy of 1852 was a wise one. The Prime Minister had pointed out in striking language the wisdom of diminishing the sphere of our responsibility. That reasoning operated powerfully in favour of our withdrawing from the Transvaal. The wise policy pursued by the Liberal Government with respect to the Transvaal, however, was reversed by their Successors when they broke that Treaty in 1877. Even if the reasons they gave for it had been proved to be as sound as they had been proved to be false, they would have formed no justification for such a breach of faith. The late Government were constantly seeking to justify an immoral policy, under the pretence of upholding "British interests." ["No, no!"] It was a policy which disregarded the rights of other nations; and, as a part of that policy, they annexed the Transvaal, sacrificing the independence of the Boers. The question to be decided was, Did the people of the Transvaal agree to that annexation or not? So far from agreeing to it, they solemnly protested against it at the time, and they had protested against it ever since. In proof of that statement he would refer to the Blue Book published on the 9th of August, 1877. In that Blue Book it would be found that the Executive Council of the Boers, after referring to the Treaty of 1852 and our recognition of Boer independence, expressed their readiness to satisfy all just and equitable demands made upon them; but stated, at the same time, that the large majority of the people were averse from annexation and protested most strongly against it. But in that House they had been entirely misled. He recollected that when the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. James Lowther) was Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, he was asked how the annexation had been received. The reply was, that it had been received with gladness. In the Queen's Speech, too, in August, 1877, it was stated that the proclamation of the Queen's Sovereignty in the Transvaal had been received throughout the Province with enthusiasm. To say the least, that statement was an inaccuracy. He did not like to use stronger language; and although some hon. Members of Parliament might have been imposed on by it, those who knew something about the manufacturing of Queen's Speeches were not. In the country he (Mr. Rylands) had no doubt it was accepted as a positive and acknowledged fact. But in a very short time they began to discover that the statements of the late Government were not to be relied on. He thought they might assume that the fact was now universally admitted that the annexation of the Transvaal was carried in opposition to the will of the Transvaal people, and there was no excuse for it. First, a deputation representing the Boers of the Transvaal came to this country to urge the restoration of their independence. Then there was a second deputation, which represented 6,600 out of 8,000 Boers, and which stated that the people of the Transvaal in large numbers protested against the violation of their independence. Early in 1879 Sir Bartle Frere met a large assembly of Boers in conference on the subject; but his persuasive eloquence entirely failed to induce the Boers to believe they were better off under British rule than when independent. Sir Bartle Frere undertook that their representations should be conveyed to the Home Government; but no result came of those representations. It thus appeared that the annexation was carried out in utter opposition to the will of the Boers, and that we, without the slightest excuse, broke the provisions of the Treaty into which we had solemnly entered in 1852. He wished to draw attention to certain utterances of the present Prime Minister in the Mid Lothian speeches. He believed that the Prime Minister had not only raised the ideas of the people by his eloquent speeches to a high standard of public policy, but that he had touched the conscience of the nation, and that many of those who voted for the Liberal Party at the last Election had done so because they felt that their country had been degraded by the policy of the Conservative Government. In several of these speeches the Prime Minister referred to the policy which had been adopted by the late Government in annexing the Transvaal. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the Transvaal as—

> "A country where we have chosen most unwisely—I am tempted to say insanely—to place ourselves in the strange predicament of the free subjects of a Monarchy going to coerce the free subjects of a Republic, and to compel them to accept a citizenship which they decline and refuse. But if that is to be done, it must be done by force. There is no strength to be added to your country by governing the Transvaal."

On November 25, at Edinburgh, the right hon. Gentleman condemned the late Government for having annexed the Transvaal—a country inhabited by a free, European, Christian, Republican community—and having brought it, in spite of the protest of 6,500 of the people, within the limits of the Monarchy. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) also, at the commencement of the first Session of last year, said—

> "That the annexation of the Transvaal was a measure adopted by the Government and sanctioned by the House under wrong impressions and under inaccurate information."

The noble Marquess also added that—

> "If the people of England found it would be more honourable to restore the former Government, no false sense of their dignity being involved in the question ought to stand in the way; and that their true dignity would be best consulted by acknowledging that they had made a mistake, if, indeed, it was found that a mistake had been made, and restoring the Government of the Transvaal."—[3 *Hansard*, ccl..92.]

Those sentences of the noble Marquess were truly honourable. They evinced the same kind of real British honour as the noble Marquess showed when, in reply to a deputation about the retention of Candahar, he said—"The first question we have to consider is, What right have we there?" It was, he thought, refreshing to hear such sentiments as these after our late experience of a Conservative *régime.* Well, these declarations of the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Marquess were, of course, published in Africa, and they naturally excited hopes among the inhabitants of the Transvaal, that when the present Government should accede to power, the decision of their Predecessors would be reversed. Why had it not been reversed? He was not going to condemn the Government, for he knew the difficulties in which they were placed by the inheritance of their Predecessors' policy, and by the deception practised by official correspondents and others, whose object was that the Government at home should remain satisfied with the policy at present prevailing in connection with the Transvaal. Since the accession to Office of the present Government there had been a constant system of misrepresentation by the officials of the Colony, which had led Her Majesty's Ministers to suppose that the state of things in the Transvaal had been comparatively satisfactory. In a recent number of a leading Cape journal, *The Cape Argus*, were the following words :—

> "As to the profound discontent of the entire population in the Province so rudely annexed there can be no doubt. As to the detestation in which the Government is held, by British *winkler* and British adventurer, as well as Boer, that is a fact beyond question or cavil. The authorities appear to have been systematically misrepresenting the situation. Despatch after despatch has gone to England, leading the Secretary of State to believe that the Boer population was fast ceasing to care for independence. The present gathering at Paardekraal is a sufficient answer to these mischievous perversions of what we do not pretend to regard as other than a most unfortunate truth. The most glowing accounts of financial revival have been periodically published abroad, By these our scepticism was more than once aroused, and the mail which arrived yesterday brought us a copy of the one Pretoria newspaper which is on the side of British rule, and this we find describing them as 'fallacious in every respect.'"

No one, he (Mr. Rylands) maintained, who read the despatches of Sir Owen Lanyon, could doubt that that official was one of those who were in the habit of closing their eyes in order to avoid seeing what they would not like to see. There was evidence of that in Sir Owen Lanyon's recent despatches, in which he said the Government would be strangely wrong were it to mistake the clamour of agitators for public opinion. It was, he (Mr. Rylands) thought, a most singular thing that whenever we found ourselves ruling people despotically, our Representatives never failed to persuade us that any expressions of the public will and of discontent did not emanate from the *vox populi*, but came from agitators and others actuated by self-interest. The result of our refusal to admit the grievance of the Transvaal people was the terrible struggle in which we were now involved—for terrible he deemed it to be. The justification of the Government lay in the fact that they had, no doubt, been deceived by their Representatives. But he thought the Government had also been anxious to maintain a continuity of Government policy. It was understood that when one political Party succeeded another, there should be a continuity of Governmental policy in regard to foreign affairs as far as possible, and, no doubt, in regard to Colonial affairs. He was not prepared to dispute that continuity of policy in some cases might be justifiable. He was not prepared to deny that, in many cases, it was undesirable that where it could be avoided there should be an absolute reversal of previous Governmental policy; but the continuity of policy was really the continuity of the permanent officials of the State to a great extent, and he had no doubt whatever that the Colonial Office was entirely in favour of the annexation of the Transvaal. But there were exceptions, and these were where an iniquitous policy had been followed. He had no doubt Her Majesty's Government believed that this policy was an unfortunate one to have entered upon, and that they would rejoice if it were possible that that annexation should never have taken place. He had not brought forward his Motion with the view of indicating that he had not perfect confidence in Her Majesty's Government carrying out those principles of policy which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) advocated before he took Office. He brought forward his Motion simply because he felt that they were possibly getting into an obligation which would involve them still further in a policy which was iniquitous in its commencement, and was criminal in its development. The Government must either give up this iniquitous policy and seek some means by which they could restore to the inhabitants of the Transvaal that independence to which they had a just claim, or they must decide to support this iniquitous policy to its bitter end, to use all the power of Great Britain in order to crush the Boers of the Transvaal. No false idea about British honour and British prestige need affect their judgment in regard to a question of this kind. The world would never believe that they did not put forth their power against the Dutch in the Transvaal because they were afraid of them. If they did not crush them, it would be known to the world that it was because they did not believe it was just to crush them. The House should bear in mind that these few thousand Dutchmen were connected by ties of blood, and by national sympathy with two-thirds of the White inhabitants of Cape Colony. It was impossible to take any steps to crush the Dutch in the Transvaal without creating the most painful feeling amongst the loyal subjects of the British Crown in the Cape Colony. *The Cape Argus* dwelt upon that fact, and a speaker at a recent deputation to the Administrator (Sir George Strahan) used these remarkable words—

> "We are very anxious about this Transvaal matter. We see the agitation which is going on here, and which must be expected to go on throughout the whole of the country. It is of no use disguising the fact, that there must be a fellow-feeling between the inhabitants of the Cape Colony and the Transvaal. In the present state of affairs, anything occurring in the Transvaal cannot fail to prejudice the Cape Colony and the majority of Cape Colonists. Every shot fired in the Transvaal will find its echo down here in the Cape Colony. Every drop of blood shed in the Transvaal will sow the seeds of that bitter feeling which was dying away between Dutch and English."

They had proof, also, of the sympathy of the different sections of the Dutch population with each other in the very influentially signed and representative Memorial presented to the English Government by the inhabitants of Holland. He could not but think that the Government were prepared to do justice to a weak and struggling race, and, therefore, he begged to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

MR. W. CARTWRIGHT, in seconding the Motion, said, he did so in the firm conviction that it was most desirable, at the present conjuncture of affairs, that the whole of the facts as to the relations of this country with the Transvaal should be subjected to the thorough sifting and investigation which resulted from a debate in that House. He, of course, agreed that the first duty of the Government was to assert the dignity and authority of the British arms; but when that had been done, they would have to consider certain important political conditions to which, perhaps, it was not inappropriate that he should now invite the attention of the House. He thought it had been conclusively shown, and the people of this country could not too often be told the fact, that the representations under which the Earl of Carnarvon was originally induced to sanction the annexation of the Transvaal were not borne out by subsequent events, but had rather been confuted by the official Papers which had been presented to Parliament. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who was mainly instrumental in bringing about that annexation, based his policy upon three grounds—first, that the state of the Transvaal was anarchical; secondly, that danger was involved in a continuance of this state of affairs; and, thirdly, that in consequence of the anarchy which existed in the Transvaal, a large and important section of the population desired to have annexation with this country; and it was upon that view that the instructions which were sent out by Lord Carnarvon were drawn up. Certain conditions were put forth as a basis; but he (Mr. Cartwright) believed that those on which the annexation was to take place were not fulfilled. It was in January, 1876, when Sir Theophilus Shepstone arrived at Pretoria. He did not put forward that he had come to bring about annexation; he represented himself as having come to confer with the Transvaal Government in respect to certain events which constituted a danger to the English Colonies. There was no evidence to show that at that time there existed any hostile feeling against the English in the Transvaal. Shortly afterwards, Sir Theophilus Shepstone initiated the annexation policy, and supported it with Memorials from the Transvaal population. Now, it was evident that much depended upon the character of those Memorials. He (Mr. Cartwright) had, therefore, carefully examined them as they appeared in the Blue Books, and the conclusion that he had come to was that they could not be considered as fairly representative of the public opinion of the Transvaal. Some had no names attached to them, only the number of signatures being given, and where names did appear they were principally signed by Englishmen who lived in the hamlets which were called towns in the Transvaal; while the Dutch farmers, who really formed the White population of the country, had nothing to do in the matter at all. It should be remembered that the condition of the Transvaal was, that there was a Dutch population and an English population; the former resided in the country districts, and were scattered far and wide, and the latter in the hamlets—places called towns—and the capital, Pretoria, had not more than 600 inhabitants. Those Memorials did not at all show the measure of feeling existing among the whole population; but they were acted upon, and the annexation pure and simple took place. Sir Theophilus Shepstone next instituted a Commission to inquire into the financial condition of the country, and he selected as the head of that Commission a gentleman who had for some years been engaged in commerce in Natal, and large tracts of land in the Transvaal had been purchased, if not in his name, at any rate for his profit. It should not be forgotten, too, that at the time of the annexation Sir Theophilus Shepstone issued a proclamation, in the course of which he promised that the annexed Transvaal should have not only a continuance of the existing system of law, but a Legislative Assembly to conduct its own affairs. This promise had not been fulfilled, and the inhabitants of the territory had good ground for complaining on that score. The people of the Transvaal might not be able to hold their own successfully against disciplined arms; but they had shown all the pertinacity and tenacity which in former times marked the conduct of people who resisted the aggression of strangers. It was a fact worthy of notice that whereas Sir Theophilus Shepstone had, whilst in Natal, considered the Boers wrong in their frontier dispute with the Zulus, as soon as he was established in the Transvaal he completely changed his views. From the moment of the annexation the Boers tried to bring home to the mind of the British Government the fact that they loved their independence and that annexation was a thing detestable in their eyes. They sent to England a deputation, who put this view in simple and forcible language before the Earl of Carnarvon, who was at that time Secretary of State for the Colonies. The noble Earl heard what the deputation had to say, and simply informed them that, annexation having become an accomplished fact, Her Majesty's Government could not go back from the position they had taken up. When this deputation returned to their own country and stated the result of their visit, they were told that it could not be; and the leaders issued a document upon the subject, which reminded him (Mr. Cartwright) of the old Covenanters. The inhabitants left their farms and travelled, some of them hundreds of miles, in order to protest against the course which had been taken, and to urge that, in their view, the Imperial Government would consent to listen to reason and justice. The assembled inhabitants of the Transvaal, not satisfied with the result of the first mission, clubbed together and provided the necessary funds to defray the charges of a second deputation, who came to this country in order to lay before the Government the views of their countrymen on this subject. Those views were fully set forth by the deputation; but no satisfactory answer was given to them, and on their return to the Transvaal they had to report the fact, together with a statement that the promises made by Sir Theophilus Shepstone in his proclamation were not to be fulfilled, unless it could be supposed that a Legislative Council to manage the affairs of the Transvaal could be satisfactory which consisted mainly of persons who did not know the Dutch language. It was absurd to suppose that a Government of the kind could win the affections or soothe the asperities of a people who felt that they suffered under a grievance of which they had a right to complain. The danger with which the Government was menaced was a grave one, and he hoped the House and the Government would not hesitate in giving to it most serious consideration. The danger of annexing a hostile population was not a small one. It was, on the contrary, one which, under certain circumstances, might tax the power even of this great Empire. The British Army might be able to meet the Boers in the field and to shoot them down, but they would never subdue their indomitable spirit. Had anything been done by the Government calculated in any way to satisfy the wants of the Transvaal? There was a Legislative Council; but there were on it only two Dutchmen, the rest being Englishmen, who were squatters and adventurers. Was a Council so constituted calculated to win the affections and soothe the asperities of the people? The Colonial tendencies that had carried us to the Transvaal were of the most dangerous kind, tending in the direction of an African Empire, which this country would have to support; and those tendencies were explicitly set forth in a characteristic despatch by Sir Bartle Frere at the very time that we were annexing the Transvaal. He hoped the example set by what was so wisely done in 1852 would not be lost upon Her Majesty's Government, and that when the proper time came, and when we had vindicated our arms, some settlement would be arrived at which would insure to those populations that which they would not cease to seek—namely, their autonomy. He begged to second the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), and thought he might appeal to the House to accept it.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is of opinion that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjustifiable, and would view with regret any measures taken by Her Majesty's Government with the object of enforcing British supremacy over the people of the Transvaal, who rightfully claim their national independence,"—(*Mr. Rylands,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, who had given Notice of his intention to move the Previous Question, but who was precluded from doing so by the Forms of the House, said, his hon. Friends who introduced the subject had claimed the indulgence of the House, and he had to make the same appeal, on the ground that a very few hours ago no hon. Member knew that the debate could be proceeded with that night. His hon. Friends had put forward their views with great force and skill, not only in the points they brought forward, but in those they avoided. His hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had expressed unlimited confidence in Her Majesty's Government, notwithstanding that his Resolution was really a Vote of Censure; and his hon. Friend who spoke last (Mr. Cartwright) said that no settlement could take place until after the vindication of our authority, a view quite inconsistent with the terms of his own Resolution. He (Sir John Lubbock) could not, for his part, see how the Queen's authority could be maintained, except by the steps the Government were taking. His hon. Friend the Member for Burnley said he would not enter into the Native question; but that question was the whole gist of the controversy—a question, moreover, which the Government could not avoid, since it rested at the root of the whole difficulty. The hon. Member had quoted the Sand River Convention in support of his view; but had omitted from it one very material passage. It was there agreed that slavery should no longer be carried on in the Transvaal. His hon. Friend began his Resolution by inviting the House to affirm that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjust. The first statement he (Sir John Lubbock) was not disposed to question. He did not feel called upon, nor did he think that that was at all a convenient moment to express any opinion upon it. So far, however, he would concede to his hon. Friend; that at the time and in the manner in which the annexation was effected, it was, in his judgment, impolitic; it involved us in heavy expense and great responsibility. Beyond that, however, he was unable to go with his hon. Friend. He could not think the annexation was an unjust act on our part. No one could read the South African newspapers, or even those portions which had been laid on the Table of the House, without being convinced that the Boers behaved with great cruelty towards the unfortunate Natives. Sir Henry Barkly's despatches contained numerous and indignant letters with reference to the atrocities perpetrated on them. In his despatch of December 18, 1876, he says—

"I had felt it my duty to address President Burgers against the barbarous mode in which, according to accounts from many quarters, the war with Secocœni is being prosecuted."

Lord Carnarvon, in April, 1877, said—

"Her Majesty's Government, after having given full consideration to all the information obtainable on the subject, and with every desire to view matters in the most favourable light, deeply regret that they are forced to come to the conclusion that the barbarities alleged to have been committed, though denied by the Transvaal Government, have, in fact, occurred."

But the ground of complaint against the late Government of the so-called South African Republic was not confined to the mode in which they carried on war.

A system of slavery had been organized, which certainly ought not only to be condemned by every generous mind, but which was in direct contravention to the Sand River Conference, in which we made the absence of slavery a condition of our recognition. His hon. Friend had several times referred to *The Cape Argus* as a paper of authority in support of his proposition. He (Sir John Lubbock), however, would now quote to them that very paper in the opposite sense. That newspaper, speaking on the subject, said—

> "The whole world may know it, for it is true, and investigation will only bring out the horrible details that, through the whole course of this Republic's existence, it has acted in contravention of the Sand River Treaty; and slavery has occurred, not only here and there in isolated cases; but as an unbroken practice has been one of the peculiar institutions of the country; mixed up with all its social and political life. It has been at the root of most of its wars. It has been carried on regularly even in times of peace. It has been characterized by all those circumstances which have so often roused the British nation to an indignant protest, and to repeated efforts to banish the Slave Trade from the world. The Boers have not only fallen upon unsuspecting kraals simply for the purpose of obtaining the women, children, and cattle, but they have carried on a traffic through Natives, who have kidnapped the children of their weaker neighbours and sold them to the White man. Again, the Boers have sold and exchanged their victims among themselves. Waggon-loads of slaves have been conveyed from one end of the country to the other for sale, and that with the cognizance of, and for the direct advantage of, the highest officials of the land."

Other local papers expressed themselves quite as strongly. But it was not only the local Press and Her Majesty's Representatives who expressed themselves so strongly. The German missionaries themselves, who could not be supposed to have any leaning one way or the other, were equally outspoken. The Rev. Mr. Ludorf, for instance, protested most strongly against the cruelties exercised towards the defenceless Natives. Mr. Merensky, another German missionary, says that the Transvaal was a

> "Vast preserve for the Slave Trade; wide fields over which the lust of land and cattle and of the bodies of men may hold its devastating sway."

Mr. Nachtigal, of the Berlin Missionary Society, who had also resided for many years in the Transvaal, spoke most indignantly in similar terms. He protested against the proceedings of the Boers

Sir John Lubbock

> "As in conflict with all the laws of civilized nations, and as placing me in the eyes of my fellow-men as a dishonourable man and a deceiver. I can only conclude that those concerned in this matter are too cowardly to be merciful."

Even President Burgers himself admitted that the Natives had been cruelly treated. He said—

> "Do you know what has recently happened in Turkey? Because no civilized Government was carried on there the Great Powers interfered and said, thus far and no further. And if this is done to an Empire, will a little Republic be excused when it misbehaves. Complain to other Powers, and seek justice there? If we want justice, we must be in a position to ask it with unsullied hands."

He (Sir John Lubbock) was unwilling to dwell on this painful part of the subject; but the hon. Member forced him to allude to it. Now, what was the condition of the Transvaal at the time of the annexation? People often spoke as if it was a country inhabited by a sturdy and numerous people of Dutch extraction. That was entirely a mistake. They were told that three-fourths of the people were strongly opposed to British rule. But what were the numbers? The country itself was about as large as France, and it contained about 40,000 White men and 800,000 Natives. Of the 40,000 Whites, it was calculated that there were 8,000 adult males, and that of these 6,000 were opposed to British rule. But the idea that 6,000 should claim to hold a country as large as France was one of the most preposterous pretensions on record in history. The 800,000 Natives, the original owners of the soil, surely ought to be considered; and they were bitterly opposed, not without good reason, to Boer rule. Indeed, at the time of the annexation, the Boer Government had utterly collapsed. The country was in a state of anarchy; the Treasury was empty; the salaries of the officials were unpaid; the Government had overdue bills which it was unable to meet; the military system had broken down; the Boers were split into factions, and were surrounded by a warlike and hostile population. To show how powerless the Government was, he might mention that at Lydenburg a public meeting was held in October, 1876, and a remonstrance was addressed to the Volksraad, signed by nearly every adult male of Lydenburg, and Kruger's Post. They said—

> "Matters in connection with the war with Secocœni are daily becoming more complicated, our position more critical, and we have looked vainly for help and for the fulfilment of the promises made by His Honour the State President while at Lydenburg. . . . It is alone attributable to Providence that everything has not been burnt and devastated by our enemies. The assistance promised has not been afforded, and lately no effort has been made by the Government to stop the war."

They continued—

> "An attack by Kaffirs will inevitably result in the murder of our families, to say nothing of the destruction of property. We therefore request the Government candidly to let us know whether it intends to do aught for this district; and, if not, or if it is not in a position to do anything, to let us know, so that we may try to adopt measures for our own preservation. We were surprised to notice the Confederation with the British Power, so nobly offered, was not accepted, inasmuch as we have all to gain and nothing to lose thereby, the more that it continually appears that the Government is not in a position to properly protect us, as is evident from the unpunished incendiarism and thieving by the Kaffirs. If no other measure can be devised to quell the disturbances, we desire that the Government proceed to request the intervention of some other Power."

As proving how hopeless was the financial condition of the country on the eve of a war with Cetewayo, who was not, as was afterwards found, so easy to beat, he might state that a bill for £2,500 to the Port Contractors being overdue, the Government, after much pressing, promised to pay £1,500 in a fortnight, or to forfeit £2,000; and yet when the time came only £600 was forthcoming. The Volksraad themselves, having appointed a Special Committee to consider the disastrous state of the finances, after receiving their Report, resolved that it appeared

> "From the Report of the Financial Commission that the taxes have not, for the greater part, been paid; and it has thus become impossible, under such circumstances, for the Government to carry on the administration and control of the country."

The President himself hoped for a moment that the Volksraad might intrust him with greater powers, and that then possibly it might be in his power to "right the State," as he said. He introduced his Reform Bill, and, according to Sir Theophilus Shepstone—

> "He enforced the necessity of adopting this measure very strongly upon the Volksraad as the only possible means of saving their independence; but the Raad threw it out without even discussing it."

Lest it should be supposed that he (Sir John Lubbock) was taking too gloomy a view, he would quote from the candid and graphic speech to the Volksraad, delivered shortly before the annexation by Mr. Burgers, the President of the Republic. After detailing the ruinous state to which affairs had drifted, he alluded to the non-payment of taxes, and the consequent state of bankruptcy which had ensued. He said—

> "To-day a bill for £1,100 was laid before me for signature; but I would sooner have cut off my right hand than sign that paper, for I have not the slightest ground to expect that when that bill becomes due there will be a penny to pay it with."

At that very moment, without money and without military organization, the Boers were in imminent danger of being attacked by an overwhelming Native force. His people, said President Burgers—

> "Were as good as any other people; but they were completely demoralized."

Then he referred in warm terms to the ant, extolling its patience, industry, and courage. He wished, he said, that they had

> "The instinct of that little insect, the wisdom and sense shown by the ant."

He continued—

> "We should delude ourselves by entertaining the hope that matters would mend by-and-bye. It would be only self-deceit. I tell you openly, matters are as bad as they ever can be; they cannot be worse. These are bitter truths, and people may, perhaps, turn their backs on me. But then I shall have the consolation of having done my duty."

It was, perhaps, too much to expect that the President of any State would say, in so many words, that his Government had broken down utterly; but what was President Burgers's advice to his fellow-countrymen? What were his aspirations for the future of his country? He said—

> "Let them make the best of the situation and get the best terms they possibly could; let them agree to join their hands to those of their brethren on the South, and then from the Cape to the Zambesi there would be one great people. Yes; there was something grand in that, grander even than their idea of a Republic, something which ministered to their national feeling; and would this be so miserable? Yes; this would be miserable for those who would not be under the law, for the rebel and the revolutionist; but welfare and prosperity for the man of law and order."

But what was the opinion of the people? So hopeless was the state of things, so imminent the danger, that Sir Theophilus Shepstone received addresses in favour of annexation from many towns and districts—from Potchefstroom, Lydenburg, Pilaansburg, Bloemhof, Waterburg, Middleburg, Rustemberg, &c. They were told that the Petitions presented to the English for annexation were from small towns; but it must be remembered that, though they were small compared with British towns, they were about the most important the Transvaal possessed, and it must be further remembered that there were no Petitions in the other sense. The principal Transvaal newspaper expressed, in fact, the general opinion when it said—

> "It would be mere affectation on our part if we were to hint a belief that the change would not be beneficial to the country, although we do not share the extravagant ideas of rapid progress which some of our friends anticipate. And although we would have preferred to have seen the improvement brought about by our own agency, yet now that another Power has stepped in which will accomplish the change quicker than we could have wrought it, we are not going to quarrel with that Power."

One little indication of this was afforded by the fact that the Proclamation of Annexation was actually printed in the printing-press of the late Government. No doubt, it was much to be regretted that the consent of the Volksraad was not obtained. But if they did not assent, neither did they dissent. It was true that in February they passed a Resolution in favour of maintaining their isolation; but the annexation did not take place till the middle of April. By that time things had become much worse, and then was the time they ought to have protested. This they did not do. Moreover, we must remember not only the addresses which Sir Theophilus Shepstone had received, not only the tacit acquiescence of the people of Pretoria, but also the alarming state of affairs with the Natives. During the second week of April things looked still more serious; and, fearing a catastrophe, which might have happened at any moment, Sir Theophilus Shepstone did not venture even to wait for the actual annexation, and, accordingly, the day before it took place, he sent a trusted messenger to the Zulu King, informing him of his intention. The reply was as follows:—

> "I thank my father for his message. The Dutch have tired me out, and I intended to fight with them once, and once only, and to drive them over the Vaal. My armies are gathered. It was to fight the Dutch I called them together. Now I will send them back to their homes."

It would be seen, therefore, that Cetewayo was on the point of swooping down on the helpless Boers. The annexation of the Transvaal was often spoken of as if it had been an act of arbitrary violence. But what were the facts? Sir Theophilus Shepstone entered the country with a staff of 12 persons and 25 Native policemen. He found the country in a state of bankruptcy, anarchy, and terror. As he moved slowly up to Pretoria, he was everywhere well received by the inhabitants, who held meetings in favour of annexation, but none against it. Though he had no troops with him, and had given notice of his intention, he met with no opposition when he proclaimed the annexation, not by stealth, as the hon. Member for Burnley said, but in open day in the principal square of the town. At Pretoria itself the state of things was long and frankly discussed with the Executive Government. Sir Theophilus Shepstone's idea of annexing the country was long known, but no meetings to protest against annexation were held; the Volksraad did not themselves protest. No force was threatened. The English troops were a month's march away. At last Sir Theophilus annexed the country —which, be it remembered, was as large as France and had a population of nearly 1,000,000 persons—with a force of 12 Englishmen and 25 Colonial policemen. The whole thing read like a scene in a fairy tale rather than one of real history; and Lord Beaconsfield was, perhaps, the more disposed to accept the annexation because it must have reminded him of a chapter from *Endymion* or *Lothair*. Although a representation was sent over here against it, at the same time a Petition, which was influentially signed, was sent to the contrary effect. He did not understand why his hon. Friend (Mr. Cartwright) should speak so slightingly of the English settlers. Surely our countrymen who vested their money there had rights as well as people of other nationalities. The fact of the Government of the Republic having been cognizant of all the steps taken, and of having made no resistance, proved that the act was not done against their wishes. Under these circumstances, he contended that if there was not a feeling in favour of annexation, there was no strong feeling against it at the time. Yet now, after we had spent our money and shed our blood, conquered their enemies, improved their finances, restored law and order and security, we were met with obloquy and abuse, with violence, if not with treachery, and were accused of having committed a violent act of arbitrary injustice. But while it seemed clear that when we annexed the Transvaal a considerable proportion of the White population were really in favour of that step, while it was obviously impossible that Sir Theophilus Shepstone and his 25 men could not, after ample notice, have annexed a country as large as France without the consent of the people, it was much to be regretted that he did not obtain the actual assent of the nominal Government, or of the Volksraad. He would, perhaps, say that the danger of war with the Natives was so imminent that it might have broken out at any moment, and that when blood was shed it would have been very difficult to restore peace. That might be; but the fact was not the less to be regretted. The real state of the case was well put in a Petition in favour of annexation, and protesting against the so-called mission of Messrs. Kruger and Jorissen, which was very influentially signed by members of the Volksraad, landowners, and other influential inhabitants of the Transvaal. These gentlemen, writing in June, 1877, say—

> "That the fact of the Government of the Republic having been cognizant of all the steps taken by the Special Commissioner from the commencement, and the Legislature and the population generally practically acquiescing in the Act, proves that it was not against their wishes or real interests.
>
> "That the mission of Sir Theophilus Shepstone was known to the country long prior to the Proclamation of Annexation being read, and that no movement was organized to prevent that step being taken.
>
> "That the plea of coercion cannot be maintained, as no armed force entered the country until after the annexation, and no attempt whatever was made to oppose the small number that subsequently did arrive.
>
> "That the inherent weakness of the former Administration was such that anarchy already prevailed, and civil war would to a certainty have resulted had the Special Commissioner left without proclaiming the country."

As regarded the Natives, one of Sir Theophilus Shepstone's first acts was to summon a large meeting, numerously attended by the most influential Chiefs. After he had explained to them what had been done, they expressed their satisfaction at the change, their thanks for what he had said, and their confidence that their grievances would now be redressed. But perhaps it would be said that in maintaining that the Boers, at any rate, had no ground of complaint against us we deceived ourselves; that no one could make a good judge in his own case, or decide fairly when his own interests were concerned. That was true; but that very consideration seemed to strengthen his argument. This country assuredly gained nothing by the annexation of the Transvaal; one of the first results was that they had to provide £100,000 for the pressing and immediate necessities of government, and they had also entailed on themselves heavy military expenditure. They would not grudge their lives or money to protect their brother Whitemen at the Cape; but it did seem hard that, having lavished both the one and the other, the Boers should repay them with obloquy and violence. On the other hand, the Transvaal itself had immensely gained. The security of life and property was restored. The income, which had fluctuated between £58,000 and £65,000, rose, without any new taxes, and, though the war tax was remitted, to £82,000 in 1878, £93,000 in 1879, while the first six months of 1880 produced £84,000. He had received a very respectable Petition signed by a number of Dutch citizens. He had a most sincere admiration for the Dutch people, and was most anxious to retain their good opinion. With the spirit of that document he concurred; but if those who signed it had had the facts fully before them, he felt sure they would have acquitted us entirely of any avarice or injustice, and do us the justice to believe that in very difficult circumstances we had done what we thought to be our duty; and in defence of the Boers had not hesitated to spend British money, and, alas, to sacrifice British lives. The truth seemed to be that when the Boers found themselves in the face of a powerful enemy, with a bankrupt Treasury, and in a state of anarchy, they welcomed our protection; now that we had restored order, replenished their Exchequer, and vanquished their enemies, many of them sighed for the old state of lawless licence, and chafed at the idea of being, not so much under British rule, as under any rule at all. They were told that the people of the Transvaal claimed their "national independence." These 6,000 Boers claimed a great deal more than that; they claimed for themselves to rule over, as he had said, a country as large as France, and to exercise a dominion over 800,000 Natives. He would not enlarge on the manner in which they were carrying on the struggle, or refer to the cruel treachery with which they were said to have acted, because he would fain hope that the accounts we had received might admit of some explanation. Under existing circumstances, however, he could not imagine that the House would do anything to weaken the hands of Her Majesty's Government, or discourage the loyal inhabitants of the Transvaal. Her Majesty, in Her Gracious Speech from the Throne, informed them that it was her wish

> "To give the European settlers in the Transvaal full control over their own affairs, without prejudice to the interests of the Natives."

The policy of Her Majesty's Government, as stated in the Instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson, was as follows:—

> "Her Majesty's Government have anxiously looked forward to the time when it might be possible to confer such institutions on the Transvaal also; but the recent news of an attempt to overthrow the Queen's sovereignty by armed force renders it useless to discuss arrangements which can only be practicable when the authority of the Crown has been vindicated, and the maintenance of tranquillity is firmly assured. When this has been effected Her Majesty's Government will be prepared carefully to consider the best means of assuring to the Dutch settlers such full control of their local affairs as may be consistent with the general interests of Her Majesty's Dominions in South Africa, and with the obligations which have been incurred by this country to the very large Native population in the Transvaal."

The English Government was, therefore, in favour of giving the settlers in the Transvaal full control of their own affairs. For his own part, indeed, he (Sir John Lubbock) regretted that the Government of the Transvaal should have so utterly broken down. A strong and free State there would have been a great advantage. If such a State entered into a South African Confederation voluntarily so much the better; if they were really reluctant to do so they could never be a source of strength to the Empire. They had not, however, now to deal with facts as they could wish them to be, but as they were; and, being quite satisfied with the Instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson, he should much regret any Resolution of the House which would seem to imply a difference of opinion or want of confidence in Her Majesty's Government. Any appearance of disunion among themselves, the adoption of any Resolution such as that proposed, could only encourage resistance, and prolong and intensify the war. He was satisfied with the policy of Her Majesty's Government in regard to the Transvaal, and hoped the Motion would not be pressed to a division; and though things at the present moment looked gloomy there, he was as anxious as anyone that the present unfortunate war might soon be brought to an end; that the policy of giving the Boers all possible power of managing their own affairs, as desired by both the late and present Governments, might happily be carried out; and that we might soon see the Transvaal a prosperous, contented, and self-supporting people, none the less free because it formed a part of this great Empire.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, that, from what was said by some persons, one would think that the Transvaal was a model Republic, such as had been the dream of philosophers from Plato to the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands). He, on the other hand, maintained that the Boers were *curvæ in terras animæ ac cœlestium inanes*, as was proved by the statements just made by the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) as to the relations of the Republic with the Natives, which indicated what were the origin and character of this Government. The truth was that the Boers, who were originally British subjects, disgusted with the abolition of slavery by the British Government in 1834, rather than give up their slaves, marched forward from the possessions they originally inhabited, and squatted on the large tract of land on which they now lived, said to be the finest in South Africa. The course taken in 1852 had been referred to as a precedent to recommend to Her Majesty's Government; but the two cases were not analogous. In 1852, the Colonial Office, which had previously claimed authority over those regions, entered into the Treaty referred to by his hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright), in the 1st Article of which it was stipulated that no slavery should exist in the Transvaal. There could be no question that that Article had been most grossly violated. A system of slavery had been introduced, in atrocity second to none that ever existed in the world. England, it was forcibly urged some years ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) and the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. W. E. Forster), could extend no sympathy to the Southern States of America, because slavery existed there; but, whatever could be said against the slavery existing in the Southern States of America, much more might be said against that system which prevailed in the South African Republic. The Southern States treated their slaves with humanity, and, at all events, even in cases of exceptional harshness, they took care of them as cattle; but the Boers murdered the adults, both men and women, and carried the children into slavery. The hon. Member for the University of London referred to a case in which a number of children too young to be carried into slavery were burned alive; and he (Mr. R. N. Fowler) asked the House whether it was prepared to support a Republic which could be guilty of such atrocities, and where such a system of domestic slavery was maintained? The atrocities of the Boers made the surrounding Natives so hostile that it was impossible for them to maintain their independence. Whatever they might say now, they were then very glad to have the ægis of British protection thrown over them. It was now stigmatized as a nefarious transaction; but it was not so then. They were glad to be protected by British bayonets. Indeed, it was in consequence of the annexation we became involved in the quarrel with the Zulus, which led us into a disastrous and expensive war. When the annexation was made, no objection was taken either by Lord Kimberley or by Lord Brabourne (then Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), the official Representatives of the Party opposite in their last Government, and the latter noble Lord had recently expressed approval of it; and, in fact, it took place with the approval of some of the most eminent Members of the Liberal Party, and with the general assent of a large number of the Members of that House. Only one Member of the present Government (Mr. Courtney) was strongly adverse to it; but he was then a private Member; and the Office he now held had nothing to do with the question. If the details which had been given of the insurrection were correct, as to the treacherous attack on the convoy at Heidelberg, he hoped no hon. Member would get up and defend the Boers, who had been all along a slave-holding and slave-trading race. The annexation of the Transvaal was a necessity; and he most earnestly appealed to the House not to support a Republic, to which he might apply the burning words of Canning—

> "Its infant lips were stained with blood, its whole existence has been a series of rapacity, cruelty, and murder."

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he had as little sympathy with slavery as anyone; but it should be remembered that the Transvaal was not annexed because the Boers were slaveholders, and he wished to remind the House that when reference was made to that institution the conduct of England with regard to it had not always been consistent. It should be remembered that although the emancipation of our West Indian Colonies was highly creditable to us as a nation, we had subsequently adopted a policy which gave a great impetus to the Slave Trade in order that we might obtain cheap sugar. He was not prepared to question the motives of the late Government for what it did in the annexation of the Transvaal, nor the present Government for continuing that policy; but he must say that, in his judgment, it could not be justified upon any ground of public law or expediency. He would, at the same time, admit that the late Government had acted with the best intentions, accepting in good faith the representations which were made to them on the subject. The hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) had referred to the Boers as arrogating to themselves the right of ruling over a district as large as France; but they must remember that it was the British Government which gave the Boers this right. We gave it to them by solemn treaty; and when, within a year after the Transvaal had become an independent Republic, complaints were made by some societies of their misconduct, the Duke of Newcastle, in a despatch from the Colonial Office, said distinctly that while he was prepared to use friendly offices he declined to interfere, because—

> "As the Convention with the Boers recognized their independence, any act of interference which might lead to collision was totally out of the question."

No doubt, the finances of the Boers were low; but he had yet to learn that because a people were insolvent and could not meet their obligations that afforded justification to the British Government for putting an end to its independence. If that was a reason for annexation, there were countries nearer home that the Government might annex, and with greater show of reason. The insolvency of the Transvaal did not concern foreign States. It affected only its internal obligations. What a valuable acquisition this insolvent country was, when we had to advance £100,000 at once, and since then £140,000 more to carry on improvements and public works. No doubt, under English rule they would be benefited; but that was no reason for enforcing our rule. We hunted these people before from Natal, and with our consent they went forth and founded an independent Republic. Who were these men? They were the descendants of a great race—a race that for 80 years withstood the whole power of Spain. Such men were not likely to submit to a rule which they detested, and which they had endeavoured to avoid. The country was in extent about 114,000 square miles, thinly peopled, its towns, little more than hamlets, and its White population distributed over that enormous tract, families being separated 10 miles from one another. Were we going to embark in a war against these men, to send an army to take one farm and then another 10 miles off? The hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London said that we must first of all establish the authority of the Crown. What did that mean but shooting down these people? He (Mr. Serjeant Simon) believed that the dignity of the Crown and the honour of the country would be best established by acting with justice. He did not believe that either the dignity of the Crown or the honour of the country could be promoted by the shooting, or hunting down of people who had protested from first to last against our rule, and from whom we had no claim of loyalty. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had said that—

> "The late Prime Minister had spoken of difficulties in Europe and Asia, but of the difficulties in Africa he did not speak; and yet there, without the slightest necessity or excuse, he spent £5,000,000 of their money in invading a country which did him no wrong, and was trying to spend more of their money in establishing the authority of the Queen over a community Protestant in religion, and Dutch in origin, against their will."

He (Mr. Serjeant Simon) did not wish to embarrass the Government, nor did his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands); but the discussion of the question would be useful as showing the opinion of the great constituencies of the Kingdom; it would impel the Government, and give them strength to act in accordance with the policy which the right hon. Gentleman had shadowed forth. In the Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson it was stated that—

> "Her Majesty's Government anxiously looked forward to the time when they could confer free institutions on the Transvaal; when that was effected, they were prepared to consider the best means of insuring full control over their local affairs."

He should like an explanation of that passage. Did it mean that they were to continue a kind of semi-rule over that country—to have a Republic within the dominion of the Crown—that the White men were to have an independent Government, with the right to manage their own affairs, with or without the superintendence of the Colonial Office, and that the Black men were to be under the Crown? We had widespread possessions; but we should desire least of all to extend those possessions into the interior of a savage country. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said that the prospect of the multiplication of our possessions from sea to sea was far from desirable. We were at peace with the Transvaal when we took possession of the country. His hon. Friend (Sir John Lubbock) said that the people had notice. But in a country as large as France, with a scattered population, what was the good of a notice to the people of Pretoria? There was no doubt that from the beginning the people made a stand against annexation. They sent delegates to England to protest against it. It was not until all peaceful measures had been exhausted that, at last, 6,000 armed men assembled at Pretoria to protest against our rule. He never knew a case in which a people had more modestly and humbly claimed their rights, rights which we had given them. Their conduct from first to last had been praiseworthy and admirable. It was only when every peaceable effort had failed that they had recourse to arms. He hoped that, if it was deemed necessary to vindicate what was called the authority of the Crown, Her Majesty's Government would spare the lives of these men and treat them leniently, for they had only fought for the liberties which belonged to them of right. It was we who had committed the wrong. Having done so, we ought not to add to our wrongdoing by massacreing the insurgents, or treating them in a vindictive manner. He had no wish to force the hand of the Government, and would not call upon the Prime Minister or the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies to say precisely what course they intended to adopt; but he hoped that some intimation would be given that would satisfy those who took an interest in the subject. He had full faith in the good intentions of the Government, and he hoped some indication would be afforded that we were not intending to carry out a wrongful act by worse means than the act itself. He believed that but for the anxiety prevailing respecting the state of Ireland, there would have been a cry throughout the country against this annexation.

MR. CHAPLIN said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had assured the House that he did not desire in any way to force the hand of the Government or to cause them the least embarrassment. That was also the plea of the hon. Gentleman who had introduced the Motion (Mr. Rylands), and he (Mr. Chaplin) hoped that both hon. Members might be successful in their desire; but the Motion, unless he was altogether mistaken, was calculated to produce very considerable embarrassment. He had listened carefully to the speech of the hon. Member for Burnley, and could not help differing from many of the observations he had made. The hon. Member had informed the House that the late Government, under the pretext of advancing British interests, had been in the habit of pursuing an immoral policy. He denied that proposition *in toto*, and begged to observe that the hon. Member had not adduced any facts in support of his statement. Again, he could not concur with the hon. Member in his description of the annexation as a most iniquitous piece of policy, or assent to the terms of a Motion that characterized it as impolitic and unjustifiable. There was, however, one point as to which he was heartily in agreement with the hon. Member—namely, as to the expediency of a declaration from the Government whether they would continue or abandon the policy of annexation. Such a declaration would, no doubt, involve the Government, and especially the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, in considerable difficulties. But that result would not be the fault either of the hon. Member for Burnley or the Boers themselves. As it appeared to him (Mr. Chaplin), it was only an additional instance of the great difficulties that had been created for the present Government by certain rather unwarrantable statements and utterances of the Prime Minister and of some of his Colleagues just before the last General Election. No doubt, the intelligence from the Transvaal was most distressing; but the Prime Minister had the least right of any man in the world to complain of the conduct of the Boers, seeing that eight or nine months ago he had distinctly pledged himself to repudiate the annexation of the Transvaal. [MR. GLADSTONE: Where, and when?] He would tell the right hon. Gentleman with the greatest pleasure. Unless the right hon. Gentleman had been totally misreported, he had made a most remarkable statement, and other statements had also been made that bore out his assertions. [Mr. Serjeant SIMON: Condemning the original annexation.] That might be so; but the hon. and learned Gentleman, on hearing the quotation that he (Mr. Chaplin) proposed to read, would find that it was a question not of condemning the original annexation, but also of repudiating it. Now, the words of the right hon. Gentleman were as follows, and had been spoken at Peebles, on April 1, 1880:—

> "That is the meaning of adding places like Cyprus and places like the country of the Boers in South Africa to the British Empire. And, moreover, I would say this—that if those acquisitions were as valuable as they are valueless, I would repudiate them, because they are obtained by means dishonourable to the character of our country."

His charge against the Ministry was this—that in the rising they witnessed to-day the Boers had a right to complain, as the rising was made, if not under the sanction, at all events at the incitement, of the right hon. Gentleman himself. Could that House suppose that such utterances, coming from so distinguished and eminent a man, at a time when his campaign against the late Administration was the wonder and the admiration of the whole civilized world, would not also reach South Africa? He could imagine the sensation of delight with which the news of the General Election would be received by the Boers, and how they would hail it as an announcement of liberty. But, of course, that simple-minded people were not aware that the right hon. Gentleman engaged in Scotland in compassing the overthrow of the late Government was one thing, and the right hon. Gentleman safely back in Downing Street another. Nor could they know that the language by which the hon. Gentleman had deluded them, which had misled many of his own countrymen, and had utterly bamboozled the hon. Member for Burnley and his Radical Friends below the Gangway, would probably receive a different interpretation from an English Minister, that Minister who was now sending troops and money to suppress the victims of his fatal eloquence.

Mr. GLADSTONE: If I rise immediately after the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, it is not because I feel it incumbent on me to make any particular or detailed reply to the well-intentioned attack which he has made upon me; but because I think it would be best for the convenience of the House that, at the point to which the discussion has reached, some declaration should proceed from Her Majesty's Government upon a subject of so much interest and delicacy and difficulty. Now, we are engaged upon a Motion which is entirely of a prospective character; but the character of the discussion by which that Motion has been opened and illustrated has been almost entirely retrospective. Having so described it, I think I may add that it is quite needless for me to enter at large into the retrospective view of this question. A few words, indeed, I may say, and should have said, even apart from the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin). The hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. R. N. Fowler) has stated that when the annexation of the Transvaal took place there was some amount of support and countenance given to it by eminent Members of the Liberal Party. As far as Lord Kimberley is concerned, he would not be disposed to admit that he had ever pronounced any approval of that annexation, however qualified, except upon the supposition, stated at the time, that it was an annexation made in conformity with the wishes of the Boer community. In regard to Lord Brabourne, I need not speak. But my own account of the state of opinion at the time when the annexation was proclaimed would be this—That Her Majesty's Government of that day were, I think, fully supported and sustained in the annexation by a considerable majority of the House. It may be that there were individual Members of the Liberal Party who concurred in the policy. It is certainly the fact that only a very limited portion of the Liberal Party expressed dissent in a regular and Parliamentary manner. Of that admission they are entitled to the full value. But I must say that value is not so great as it might appear to be. I certainly, for myself, and I think I may venture to speak for my noble Friend not now in his place, then Leader of the Opposition, decidedly and strongly disapproved of the annexation—but for myself I will say, I think I may venture also to say for him, that while disapproving of it, we had a duty to consider to ourselves and to the country, over and above the function of making known our opinion in the House of Commons, and that was to consider the bearing that the expressions of those opinions would have upon the public interest, for the reason—the plain reason—that, in my opinion, votes of this House, or speeches in this House, against the annexation of the Transvaal, made at that period, would not have reversed the act; and although I was averse to the annexation, and, I confess, thought it would involve us in unmixed mischief, for that reason I remained entirely silent. But, says the hon. Member, I was not silent when I went before the constituency of Mid Lothian. That is perfectly true. I was not silent. My hon. Friends on this side of the House are entirely justified in the citations they have made of my speeches, and in the construction they put upon them; but the hon. Member for Mid Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) is not at all justified in the construction that he puts upon the citation that he has made. He has said that I declared—I do not doubt that the report is accurate; whether it is from a corrected report or not I cannot say—and repudiated the policy of annexations made by the late Government in Cyprus, and in the Transvaal, and he might very properly have added their extension of the Afghan Frontier. The hon. Member supposes that the word "repudiated" bears no sense except that of intention to reverse a thing, although, in fact, the word does not necessarily bear any such sense at all. I will give the House an illustration of this. I repudiate—if I may say so without disrespect—entirely the speech which the hon. Gentleman opposite has just delivered; but I cannot undo that speech and prevent it from having been made, or I admit I would do so. Still, I repudiate the speech just as much as I repudiated the annexation of Cyprus and the Transvaal. To disapprove the annexation of a country is one thing; to abandon that annexation is another. Whatever we do, we must not blind ourselves to the legitimate consequences of facts. By the annexation of the Transvaal we contracted new obligations. I have not said a word, and it was totally unnecessary to say a word, of adverse comment on the annexation itself at this time; but I may remark that I do not disown or recede from the opinion I expressed at a former period; and although I thought it was my duty not to add to the difficulties of the case by speeches in this House, it was impossible for me to go before my constituents to arraign generally, as I did endeavour to arraign, the policy of the Government, and to give reasons why I thought it should be displaced, without pointing out the various items. I do not, however, intend, in the slightest degree, to go back on that point. On the contrary, I would say that, having listened with a great deal of personal sympathy to the able speeches of my hon. Friends the Mover and Seconder of the Motion, and of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), yet I am extremely glad that the able speech of the hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) opened up fairly and fully the other side of the question, as did also the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. R. N. Fowler) in his more highly-coloured and thorough-going address; because I admit that there were two policies in this House, and that there were two sides of the question, for I never said there were no arguments that might be advanced in justification of what was done. But on that, at the present time, I consider I have nothing more to say. I must look at the obligations entailed by the annexation; and if in my opinion, and in the opinion of many on this side of the House, wrong was done by the annexation itself, that would not warrant us in doing fresh, distinct, and separate wrong, by a disregard of the obligations which that annexation entailed. Those obligations have been referred to in this debate, and have been mentioned in the compass of a single sentence. First, there was the obligation entailed towards the English and other settlers in the Transvaal, perhaps including a minority, though a very small minority, of the Dutch Boers themselves; secondly, there was the obligation towards the Native races, an obligation which I may call an obligation of humanity and justice; and, thirdly, there was the political obligation we entailed upon ourselves in respect of the responsibility which was already incumbent on us, and which we, by the annexation, largely extended, for the future peace and tranquillity of South Africa. None of these obligations could we overlook. We shall endeavour to give full value to them; and, while giving full value to them, we shall endeavour, as far as we are able, to weigh every other element of the case, and allow it to have that influence on our future conduct and policy to which, subject to the correction of this House, we may deem, and which we may believe in our consciences, is correct. And now I come to the Motion upon which the

House has heard—I may say without respect to Parties—a very interesting discussion. The hon. Member who moved the Motion calls upon us to declare—

> "That this House is of opinion that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjustifiable."

And, secondly, that it—

> "Would view with regret any measures taken by Her Majesty' Government with the object of enforcing British supremacy."

With respect to the first part of the Motion, which invites us to express our opinion that the annexation was impolitic and unjustifiable, I am unwilling to concur in a Parliamentary statement to that effect, because I can anticipate from such a Parliamentary statement, at the present juncture, no advantage either to the public interest of this country, or to any other interest; but, on the contrary, an aggravation of the difficulties in which the Government of this country are involved, and an aggravation of the dangers which hang over some of our fellow-creatures, fellow-Christians, and fellow-subjects. With regard to the second part of the Motion, my objections are still more pointed. Here, I think, I may almost invoke against my hon. Friend the Seconder of the Motion, the Motion itself; because he, in the most candid manner, and with that intelligence which belongs to him, did not scruple to admit that we had at present one duty upon us anterior to every other, and that was the duty of vindicating the authority of the Crown. I will not say that the House is, in the slightest degree, bound by the declarations in the Speech from the Throne; but the Government is bound by them, and we have advised the Queen to state that—

> "A rising in the Transvaal has recently imposed upon me the duty of taking military measures with a view to the prompt vindication of my authority."

The remainder of the paragraph states that the rising in the Transvaal—

> "Has of necessity set aside for the time any plan for securing to the European settlers full control over their own local affairs."

With regard to that, I need only state that the Seconder of the Motion did refer to the promise which had been given by the late Government for the institution of what I may call a free Legislature in the Transvaal, and that that promise had not been fulfilled. With regard to the promise, I have not the slightest doubt that the late Government were precluded, as we have been precluded, from fulfilling that promise until the greater and larger question is thoroughly disposed of. The question of giving free institutions to the Transvaal would never cause the slightest difficulty to either side of the House; but there is the larger question of the relations which are to subsist in future between the Transvaal and the British Crown, and the way in which we are to reconcile the obligations we have undertaken with respect to the future tranquillity of South Africa, and the interests of the Natives of that country, with the desire that we feel to avoid everything like even the appearance of assumption of authority over a free European race adverse to the will of that race. That is a question of rather a moot character, most difficult and important, and completely absorbing and enveloping within itself every minor and undisputed question as to the grant of free institutions to a country with which your relation is well determined. I shall, therefore, say that, as Her Majesty's Government have advised the Crown to state that the rising in the Transvaal has imposed on the Queen the duty of taking military measures for the prompt vindication of her authority, my second objection to the Motion is that the latter part of it is in direct contrariety to the announcement which is made from the Thrône; because, after all, so far as they go, the measures we adopt for enforcing the authority of the Queen, and for putting down armed resistance to that authority, may justly be termed measures for enforcing the authority of the Crown. In passing a Motion of this kind, my hon. Friend would involve himself in consequences of a most serious description, which all those who are inclined to support the Motion ought to have clearly before their minds. If it be right for the House to state that they would view with regret any measures taken by the Government to enforce British supremacy, it would be felt that those words exclude the prosecution of that which we have announced to be our duty and our design—namely, the vindication of the policy of the Queen. I avail myself gladly of the concession of the Seconder of the Motion; but I am almost disposed to believe that the

Mover of the Motion would hesitate before he went so far as to intercept the Government in the execution of that work which is certainly viewed by them as incumbent upon them in the circumstances of the case. My hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Serjeant Simon) quoted a passage from the Instructions of Sir Hercules Robinson, and expressed a hope that I would give an explanation of it. He then proceeded to put to me questions of a very searching character—questions which went far into the future; and further, I must say, into the future than I am prepared at this moment to travel with the hon. and learned Member. I feel that at this moment, viewing the state of things in South Africa, which I must describe as not only an approximation to war, but as a state of actual war, as far as we know, in the Transvaal—I make no extravagant demand on the House of Commons when I say, without respect to Party, that those who approve or disapprove the annexation will feel this is not a moment when we can be called upon for such specific declarations as we have been asked to give. General declarations of our views we have made. The object of the publication of the Instructions of Sir Hercules Robinson was to convey to the House, as far as we were able, a general, but, at the same time, a faithful and a tolerably clear idea of the views with which we approach the question. I am glad to think that these Instructions have not been made the subject of adverse comment; for while every liberty of adverse comment may be reserved for the future, it is probably better that, on the one side or the other, either looking backwards or forwards, it should for the present be avoided. Yet I am not compelled entirely to refuse the request of my hon. and learned Friend; because, since these Instructions were prepared, there has arisen in a manner not due to the action or the wish of Her Majesty's Government an occasion which appeared to them to call for some further declaration. The hon. and learned Gentleman read in the public prints the various telegrams which had been transmitted to this country from a source which has every title to respect in our eyes—namely, from the President of the Orange Free State—a gentleman associated by kindly national ties with the Boers of the Transvaal—and at the same time, I believe, a gentleman whose policy and whose desire it is to maintain the tranquillity of the country, to respect the authority of the Crown, and to do his best for bringing into harmonious relations all the different races. That communication from the President of the Orange River Free State imposes upon Her Majesty's Government the choice between two alternatives—either that of appearing insensible to a step which was evidently dictated by an amicable spirit, and which proceeded from one who was entirely entitled by his station, and by the proximity of his relations to the country, to address us; or, on the other hand, of making an answer to it, communicating our own views with regard to the particular proposals which were submitted to us, and, as far as it appears to be within the lines of our duty, to give that communication. Accordingly, this is the letter which was sent as a reply to the first of the series of telegrams which hon. Gentlemen have read. Of course, it will be our duty to lay the letter upon the Table with the telegrams as far as they have gone. The first telegram bears date some time before the 11th of January. The President of the Orange River Free State telegraphs to the Consul of that State in this country—

> "Do not believe the fabrications about the wishes of the Free State. The Free State only wishes peace and prosperity for the whole of South Africa; and, further, it hopes that every effort will be made without the least delay to prevent further bloodshed."

That telegram was not sent to Her Majesty's Government, but it became an official communication to us from its being immediately forwarded by the Consul in this country, the agent of the Orange River Free State, to Lord Kimberley; and we, therefore, concluding that he acted according to the spirit and intentions of the President whom he represented, looked upon this as a communication from the President. Mr. Herbert, the Under Secretary of the Colonial Department, wrote as follows on the 11th of January, in reply to the Consul, of course, for transmission to the President:—

> "Sir,—In reference to your telegram, which you left this morning for the Earl of Kimberley, I am desired by his Lordship to request that you will inform the President that Her Majesty's Government have received with pleasure the expression of his friendly wishes, and that provided only the Boers will desist from their

> armed opposition to the Queen's authority, Her Majesty's Government will not despair of making satisfactory arrangements."

That is a letter which will be immediately laid upon the Table. I venture to hope that what I have said of our desire to respect the conditions of free people, wherever we find them, on the one hand, and of our recognition of the obligations which we have undertaken with respect to the future of South Africa, with respect to the Natives residing within the Transvaal, and with respect also even to the minority of the Europeans of the Transvaal; I hope that after that the House may think that, under the circumstances of the case, I have probably said all that my duty will permit. I conclude with expressing the hope that I have not given to these remarks any controversial character in consequence of quotations not unnaturally made by others. I can assure the House that we shall, with earnestness, with temper, and, I hope, with firmness and decision, pursue the course that we have marked out for ourselves—namely, resolutely, and let me add also, as promptly as possible, to re-establish the authority of the Crown; and, having re-established the authority of the Crown, to pursue such a policy for the full settlement of the question as will deserve and receive the approval of the House and the country.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I shall not detain the House long, for I am not very well able to do so; but I am anxious to say a very few words upon the position of this question. In the first place, I wish to express my regret that my right hon. Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) is not here to-night. I have received a telegram stating that he is detained in the country in consequence of the state of the weather; and having had no Notice, as none of us have had Notice, that this debate was to come on, he is not here. I say that to explain why we are not fully prepared to enter into the details of this question as we might have been. I do not think it necessary to enter at any great length into what my right hon. Friend has said with regard to the retrospective part of the question—first, because it is not that to which our attention is mainly directed; and, second, because the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) has stated, in a most admirable, succinct, and correct manner, the exact state of the case as regards the steps that were taken three years ago for the annexation of the Transvaal. I feel, however, that this is a matter on which it is desirable, as far as possible, that no uncertain sound should go out from the British Parliament on this question. We are engaged at this time, sad as is the necessity, in carrying on hostile operations; and, however sad it may be that this necessity is imposed upon us, nobody can doubt that, if we are carrying on such operations, they should be carried on in a spirit which would show that the mind and conscience of the country are satisfied, and that we should not, on the one hand, be dealing blows to those who are in arms against us; and, on the other hand, be using language that may lead them to believe that we consider them to be in the right and ourselves in the wrong. But this appears to me to be a strange moment to choose for bringing on such a Motion; and it is open to very serious doubt whether you do not do much more harm than good, even in the interests of those whose interests you profess to have at heart, by using language that is calculated to put into their minds false ideas as to the real feelings of this country. We have had a controversy just now between my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) and the Prime Minister with regard to some language used by the Prime Minister on a former occasion, and my right hon. Friend disavowed my hon. Friend's interpretation of the word "repudiation." Well, no doubt he is a great master of language, and we cannot undertake to dispute his meaning of language he has himself used. But where language of that kind is used, it is calculated to have to an ordinary mind a meaning which may be very different. Let us take this word "repudiation." There are two cases in which we know the word is used, and used in the sense which my hon. Friend suggested. We sometimes say that a man has repudiated his wife. That does not mean that he disputes the validity of her marriage; it means that he has put his wife away. You hear of a State repudiating its debts. That does not mean that those debts were contracted under such circumstances as to make it doubtful whether they were properly contracted: it means that the State intends to refuse payment of its debts. And, therefore, when a statesman gets up and says—"I repudiate the general policy," the impression upon ordinary minds is that he intended to reverse the steps that had been taken. Well, it is very unfortunate that such expressions should go abroad; and we are glad to have got in this debate from the Prime Minister an assurance that that is not the sense in which he used the expression. The hon. Member for Burnley felt it repeatedly necessary, in the course of his speech, to assure the Government and the House that he had no intention of embarrassing Her Majesty's Government; but it is rather a curious mode of attaining this end that he felt it necessary, from time to time, to lay on very thick such a censure on the late Government. The present Government are, in every respect, excellent men; their intentions are admirable; they are in a difficulty; they had a legacy left them by their Predecessors which it was extremely difficult for them to deal with without entering on a course of conduct which, perhaps, they themselves did not desire to pursue. Their motives must be excellent, although they are going to do a very severe thing which we did not do: they are going to carry fire and sword against the Boers. I do not say that they can help themselves. We did nothing so strong as that. But then they are justified by having only a moral view, and we are to be stigmatized as being immoral, and as constantly justifying an immoral policy under the cloak of protecting British interests. Now, we have, at least, a right to take the same credit to ourselves as we give to our opponents, and to say that in what we did we acted on no immoral principles at all, but according to what we believed, and still believe, to be our true duty in the case in question. Everybody is, of course, at liberty to form his own opinion as to the merits and the wisdom of a particular policy; but when you attribute these motives to your opponents you ought to be rather careful how you venture to impute to men, who generally have been considered honourable men, an entire disbelief in the statements which they make. You ought to be careful, for instance, how you impute to Lord Carnarvon that he was entirely misleading the House of Lords and the country in the statements he made as to the circumstances and the grounds on which his policy rested. If that is the view to be taken, if we are to be told that everything that we did is so base, so immoral, and so improper, let me assure hon. Gentlemen that they are not adopting a line which is likely to conduce to the real interests of the country. I will not repeat that which has been so well said by the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London. Lord Carnarvon stated his case twice in the House of Lords at the time when these matters were under consideration. Twice he brought the subject before the House of Lords in the year 1877. The first time was before the annexation took place. That was in his speech on the 23rd of April, when he introduced the South Africa Bill with a view to the Confederation of the Colonies, and what did he then say as to the Transvaal? He first spoke of the very serious position in which that country was; its utter want of vigour and of power; the confusion among its inhabitants themselves; and he then went on to say—

> "Although I cannot but anticipate, knowing as I do how large a portion of the people of the Transvaal desire to come under British rule, that in the end the Transvaal will become a British State, I have no desire, if it can be avoided, to take over that State. We have territory enough and to spare in South Africa, and I feel no desire to have unwilling members in this Confederation."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxiii. 1650.]

About three weeks afterwards we received the news of the annexation of the Transvaal. Lord Carnarvon was questioned on the subject, and he stated that undoubtedly a telegram had arrived stating that Sir Theophilus Shepstone had taken that step. He does not speak of it as a matter either that had been directed or that was received with joy by Her Majesty's Government. On the contrary, he says—

> "If the measure has taken place, I have no doubt it has been adopted as a measure of self-preservation, so far as we are concerned, far more than anything else."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxiv. 354.]

And he speaks of it as a measure which he regrets. He says he is hardly surprised that it has been taken, but he regrets it, although, at the same time, he regarded it as inevitable. I quote this to show that it was no deliberate purpose of that wicked Government which the hon. Member opposite is haunted by to annex that country against its will. But, finding ourselves in a position of the greatest difficulty and delicacy—finding that the condition of the South African Colonies was such that there was the greatest danger of serious evils, of bloodshed, and of terrible wars breaking out between them and the Native States in their neighbourhood, and earnestly labouring, as we were doing, to bring about a policy of co-operation between our own Colonies and the other States which were contiguous to us in order to prevent those evils, it did so come about that it was necessary for us to take the step that was taken. We took it without any sinister wish, but because it was the only thing that could be done; and I am perfectly certain that it did for the moment ward off from the inhabitants of the Transvaal the most serious evils. They were absolutely insolvent. The hon. Gentleman opposite says that you have no right to annex a State simply because it is insolvent. Of course not; but here the question was whether its insolvency did not render the State absolutely powerless to protect itself, and, therefore, it could form no barrier for the White race against the serious evils that were about to fall upon them. Then we were told that they at that time passed a Resolution declaring that their Administration was not capable of carrying on the government. And in connection with all this, bear in mind what the state of South Africa was—how, as has been well stated by the hon. Baronet opposite—it was the case of a small party of Whites in the midst of a very large Black population, with that great force of the Zulus bearing down upon them, the Whites, moreover, not being able to show that they had quite clean hands in regard to the hostility aroused against them among that vast mass of Blacks. I say that our position in those circumstances was one in which we should have been criminal if we had shrunk from taking all the steps that were necessary to ward off that great danger. It is easy now to say that errors were committed here or committed there; but it is not only altogether unfair to political opponents, but injurious to the interests of the country, that it should be permitted that language of the kind which has been used to-night should go forth from the British Parliament at the time when the Ministers of the Crown find it necessary to assert the position of their country and the rights of their Sovereign even by force of arms. For heaven's sake, let us not use language of this sort when we are obliged to use force with the other hand! There was one part of the speech of my right hon. Friend to which I listened with the greatest pleasure and sympathy. It was the concluding passage of the telegram from that distinguished man the President of the Orange River Free State, and when, at the same time, he said that it was the earnest desire of Her Majesty's Government, and even their hope, that it might be possible to bring about the result which President Brand wished. There never was any doubt in the mind of the late Government that it was most desirable that it should, as far as possible, harmonize the institutions of the Transvaal with the wants and wishes and the natural feelings of its people. We have no desire to live in hostility with them—far from it. We have every desire that they should live under institutions suited to them. But I say that this is not a moment at which it is desirable to give vent to such sentiments as are expressed in the Motion of the hon. Member for Burnley, because they are liable to be mistaken; and I do earnestly trust that the House will sustain, not only in the letter, but also in the spirit, Her Majesty's Government in the course which they are now taking.

Mr. DAWSON said, that as an Irish Member, who had received a communication from some Dutch people, he could not pass by the debate in silence.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. DAWSON said, he had heard with much satisfaction that the Boers intended to vindicate their national independence. He did not think that the Government should continue a struggle merely because their Predecessors had commenced it. The examples of retiring from a territory on an honourable understanding after hostilities had commenced were not wanting. It was, however, with much pleasure that he (Mr. Dawson) heard the cause of the nationality of the Boers vindicated by Members on the Liberal side of the House; and he only regretted that his lot, instead of being cast in Ireland, had not made him a member of some South African Colony that enjoyed such a vindication as he had heard that night. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) had spoken of the different senses of the word "repudiation," which the Prime Minister had put upon that word. There was another sense—the repudiation of a debt. A promise was made by the right hon. Gentleman in Mid Lothian, and the people in the Transvaal and in Holland would expect that whenever he came into power he would undo that which he repudiated. The promise was a debt, and the repudiation of it now did not become the present Government of the country, nor the right hon. Gentleman who had raised such hopes. The treatment of the Natives by the Boers in 1877 could have no bearing on that hope, because whatever force was in that argument was as strong in 1879 as it was now.

SIR HENRY TYLER said, that the utterances of the Prime Minister had been very misleading to the people of Ireland as well as to the Boers of the Transvaal. He well remembered the remarkable expressions used by the right hon. Gentleman about the Clerkenwell explosion, which was stated to have brought the question of the Irish Church within the range of practical politics. He feared that the words referred to would hardly bear, even in English, the meaning attributed to them by the right hon. Gentleman, and when they were translated into Transvaal Dutch the difficulty would be further increased. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had repudiated — looking to the exact words quoted — not the policy which had led to the annexation, but the acquisition of the territory itself. He (Sir Henry Tyler) thought that the expression in question would be so understood by the people in the Transvaal, as they had been by the hon. Member for Mid Lincoln. And what really had been repudiated was the right hon. Gentleman's speech in Mid Lothian.

MR. GOURLEY wished to address himself to the question, not as to who was responsible for the acquisitions in the Transvaal, but as to who must be held responsible for the present war. His impression was that Her Majesty's present Advisers were mainly responsible for it. When out of Office they condemned as loudly as they could the policy of their Predecessors; and holding the strong opinions which he did, the Prime Minister, when he assumed the reins of power, should have made it one of his first duties to have taken into consideration the position which this country occupied with regard to the annexation of the Transvaal. What he did for the Montenegrins he should have done for the Boers; and if Her Majesty's Ministers had carried out when they came into Office the intentions which they expressed when in Opposition, he felt confident that the present war would not have taken place. The annexation was brought about in the belief that it would be good for the country; and it so happened that the ex-President of the Transvaal was in this country at the time, and told him that it was the best thing that could be done. The late Government felt assured that it was for the interest of the Boers and the White population that it should take place; and, therefore, he thought that the language of the hon. Member for Burnley was much too strong when he condemned the policy of the late Government. In the reply to the telegram from the Orange Free State, the Government expressed a hope that the present difficulties would terminate satisfactorily. The Prime Minister left the House entirely in the dark as to what he considered a "satisfactory" conclusion. He (Mr. Gourley), when listening to him, inferred that the right hon. Gentleman meant to crush the Boers, and retain their territory as part of the possessions of the Crown. Instead of a crushing policy, it would be much more in harmony with the opinions of the various Members of the Government if they would endeavour to meet the Boers as a friendly Power, and negotiate with them with the intention of giving back to them that independence which rightly belonged to them.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND said, that he desired, in the first place, to answer what he could not but consider an unfair and ungenerous attack which the Under

Secretary of State for the Colonies had made the previous night upon Lord Carnarvon. The Under Secretary of State had, practically, accused Lord Carnarvon of being the cause of these different troubles and complications in South Africa. Now, as regarded Basutoland, which was last night the question before the House, Lord Carnarvon had absolutely nothing to do. Basutoland became British territory when the Duke of Buckingham was Secretary of State, and was annexed to the Cape Colony when Lord Kimberley was Secretary of State. Nay, more than that, Lord Carnarvon, in 1867, while concurring with Mr. Cardwell against taking over that territory, went even further than Mr. Cardwell, for he declined to sanction the sending a British Resident into Basutoland for fear of creating any complication. Again, Lord Carnarvon had nothing to do with the Transkei War; and he was not in Office when this country was plunged into war with Zululand. As regarded the Transvaal, the case was different, as Lord Carnarvon gave the commission to Sir Theophilus Shepstone to annex that country under certain conditions; and afterwards, though in guarded terms, approved of the annexation. The Under Secretary of State said that these troubles and difficulties arose from Lord Carnarvon being a man who could not sit still in a room. Well, in certain cases it was very desirable to sit still; but if the adjoining room was on fire, and the fire was likely to extend to the room where one was sitting, and to destroy property and perhaps life, it was doubtful whether sitting still would be a wise course to pursue. If, from a line of action adopted by a neighbouring Power, the peace and welfare of a Colony was likely to be endangered, it was not the duty of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to sit still. And that was the case with the Transvaal. He (Sir Henry Holland) would not travel over the ground so ably covered by the hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock); but he would very briefly show the House how the conduct of the Transvaal Government necessitated our interference, and justified the steps that had been taken. In the first place, a system of slavery had prevailed in the Transvaal in direct contravention of the terms of the Convention of 1852. Not only had that system been carried on by individual Boers, but it had been fostered by the "Pass Laws" of the Government. For evidence of that, he (Sir Henry Holland) need only refer to Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's speech in that House of August 7, 1877, and to Sir Henry Barkly's despatches to Lord Carnarvon in 1875. Remonstrances were made in vain against these proceedings of the Boers. In the second place, this Transvaal Government was in constant trouble with Native Tribes, owing to their encroaching upon Native lands. So far did this greed of land grow upon them, that in 1875 the Government issued a Proclamation quietly annexing a very large territory to the Transvaal—a proceeding possibly involving a further breach of the Convention of 1852, but certainly one that could not be allowed by Her Majesty's Government. Again, early in 1877 they attempted to annex the territory of the Barolongs, and again Lord Carnarvon had to inform them that that would not be allowed. Now, what was the *status* of the Government which was taking these high-handed steps, and which, by exciting the Natives, was causing danger to the peace of our Colonies? It was utterly bankrupt and rotten; unable to enforce payment of taxes; unable to keep its forces in the field; and unable to check the advance of Sikukuni. The hopelessness of the position could not be more forcibly described than it was by the then President Burgers, in what might be called his "last dying speech and confession." Sir Henry Barkly also, in a despatch of March 20, 1877, confirmed the account of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and spoke of the "helpless confusion," and the "gloomy and alarming picture." Sir Theophilus Shepstone might have acted too hastily in assuming the unanimous feeling of the inhabitants to be in favour of annexation. But in his favour it might fairly be urged that, while he had addresses from important places—such as Pretoria and Lydenburg—in favour of the change, he received none against it; and that no resistance of any kind was made, though he had no force to back him up. The truth was, that at that time the great majority of the White settlers distrusted the Government, and feared the Natives; but now that peace had been restored, and that prosperity and commerce had revived, some leading and active men, who had hoped for power and office, had come to the front and raised the cry of independence, in which it was but natural that great numbers should join. He (Sir Henry Holland) would not dwell any further upon what the Prime Minister had called the retrospective part of the case. The very grave and important question remained—namely, what was to be done with the Transvaal after the rebellion had been put down? He (Sir Henry Holland) assumed that, with the exception of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), all must agree that, in the first place, the uprising must be put down, and Her Majesty's supremacy re-asserted. Of course, if Her Majesty's Government had made up their minds ultimately to give up the Transvaal, they would be bound to let it be known, as that would materially shorten the struggle, and prevent much bloodshed. But he (Sir Henry Holland) gathered from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that the Government had not yet made up their minds; and though there ought to be no undue pressure put upon them to do so, yet he (Sir Henry Holland) feared the effect that this delay in arriving at a decision might have upon the Boers. He feared that when the Boers were informed that, after peace was restored, Her Majesty's Government did not despair of a "satisfactory arrangement"—he believed those were the words of the telegram to President Brand—they would be led to see in that message a promise of independence; for what arrangement, but a renewal of their independence, could be satisfactory to them? He did not say that they would be justified in these hopes; but he believed they would entertain them. In the meantime, he would venture to state to the House and to Her Majesty's Government some considerations which weighed with him in favour of retaining the Transvaal. It was said that the inhabitants were unanimous in favour of restored independence. That assertion could not be tested till peace was restored; but he believed that it would then be found that all the English, and many Dutch settlers, would be unwilling again to change masters. The Papers presented to Parliament showed that many were compelled to join the meetings for independence; and many might have been, in like manner, lately compelled to declare themselves on the side of the rebels. However that might be, it was certain that all the Natives—some 800,000 in number—would be found on our side if Her Majesty's supremacy was re-asserted. It must be remembered that if we retire from the Transvaal we leave these Natives, as well as the well-inclined settlers, to the tender mercies of the victorious Boers. And we leave, not only the Natives within the Transvaal, but the Native Tribes adjoining that territory, to those tender mercies. We expose them again to the constant harassing and encroachments which prevailed for so long before 1877. It might be said that the Boer leaders had agreed to make conditions, if their independence was restored, as to the future treatment of Natives and Native questions; but their past history would not lead him (Sir Henry Holland) to put much faith in their engagements to keep those conditions. Who was to secure the performance of such conditions; who was to punish for the infringement of them? Certainly not the Cape Government, who would have nothing to do with the Transvaal; but it would be the duty of the Imperial Government to secure to the Natives the rights which might be guaranteed to them by the conditions. Then all the trouble would come over again; blood would have again to be shed; the country would have again to be annexed; and again would the cry be raised of independence, the cry, as it would again be called, of a free people against oppression. Those considerations weighed with him against surrendering the Transvaal. On the other hand, if we retain the Transvaal, we might hope, when peace was really restored, that the influence of the quiet and well-disposed inhabitants would prevail, and that in a short time we might be enabled to re-establish their Volksraad and free institutions under the Government of Her Majesty. We might also look forward to the entrance of the Transvaal into a Confederation with the other South African States. That Confederation might be, nay, probably would be, postponed for some years; but he (Sir Henry Holland) believed that in Confederation would be ultimately found the security for a strong, peaceful, and prosperous Government in South Africa.

Mr. GRANT DUFF said, he felt sure that his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) would not think that he was influenced by any want of respect to himself, or that he did not appreciate the importance of the subject which he had brought before them, if he said very little in reply to his speech, and confined himself almost entirely to one single point; which he should like to make quite clear to the House and to all persons interested in the Transvaal. It was the less necessary for him to go into the question of the annexation by the last, or the retention of the country announced in the month of May by the present Government, because he had nothing to add to, or to take away from, the considerations which he had the honour to lay before the House at the beginning and at the end of the late Session. It might be necessary, at a later period, to go over that ground again; but to do so that night would be a waste of the time of the House. If it was useless for the moment to speak at much length of the past it was quite impossible now to speak of the future. The Boers had thought fit to attack the Queen's troops, and to kill a very large number of them, under circumstances not yet fully explained; but which had a most suspicious aspect. They had thrown down the gauntlet to the British Empire, and it was idle to talk about any settlement that might ensue upon peace until, at least, there was some prospect of peace. "*Parcere subjectis*" was an admirable maxim; but a Government which did not remember that "*debellare superbos*" was equally its duty would not retain, or deserve to retain, the confidence of the British people. The one point which he wished to make clear was this—that from the day of the annexation down to the outbreak of the war, the British Government had, again and again and again, offered to the people of the Transvaal the most absolute control of their own affairs, conditional only upon their professing allegiance to the British Crown, and permitting it to control their relations with the Natives in and around their border, so as to prevent intolerable injustice and imminent danger alike to themselves and to Her Majesty's other possessions in South Africa. The attitude taken up by Her Majesty's late and present Government with regard to this matter would be seen from the following extracts. He must read a good many; but it seemed to him a matter of the last importance that the position of this country in this matter should be thoroughly understood abroad, and especially in Holland—a country for which all right-thinking men had so much respect and regard. The hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), in his very able speech, had shown that the 40,000 Boers of the Transvaal were in 1877 in such a position that they could by no possibility have long retained their lawless independence. If the action of Lord Carnarvon had not been so premature, they would have come to us to save them, exactly as the Basutos did eight years before. His object was now to show that we had all along offered them everything they could ask short of lawless and perilous independence. And this position would be clear from the following extracts. In 1877, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, speaking as a subordinate of Lord Carnarvon, said in his Proclamation that—

> "The Transvaal would remain a separate Government, with its own laws and Legislature, and it was the wish of Her Most Gracious Majesty that it should enjoy the fullest legislative privileges compatible with the circumstances of the country and the intelligence of its people."

In 1878 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), replying to the Transvaal delegates, repeated those words, and added—

> "You are aware that the present system of Government, though continued in consequence of the unsettled state of the country for a longer term than had been contemplated, is altogether temporary and provisional. It is the desire of Her Majesty's Government that no time shall be lost in carrying out the promises given in the Proclamation, so as to satisfy the wishes of those who deprecate any avoidable departure from the old Constitution of the country. Whether it will be in their power to proceed at once with that policy depends, in a great measure, upon you, and upon all over whom you have influence. I earnestly recommend you, and those on whose behalf you act, to turn your attention from that which is impossible to those much needed reforms and undertakings on the necessity of which all are agreed, and to co-operate loyally and heartily with Her Majesty's Government in concerting such measures as may make the Transvaal a prosperous, contented, and self-supporting country."

Again, upon the 20th of November, 1879, the right hon. Gentleman reiterated the same assurances. Among other things, he said—

> "As there has never been any room for doubting that Her Majesty's power would continue to be supreme in South Africa, the union provided for by the South Africa Act, 1877, is practically that which the people of the Transvaal have professed to desire; and it is obvious that, as a member of the South African Confederation, the country might receive a Constitution which would confer upon the people, under the paramount authority of the British Crown, the fullest independence compatible with that thorough unity of action which the common welfare demands, and would enable them practically to govern themselves according to their own views in all matters except those as to which an independent Power, unless determined to be hostile, would be obliged to co-operate with its neighbours."

In the month of April the present Government had to consider what course to take; and it came to the conclusion that although, as he had on former occasions said, it thought the annexation a very great error in policy, yet that to cut the knot of the difficulties in which it found us involved in the Transvaal by restoring that country to its old anarchy would have been at least as great, and a less excusable error in policy. Of course, occasions arose when it was right and necessary for an in-coming Government completely to reverse the policy of its predecessor. English history could point to two such instances in very recent times, both of them occurring in Asia, the one redounding to the credit of the Conservative, the other to that of the Liberal Party; but such sudden breaks of the continuity of foreign policy were to be avoided as much as possible, and had, in fact, been rare in the annals of this country. It was all very well to say that if the Government had instantly withdrawn from the Transvaal there would not have been the present trouble; but troubles, and probably far worse ones, would, as he had endeavoured to point out in the month of August last, have come in other forms. The new Government, however, put in the forefront of their Transvaal policy their desire to give the country self-government. On the 12th of May the new Secretary of State telegraphed to say that he hoped that the speedy accomplishment of Confederation would enable free institutions to be given to the Transvaal with promptitude. Similar declarations were made in that House in the debate upon the Address some 10 days later; and on the 8th of June the Prime Minister, replying to the Transvaal delegates, said—

> "Looking to all the circumstances, both of the Transvaal and the rest of South Africa, and to the necessity of preventing a renewal of disorders which might lead to disastrous consequences, not only to the Transvaal, but to the whole of South Africa, our judgment is that the Queen cannot be advised to relinquish her sovereignty over the Transvaal; but, consistently with the maintenance of that sovereignty, we desire that the White inhabitants of the Transvaal should, without prejudice to the rest of the population, enjoy the fullest liberty to manage their local affairs. We believe that this liberty may be most easily and promptly conceded to the Transvaal as a member of a South African Confederation."

Some time after this, the Confederation scheme having for the time broken down, a debate upon South Africa took place in that House, in the course of which he said, among other things—

> "I should be extremely sorry that the idea should for a moment get abroad that we are not most anxious to give to the Transvaal, as soon as we can, as much local self-government as possible."

Precisely the same language was held by the Government officials in the Transvaal itself, as would be seen from the following extract from a debate in the Transvaal Legislative Assembly, which reached the country only the other day, long after we had heard by telegraph of the outbreak. Sir Owen Lanyon said—

> "With regard to what has fallen in this debate to-night, I have nothing more to say on the matter than that no one will be more glad than I if the united people of the Transvaal were to come forward and ask for these representative institutions, such as have been repeatedly offered them. The offer is now before them, and all that they have to do is to come forward and ask for it. But in asking for it, there is only one condition necessary—that is, that threats should be dropped, and that peace should reign within our borders. If these things be accomplished, I see no reason why the Transvaal should not have such free institutions as are enjoyed in the adjoining States."

He thought that he had shown that nothing whatever had been asked from the malcontent portion of the Boers of the Transvaal, but that they should frankly accept the sovereignty of the Queen, and submit at the hands of the Home Government to some such control over their dealings with the Natives as would have been provided in South

Africa itself if a Confederation had come into existence. If they had done this they would instantly have had the most complete control of their own affairs, after having been picked by the British Government out of the gulf of bankruptcy, and set financially, so to speak, upon their legs. How thoroughly this was understood by the foremost men in the Transvaal might be gathered from some extracts which he should read from speeches made in that same debate by persons in no case of English birth, and invariably persons who, although not elected, but nominated, hold very great positions as men of landed property in the Transvaal. The first whom he should cite was Mr. Marais, a Member of the Legislature of the Transvaal at the time of the annexation. Mr. Marais said—

"I claim that what is now clamoured for—namely, representative Government . . . . is at the present moment still by Great Britain offered to the people of the Transvaal, if they will but accept it; but to speak of the people accepting representative Government until they are united and have concluded to accept the British Government is, to my idea, preposterous on the very face of it. And it would be absolutely necessary for the British Government, which has annexed this country, first to place it in a position to accept of representation, before that could be established."

He would next cite Mr. Forssman, a man of Swedish birth, but who had been 30 years in the Transvaal, and had great estates there. That gentleman said he did not consider that they were ripe for responsible Government in the Transvaal, and he did not wish to see it. One reason was, perhaps, selfish on his part. He did not wish to see the soldiers go away, because we should then have, as under the old Government, the old "commando brief."

"If the Kaffirs did a little mischief, we should be commandered as formerly, and everyone would be taken away from his occupation, and have to go and risk his life, which was not the case at present. That was one of the boons the people of the Transvaal owed to the British Government. They were defended at the cost of the Imperial Government; and if anyone wished to fight, he would volunteer, and if any one wished to attend to his business, he could do it."

Next he would take Mr. Holtzhausen, a Boer and Member of the late Volksraad, also a very prominent man. Mr. Holtzhausen said—

"One thing I can declare, and that is that the present Government is the best I ever served under in the Transvaal. Since my 21st year I have lived in the Transvaal, and I have done my best for progress. There have been very few resolutions come to this country in which my name does not appear, and I have ever had my advice listened to by the present Government. None of the officials of the Government here complain that they do not receive their salaries at the proper time. Every private person who does not sit still has profit, the speculator as well as the farmer. There were times before the present Government was here when the farmer could not move to the bush-veld with his cattle. I belong to that number, and the enemy took away every head of my cattle, and I had not a calf left; and I have now freedom and safety, and can go safely to my farm. Concerning the Constitution that is asked for by the hon. Member from Pretoria, I know it myself; it was not necessary to state the fact that it was promised by Sir Theophilus Shepstone; I, for myself, have reason enough to say that it was not possible. The Government, as at present constituted, was at war with the Zulus; during the Zulu War and the Secocoeni campaign, Sir Theophilus Shepstone and Sir Owen Lanyon had neither Executive Council nor Legislative Assembly; it is only since the 10th of March the present Government was constituted, and possibly every man who wishes to see can see its difficulties."

Another man of high position and large property spoke in the same sense—another Boer, and, like the last-mentioned gentleman, a Member of the late Volksraad at the time of the annexation. Mr. Esterhuyze said—

"That he had thought not to speak on the matter before the House. He thought it was no time to do so under the present circumstances. But as the hon. Member from Pretoria, in speaking to his Motion, spoke about the Assembly having failed to secure the confidence of the people, it was, therefore, his (Mr. Esterhuyze's) opinion that confidence cannot come from one side."

He might quote others; but surely that was enough to show that the position of the British Government was perfectly understood in the country. The simple truth was that the persons who had revolted against the Government of the Queen were not fighting so much against her Government as against all government. It was precisely the same spirit of lawlessness which broke out against the Government of President Burgers, and which made him utter those strange and tragic complaints when, in addressing the Volksraad shortly before the annexation, he said—

"Do you know what has recently happened in Turkey? Because no civilized government was carried on there, the Great Powers interfered, and said, thus far and no further; and if this is done to an Empire, will a little Republic be excused when it misbehaves? Complain to other Powers, and seek justice there. Yes, thank God; justice is still to be found even for the most insignificant; but it is precisely this justice which will convict us. If we want justice, we must be in a position to ask it with unsullied hands."

And, again—

"To take up arms and fight was nonsense, to draw the sword would be to draw the sword against God; for it was God's judgment that the State was in the condition it was to-day, and it was their duty to inquire whether they should immerse in blood the thousands of innocent inhabitants of this country, and, if so, what for?"

When the Transvaal Papers which he had laid upon the Table were in the hands of hon. Members, they would see that phrases about nationality and independence, and so forth, went a very little way, and that the question was how things, being as they were, and the annexation having taken place, prudently or imprudently—he, of course, thought imprudently—four years ago, how was the government of 40,000 Whites and 800,000 Blacks, scattered over a territory larger than France, to be provided for without inflicting intolerable inconvenience, not to say misery, upon all South Africa? Before that question could be answered events must have further developed; meantime he need hardly say that the Government were as anxious as any people could possibly be to prevent unnecessary effusion of blood. No one would ever justly be able to say of them "*Bella geri placuit nullos habitura triumphos*" but not Empire only but government was at an end if armed men openly defied the law and attacked our troops with impunity. Let those defend the annexation of the Transvaal who annexed it in 1877, instead of allowing it to fall into our hands, as it would have done before long as a troublesome inheritance, no doubt, but not a painful one. That was not his function. But the Government which he had the honour to represent had to deal with things as it found them, not as it would have wished to find them. There was no doubt that before the annexation of the Transvaal the state of the country was rapidly becoming desperate; and he could only counsel the House to proceed with the utmost deliberation, unless they wished to bring about a state of things which everyone must deplore.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON observed, that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had quoted the opinions of Members of the Legislative Council on this question; but it would be well to know who these Members were. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to quote a number of gentlemen who were the paid nominees of the Crown; a fact which somewhat weakened the force of the evidence adduced by the right hon. Gentleman. With regard to the remarks of his hon. Friends, he was obliged to repudiate a great deal of what they had said. He was, for instance, astounded that his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), after making out such a strong case, should come to the lame and impotent conclusion not to divide the House on his Motion. The hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright) also made an admirable speech, but said that nothing could be done until we had vindicated the authority of our arms. If his speech meant anything, it meant that a great territory had been taken by fraud, and was being kept by force; and it was astonishing he should think that an honourable and upright course for this country to pursue. First kill the Boers and then do them justice was, to say the least, a somewhat curious doctrine to promulgate. That reminded him of the North of England proverb, sometimes called the Eleventh Commandment—"Tell a lie and stick to it." When an honourable man, an Englishman, did a wrong, he would frankly acknowledge it, and do the aggrieved party justice; not kill him first and then do him justice. The whole policy was a mistaken one, for if England were to go to war with every Power that committed a wrong, she would not have a single day's peace. It was all very well to talk about the brutality of the Boers; but, from what he could learn, the British were just as bad as the Boers. It was said that the annexation of the Transvaal led to the Zulu War; so that, having killed the Zulus in order to protect the Boers, we were now turning round to kill the Boers themselves. In August, 1877, the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), now Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, moved a Resolution condemnatory of the annexation of the Transvaal; and Mr. James Lowther, as the then Representative of the Colonial Office, expressed fully and completely the reasons which led the late Government to annex the Transvaal. He utterly repudiated the pretext that their policy was in any degree founded upon the internal affairs of the Republic, and declared that it was based upon the fact that its external policy would inevitably, but for the interference of Her Majesty's Government, have led to a Native war, which must have extended to Her Majesty's possessions. He (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) hoped we should hear no more, after that statement, of our having annexed the Transvaal in order to put down slavery. As for the statement which had been made on the present occasion by the Prime Minister, he could only say that, in his view, it was exceedingly vague and unsatisfactory, particularly as far as its closing sentences were concerned. He said that if the Boers did so and so he hoped there would be a satisfactory settlement. The right hon. Gentleman could not say less. Everyone, of course, wished to see a satisfactory conclusion arrived at; but the statement of the right hon. Gentleman involved the radical mistake of upholding the theory that we must carry to a successful conclusion an unjust war for the suppression of an independent Republic—for that was what it really amounted to. He could not help thinking that the Government ought to feel humiliated in considering the view which foreign countries must take of the course which had been pursued. We talked of freedom and liberty at home, and yet sent out armies to crush the liberties of nations. He was so dissatisfied with the state of things that, although his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley would be at liberty to withdraw his Motion, he should insist upon a division being taken upon it. His right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) had said in a speech which had been much commented upon that force was not a remedy. It was not a remedy in this case. In his view, a policy of justice was the only true one to be pursued if Parliament wished to add dignity to the Crown, credit to the Government, and honour to the country.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS observed, that the hon. Baronet who had just spoken treated the question under consideration in the same spirit as he treated the temperance question—that of no compromise. He would not even allow local option to have any part in bringing about a settlement of the existing difficulty. It used to be a doctrine held by certain hon. Members that dominion compassed by fraud and maintained by force ought not to be upheld. Well, he might be permitted to say that if anything had ever been obtained by fraud and maintained by force it was the much contested Act of Union between England and Ireland. But he could not forget what had been said by an eminent and learned man, Mr. Peter Burrows, on that subject—that while he had been opposed to the marriage he was also opposed to the divorce, lest it would bastardize the offspring. The same principle which applied to the dissolution of the Act of Union also applied to the case of the Transvaal. He had now for four hours listened to recrimination and reproach as to the motives which actuated those concerned in the act of annexation; but he considered that the Business of the House was not to compare or vivisect motives, but to look to tendencies. If the reversal of the policy which had been adopted would be to plunge the whole of South Africa into confusion, whatever might have been the motives of Lord Carnarvon, or of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, such a policy ought not to be arbitrarily imposed on the present Government. When the wishes and the rights of the Boers were talked of, surely the interests of the overwhelming majority of the coloured race was worthy of some consideration. He believed that the Government had acted within their plain duty in taking up their present position, and that the House ought not to pledge them to undo what had been done. The Prime Minister had, they should remember, reserved to the Government of which he was the head discretionary power to act for the best when peace had been restored. He asked the House to bear in mind what had taken place in Jamaica, in India, and elsewhere, and to say whether it was safe, when a treacherous attack had been made upon Her Majesty's troops, to allow the surrounding population to believe that the upper hand had been obtained over the power of England—whether, in short, a policy of impunity was not a very dangerous one to adopt in such a crisis. Although he sincerely deprecated the effusion of blood, he could not but think that the Imperial

Government were right in arguing that until peace was re-established they ought not to be called upon to state the course they would pursue. For his own part, he believed that their efforts, like that of their Predecessors, would be to set up, as far as possible, a system of local self-government compatible with safeguards for the safety and welfare of the various communities, Native, Dutch, and English, which, in proportions so unequal, co-existed in South Africa.

MR. DONALD CURRIE: I am sorry that this discussion has arisen, and I shall hope that the House will not come to a division on the Motion of the hon. Member for Burnley. I trust I may be allowed to impress upon hon. Members the danger to South Africa, and to the future of the Transvaal itself, which may arise from prolonging this debate. Acknowledging the great indulgence which was extended to me last night when, with reference to Basutoland, I was allowed to make a few observations, hon. Members will excuse me if I venture to say a few words now, seeing that the last delegates from the Boers of the Transvaal, Messrs. Joubert, Kruger, and Bok, were introduced by me to the late Government, as the delegates sent previously had been introduced by me to Lord Carnarvon. I remember very well the effect of one debate in this House upon the Transvaal Question. Paul Kruger and Joubert were sitting under that Gallery when the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), now Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, advocated the cause of the Boers, and was answered by the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the last Administration (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). They heard sufficient to convince them that there was no hope of the independence of their country being restored, and they telegraphed to me in Scotland that they could not follow me thither, and they left on their return to the Transvaal immediately afterwards. They wrote to me that their mission was ended, and they went away deeply disappointed, as they had hoped that some satisfactory arrangement would be secured. This present debate cannot be telegraphed to the Cape in detail, but most certainly some message will go to the effect that the Motion of the hon. Member has been adopted or rejected; and the people of the Transvaal will not understand that we are debating here, not the Transvaal Question on its merits, but simply the Motion of the hon. Member for Burnley, as against the Motion of the hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), who moves the Previous Question in order that the Government may proceed with the pressing Business of the day. It might be that if certain statements made in the course of this debate became known in South Africa through the medium of the telegraph, the result would be to embitter still further feelings which are only too bitter already. It has been stated that the Zulus would have invaded the Transvaal, and that the Boers could not have withstood them; but the people of the Transvaal distinctly assert that they were not afraid of the Zulus and Cetewayo. It has also been stated that we had to protect the Natives; but the delegates challenged the Government here to prove that within a recent period there had been any such thing as slavery in the Transvaal in the aggravated form complained of in this country. It has also been stated in the debate that we annexed the Transvaal because the Republic had employed men of the Amaswazi Tribe against Secocoeni; and yet, when Sir Garnet Wolseley attacked that Chief's stronghold, the Amaswazis in great force were employed alongside of the British troops, and left their dead and wounded in large numbers on the field of battle. These Amaswazis were rewarded, or rewarded themselves, with the cattle of Secocoeni, and returned to their homes, but not until they had destroyed many of the wounded, and even, it is said, women and children. Now that which is declared to be wrong in the Boers as against Secocoeni, was it right on the part of the British against the same Chief? These are the things which will be discussed in the Transvaal, and our deliberations in this House will occasion trouble there when the news is read in detail; and there is manifestly greater danger of misconception now when only brief telegrams are sent. What will be the belief in the Transvaal? It will be said that the defeat of the hon. Member for Burnley in his Motion for the restoration of independence means that the House of Commons denies the Transvaal liberty. I think that it is inexpedient in the present state of feeling to discuss this question, and that the decision which will be given upon a division, if we divide, will be prejudicial to the best interests of the Transvaal. The situation is complicated enough. We are obtaining taxes from the Natives in the Transvaal which the Boers did not collect. With regard to this question of taxes, an hon. Member has remarked that the Revenue of the Transvaal has been increasing, and that it now amounts to about £100,000 per annum; but this increase of Revenue is explained by the fact that a considerable portion of it is levied from the Natives, and we must be careful that these Natives do not turn round and say that they were better off under the rule of the Boers than they are under our Government. It is the interest of this country to have the friendship of the people of the Transvaal. We have enlarged our borderline on the north of the Orange Free State from about 100 miles to nearly 1,200 miles; and I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that if we annihilate every White man among the Boers and people of the Transvaal, we shall be face to face with graver difficulties than we have had yet to encounter in South Africa. I do hope that we will think of what is best for the future of that great Continent.

Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN said, he had received for presentation a Petition from 50 gentlemen from South Africa, protesting against the annexation of the Transvaal as contrary to the Sand River Convention. Trusting in the justice of the British Parliament, they petitioned that this whole question should be re-considered by the House of Commons. One important point about the Petition was that it was accompanied by a paper, in which the Petitioners state the part of the country from which each came. He found out of these 50—students at Edinburgh University—only about six were from the Transvaal, the Orange Free State, or Natal; the others were from our own Cape Colony, and in this matter they might be regarded as representative men, as they were sons of Cape Colonists who had sufficient means to send their children to this country to receive a University education. He wished to read one sentence which they had written to him, in which they stated that they felt that they were acting as the mouthpiece of their countrymen, who formed the very backbone of our Colonists over a large extent of South Africa. The fact that such a Petition had been sent brought into prominence a point on which sufficient stress had not been laid, which was that the Boers of the Transvaal had the sympathy of the majority of the Cape Colonists. He did not say that serious difficulty was impending from that; but he believed that if they treated these Boers as rebels, and dealt with them in a harsh and unconciliatory spirit, they would arouse a feeling that would be detrimental to the welfare of South Africa. The Dutch Boers had long memories, and we might create a difficulty with them, to be paralleled only by the difficulty we now had in Ireland.

Mr. RYLANDS said that after the discussion he should desire to withdraw the Amendment. ["No, no!"] He had told many hon. Members he should do so, and they had left the House on that understanding.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 129; Noes 33: Majority 96.—(Div. List, No. 8.)

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Supply Committee upon *Monday* next.

POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTIONS.

* * *

STATE OF IRELAND — THE LAND LEAGUE—ARREST OF MEMBERS AT TRALEE.

Mr. PARNELL said, he had given Notice of his intention to call attention to the refusal of the magistrates to admit to bail Messrs. Harrington and others at Tralee, and to move a Resolution on the subject. He found that, in consequence of the Forms of the House, it would not be in his power to take a division on the subject; and, therefore, he would postpone his Motion till he could submit it to the judgment of the House.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ABANDONMENT OF CANDAHAR.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he did not intend, owing to the lateness of the hour and the fatigue of the House, to proceed at the present moment with the Motion he had put on the Paper to the effect—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, Her Majesty's Ministers should adopt a peaceful and conciliatory policy with regard to the execution of the Treaty of Berlin; should advise the Greek Government to moderate its excessive demands and to demobilise its Army; and should retain possession of the great strategical and commercial position of Kandahar, in view of the advance of the Russian Armies towards India, and of the grave events now taking place in Central Asia."

He would only say that the action of Her Majesty's Government abroad had been, and was likely to be, as disturbing and as disastrous as it had been at home. We were very probably on the eve of an European conflagration, and it seemed that the bulwarks of our Empire in the East were to be abandoned. Although leaving the question for the present, he would take the very earliest opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the subject.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873.

Copy *presented*,—of Minutes of Meetings of a Council of the Judges under the Act [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DISTRESS FOR RENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. RENDEL, Bill to amend the Law relating to Distress for Rent, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RENDEL and Mr. GURDON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 74.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Ten o'clock till Monday next.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 24th January, 1881.

RIVERS CONSERVANCY AND FLOODS PREVENTION BILL.

QUESTION.

EARL SPENCER asked the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon), Whether it would be convenient to noble Lords on the Opposition side to have the second reading of the Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention Bill taken on Monday next?

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON replied, that he thought there would be no objection to that arrangement.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES) asked the Lord President whether it was the intention of the Government to refer the Bill to a Select Committee of their Lordships' House?

EARL SPENCER said, there was at present no intention to adopt that course, because a Select Committee of their Lordships' House considered the subject only a few years ago.

ENDOWED INSTITUTIONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—BURNETT'S LITERARY FUND—THE PROVISIONAL ORDER.

MOTION.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON rose, pursuant to Notice, to call attention to the Provisional Order made by the Secretary of State, and relating to "Burnett's Literary Fund," now lying upon the Table, and to move "That this House disapproves of the said Provisional Order."

THE EARL OF DALHOUSIE (interrupting), said, he had no wish to interpose between their Lordships and the arguments the noble Duke was about to address to them in support of the Resolution which stood in his name on the Paper. Far from it. His (the Earl of Dalhousie's) object in rising was to make a short statement on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, so as to give the noble Duke the advantage, before he made his speech, of knowing exactly what were the intentions of Her Majesty's Government with regard to "Burnett's Literary Fund."

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he objected to that entirely. He was very sorry to have to disagree with the noble Earl; but it seemed to him that he was in possession of the House, and he wished to make his statement and to lay his case, which he believed to be a very strong one, before their Lordships.

EARL GRANVILLE understood his noble Friend behind him (the Earl of Dalhousie) had risen for the purpose of stating that the Government did not mean to oppose the Motion of the noble Duke.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON was glad to hear that the Government did not mean to oppose his Resolution. Before he proceeded with his statement he wished to present two Petitions—one from the city clergy of Aberdeen, signed by four of their number. There were six of those gentlemen altogether; but one, although he had signified his adhesion to the prayer of the Petition, had not signed the document, and the sixth had not taken any part in the matter at all—the prayer being that their Lordships' House should withhold their sanction from the Provisional Order under discussion. The other Petition was signed by the Principal of the University of Aberdeen, Dr. Pirie, on behalf of the Senatus Academicus, praying that this Provisional Order should not be approved by their Lordships. The conduct of the Government on this matter had been somewhat extraordinary. He was bound to say, with all respect to the noble Earl (the Earl of Dalhousie), that what he had proposed to do was of a very unusual character in their Lordships' House. The conduct of the Government, however, irrespective of this circumstance, required some explanation. This was a Provisional Order that was signed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in August last. It was presented to both Houses of Parliament, and printed for the use of the House of Commons; but no statement was made of any sort or kind to give their Lordships the information that was contained in this Order, and had it not been for the kindness of a friend, who gave him a copy of that presented to the House of Commons, he should have been totally without the information which the circumstances of the case required. The Provisional Order was never ordered to be printed or laid on the Table of their Lordships' House until three days ago, and that was after he had given Notice of the Motion with which he would conclude. But, further than that, during the present Session this Provisional Order had been again laid on the Table of their Lordships' House, and he was at a loss to know, and should rather like information as to the position in which the Order now stood. They knew the provision whereby, after 40 days, a Provisional Order took effect unless a Motion was made. This Order was presented to both Houses of Parliament last August, and it was laid on the Table again this year; and he would like to know on what date it would take effect—whether, in fact, the 40 days would count from the time it was first presented, or only from the time it was laid on the Table this Session? Whether right or wrong, he considered it prudent to take it that the 40 days ran from the remaining days of last Session. There was, however, another point which he thought was of more importance still. There was a Report from the Commissioners on this subject; and their Lordships would be astonished to hear that though the 40 days would soon expire when this Order would take effect, the Report of the Commissioners dealing with this very subject was not now in the hands of their Lordships. This was a subject of the very last importance. It was a subject dealing with some of the most sacred truths of religion; and he held that that Report, which was published, ought to be in the hands of their Lordships, to see who were the Commissioners who signed it, and came to the conclusion which he would presently show they did. The case was a very simple one. About 100 years ago—in 1783—Mr. Burnett, a benevolent gentleman in Aberdeenshire, executed a deed of mortification and endowment; and he left to certain trustees one-third part of certain rents to constitute a fund to provide at intervals of 40 years premiums for essays in defence of Theism. The trust was accepted, and had been put in operation twice during that period—in 1814 and in 1854. The rents had accumulated, so that the capital sum had now become £4,500, and it was increasing by means of these rents £250 a-year. The object of the endowment was important, because upon that rested his whole case. The words of the will and the deed of foundation showed conclusively what were the views Mr. Burnett intended to promulgate, and what was passing in his mind when he left this bequest. The points which he specially emphasized were the advocacy of Theism and Christianity. The final form which the subject took was thus expressed in a later codicil to the will prescribing the theme of the essays or treatises—

"That there is a Being all-powerful, wise, and good, by whom everything exists, and, as the power of the Deity is easily shown, in pointing out the consideration particularly by which, notwithstanding the pains we are often subject to, we may hope and trust in the goodness of the Deity, both in this state and in the reasonable expectation of a future one; and in taking notice of the comforts arising to mankind from these considerations, independent of revelation; and, further, in considering these as confirmed by the blessed Jesus as sent by God."

In a codicil he subsequently shortened the statement, but did not change or modify in substance the scheme which he had prescribed, for the final form it assumed was this—

"That there is a Being all-powerful, wise, and good, by whom everything exists; and particularly to obviate difficulties regarding the wisdom and goodness of the Deity, and this, in the first place, from considerations independent of written revelation; and, in the second place, from the revelation of the Lord Jesus, and from the whole to point out the inferences most necessary for and useful to mankind."

Therefore, it was perfectly clear what the views, wishes, and intentions of Mr. Burnett were when he made the bequest he did. Their Lordships were aware that in the year 1878 there was passed the Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, whereby a Commission was constituted to regulate certain educational endowments; and certain processes were prescribed whereby Governing Bodies, such as trustees of educational endowments, might obtain powers to effect certain changes for better administration. The trustees of the Burnett Fund were three in number, Dr. John Webster, M.P., Mr. Grant Duff, M.P., and Sir John Clark. They applied for such powers, and in their Petition to the Home Secretary for a Provisional Order they stated that their object was to convert the fund from being one given for essays in defence of Theism at intervals of 40 years into one for a course of lectures to be delivered annually, the subject of such lectures to be "The History of Religious Thought, with special reference to Theism and the Sanctions of Morality." On the publication of this scheme, the Senatus of the University of Aberdeen, the Principal and the Professors being conjoined in the testator's deed for the purpose of choosing the judges of the essays, determined to resist it, because, in their opinion, it would effect an entire change of subject from that enjoined by the testator. In their protest they were joined by the ministers of Aberdeen, who had a similar *locus standi.* Both bodies appeared before the Commissioners under the Act, and explained that, while they were not inclined to oppose the change from an essay to annual lectures, they protested against the scheme on the ground that there was no guarantee or security that the lectures might not be framed under views subversive of the Theistic doctrine which it was the prime object of the founder to strengthen and uphold. The result was that the Commissioners agreed with the view taken by these bodies as contra-distinguished from that of the trustees who proposed the alteration. The Commissioners, who were a most important body, presided over by Lord Balfour of Burleigh and Mr. Campbell, and various other very eminent men, reported in favour of the view taken by the Senatus Academicus, which proposed as good a scheme as it was possible to provide, bearing in mind the aims and views of the testator. Well, the Commissioners sent up their scheme to the Secretary of State for the Home Department; and he (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) must say more arbitrary conduct on the part of a Secretary of State he could not conceive. Without taking another particle of evidence, without making a single inquiry into this very important subject, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, at one stroke of his pen, upset and put on one side the recommendations of the Commissioners, and restored the scheme exactly to the same shape and form as it was when sent up to him by the trustees, whose conduct the Senatus objected to. Such conduct on the part of the Home Secretary seemed to him a mockery of the Commissioners, and a mere farce. The Home Secretary, it seemed to him, could scarcely have looked into it himself, or, if he did, he must have done it in a most cursory manner. The scheme which was to promote Theism and Christianity he sent back in a manner in which Christianity was entirely ignored, and the teaching of Atheism was made perfectly possible. Now, he was sorry to say that these were not days when they could afford to give up teaching Theism and Christianity, any more than they could 100 years ago. He thought, from all they could see and hear and read, that there was as much necessity for the views sought to be advocated in the will of Mr. Burnett being carried out as they were at that time; and he was thoroughly satisfied that the Secretary of State was not justified in taking the course which he did. The Senatus Academicus were practically unanimous upon this point.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY begged the noble Duke's pardon. As Lord Rector of the University, he had had communications on the subject, and he knew that the Senatus were not unanimous. He would also remind the noble Duke that the Petition he was presenting against the scheme was signed by 10 members only of the Senatus, which consisted of 23 members.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that, as the Chancellor of the University, he had been in communication with the whole of the members of the Governing Body; and he ventured to express an opinion that his information was as good as that of the noble Earl. He would, therefore, repeat that the Senatus were practically unanimous on the point that Christianity was ignored in the provision respecting lectures. There was discussion on some points; but on the main one there was practical unanimity. He knew that one gentleman differed from his colleagues; but he repeated that there was practical unanimity on the part of the Senatus, and he asserted that the ministers and Senatus represented the religious feelings of those best entitled to pronounce an opinion on the scheme. But what was the action of the Home Secretary? By a stroke of his pen, and in the face of the opinions of those authorities and of the Commissioners, he restored the scheme to what it was when sent up by the trustees, and before it had been reported on by the Commissioners. He had, therefore, no hesitation whatever in asking them to reject this scheme, which, he was glad to find from his noble Friend opposite (Earl Granville), the Government were not going to oppose; because he believed that the manner in which the trustees proposed to deal with this endowment was in spirit and in fact entirely antagonistic to the views which would have been entertained and were expressed in the will of Mr. Burnett, who left the money. Now, from opinions which the trustees had expressed, he thought it would be dangerous to leave the subject in their hands. In his evidence before the Commission, Mr. Webster stated that the trustees were of opinion that it would be better "not to continue the controversial and polemical theme;" and Sir John Clark said his impression was very strong that if Mr. Burnett were now living he would almost certainly divert the fund to totally different uses from those to which he did apply it. He (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) would like to see the evidence of what would be the views of Mr. Burnett if he were now alive; but as Dr. Webster and Sir John Clark had given theirs, he would give his view of what Mr. Burnett would have done if he were now alive. His view would be that he should never have appointed Dr. Webster or Sir John Clark as his trustees. Sir John Clark further said that the subject of the lectures should be treated historically and critically, without reference to Theism or anything else. These were the gentlemen who were to carry out the views of this testator! He thought he had made out a sufficient case for their Lordships not approving of this Provisional Order; and, therefore, he moved that the Order be not approved.

Moved to resolve, That this House doth disapprove of the Provisional Order made by the Secretary of State relating to Burnett's Literary Fund.—(*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon.*)

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY stated that, as Lord Rector of the University of Aberdeen, of which the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) was President, he had had to present a Petition, which, with all deference to the noble Duke, constrained him to dispute the proposition of "practical unanimity." The Petition was from seven Professors out of 25 members of the Senatus Academicus, praying their Lordships' House to carry the Provisional Order issued by the Home Secretary into effect. If that was what the noble Duke called "practical unanimity," there must be extraordinary ambiguity either in the word "practical" or in the word "unanimity." That meant that one-third of the Senatus had petitioned against the Motion of the noble Duke, and in favour of the proposal of the Government. Waiving, however, the question of unanimity, which was a question not very easily settled—and they would not dispute as to terms—it did seem to him that the noble Duke had taken rather too exalted a view of the benefits accruing from this foundation, and rather too distinct a view of the intentions of the founder. Let them examine for one moment what the position and intention of the founder were. He was a man who died at the age of 45, or, at all events, almost in middle life, after a life spent in the most cruel illness. His suffering was such that, at the time of his death, he thought of leaving this sum of money, because it seemed to have been difficult to him to reconcile with the doctrine of the goodness of the Creator the physical suffering which he had himself endured. Well, he died, leaving £3,000 behind him, one-third of which was to be devoted to the purposes upon which the noble Duke has elaborated. It was rather less than one-third of the whole, for I believe, as a matter of fact, it was only five-eighths of £1,000. This was the great estate which in these times of infidelity was absolutely necessary to preserve the truth of religion. Now, it did seem to him a most remarkable thing that with an extensive hierarchy, with a great Church Establishment in Scotland, with a great many Dissenting Churches in each country, all equally devoted to Christianity, the noble Duke should feel so sensitive about the loss of five-eighths of the income of £1,000, because that, after all, was the proposal. But what would have been the practical benefit of this munificent donation? The income accrued over 40 years. At the end of 40 years judges had to be appointed, who, at the end of 33 years, or seven years from the expiration of the 40 years, had to advertise the fact of these prize essays. Only to advertise for seven years continuously in the literary papers of all English-speaking countries absorbs over £800. Throughout the civilized world it was proclaimed for seven years that this prize was to be given at the end of this period—that was to say, that at the end of the 40 years a sort of moral and religious jubilee in the United Kingdom, this prize was competed for. This gentleman (Mr. Burnett) made his will about the time when Mr. Pitt was entering on his first Ministry; since that time how often had the world been cheered and relieved by these prize essays? How often had they seen these essays? Their Lordships would, perhaps, be astonished to hear it, but the answer was only twice, for the third occasion was still in the future. He would take their effect from another point of view. By the testator's will the successful essayist was obliged to send 300 copies of his treatise for gratuitous distribution to the trustees; the trustees were then compelled to advertise—he did not know in what literary papers of the English-speaking nation — very extensively that 300 copies of these prize essays were to be distributed gratuitously to those who wished for them. Their Lordships would easily see, therefore, that if these essays were really the maintenance of religious feeling of this country it opened a very melancholy prospect, because, out of 300 copies of the last essay sent to the trustees, considerably more than 200 remained in the hands of the trustees. He did ask their Lordships to consider seriously the necessity of this wonderful benefaction continuing, when of the last essay not more than 100 copies had been distributed. But what was the position of affairs as regarded the testator? He knew he was leaving five-eighths of the income of £1,000. Since that time matters had certainly improved: What would be the cost of the next distribution of this prize? At the next distribution of prizes the money to be distributed between the two successful competitors would amount to nearly £6,000, or more than double the whole estate of the testator. The sum had got considerably beyond what the testator intended. It could not be intended that such a large sum as that should go to enlighten the world every 40 years by an essay—a little circulated essay—on a somewhat extensive and absolute subject. It was common sense to think that if they applied the arrangement of time it would show that the benefit to be derived from these essays could not be great. In the next two centuries, suppose this country should continue to exist in its present state, the essay would have been published exactly five times, and if the present circulation of the essay continued—about 70 or 80 copies on each occasion—350 copies would be circulated. Suppose the testator had died at the time of the most beneficent King Alfred—1,000 years ago—how many times should they have had it? They would have had 25 essays, while, on a moderate computation —allowing printing had existed and all modern inventions—they would have had 2,000 copies sold. If, at the rate of two copies a year, this essay was the actual maintenance of the religious feeling of this country, he could only say that a more miserable exhibition of religious sterility never was presented before their Lordships' House. After all, they were only fighting a windmill, because the noble Earl (Earl Granville) was, he believed, prepared to concede much of what the noble Duke required; but, apart from practical unanimity in the Senatus, and the moral and religious benefits derived from the bequest in question, he thought it his duty, as an humble colleague of the noble Duke in the Governing Body of Aberdeen University, to express his dissent from his views.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that before the Question was put, he wished to explain to the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) that, in the outset of his speech, he had expressly stated that the Senatus and Ministers of religion had no objection to converting the essays into a lectureship; but that the objection was, that under the scheme in question, not only was Christianity and Theism ignored, but under it it would be possible to teach Atheism.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY begged to state, on behalf of the trustees, that they had never the slightest intention of sanctioning Atheism; and he could not conceive under what idea the noble Duke suggested anything so completely incorrect.

On Question, *agreed to.*

IRELAND (GRASS LANDS, &c.)

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

LORD CLONCURRY moved for a Return showing the total areas of "Grass Lands," including Meadows and Pastures, and the total area of Tillage Lands, including all kinds of Crops and Fallows, in Ireland, for the years 1850, 1855, 1860, 1865, 1870, 1875, and 1880.

EARL SPENCER said, Her Majesty's Government had much pleasure in acceding to the Motion.

Motion *agreed to.*

The Earl of Rosebery

Return ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Lord Cloncurry.*)

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 24th January, 1881.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* New Ross, *v.* Joseph William Foley, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Leave*—Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—*First Night, debate adjourned.*

Ordered—First Reading—Lunacy Law Assimilation (Ireland) * [75]; Corn Returns (No. 2) * [76].

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—THREATENING NOTICES—THE KING'S COUNTY.

MR. MOLLOY rose to call the attention of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to the following statement from the "Leinster Leader," of the 15th inst., viz.:—

"On the night of the 6th inst., Miss Downing Nesbitt, a lady widely known, esteemed, and beloved by all classes, gave a ball at Tubberdaly House, near Rhode, King's County. The police introduced into this lady's grounds, without her knowledge or approbation, an armed force of 30 men. They also lined the roads at intervals of every few hundred yards from a short distance outside Edenderry to her residence, a distance of nearly seven miles. Mr. C. C. Palmer, of Raheen House, found on the morning of the day on which he received an invitation to attend the ball, a notice posted on his gate stating he would be shot when returning from it.

"Mr. Palmer was induced to apply for police protection, and on the night of the ball the following cavalcade started:—The ladies of Mr. Palmer's family in a covered carriage, with an armed policeman on the box seat; Mr. Palmer himself in a covered car, with another armed sub, the rear being brought up by a jaunting car, on which was seated a J.P., Mr. William Tyrrell, armed with a brace of revolvers. When about half way to Tubberdaly they overtook a poor labouring man, who, not knowing the state of affairs, thought he would have a ride at the rear of Mr. Palmer's carriage, but was scarcely seated when he was espied by Mr. Tyrrell, who immediately jumped down, called a halt, and in an instant the unfortunate countryman found a revolver at his breast, and was seized by the police. They stripped the supposed assassin, but the result of their search only produced an old pipe and a few matches;"

and to ask, if he can afford any explanation of the conduct on the part of the police and of the magistrate?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I have not seen the newspaper referred to by the hon. Gentleman in his Question; but I have received a Report of the circumstances from the Constabulary authorities. It appears that a notice was posted on Mr. Palmer's gate, telling him that he would be "met by Rory, &c.," and it was deemed necessary by the Constabulary authorities that measures should be taken for his safety when going to the ball. Consequently, two members of the Constabulary rode behind the carriage in which he was, and 16 men patrolled the road over which he was to pass. It is not a fact that 30 men were introduced into the grounds of Miss Nesbitt's house, nor that members of the Force lined the roads at intervals of a few hundred yards, as stated in the Report quoted in the hon. Member's Question. The other incident alluded to in the Question was caused by a drunken man forcing himself upon Mr. Palmer's carriage, whereupon the carriage was stopped and the man was removed. It is true that Mr. Tyrrell had a revolver with him, and that the man was searched, but no arms were found upon him.

FISHING VESSELS (REGULATIONS AS TO LIGHTS).

MR. BIRKBECK asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether the recommendations of the Select Committee on Fishing Vessels' Lights of last Session are to be carried out in their entirety; and, whether negotiations to that effect have been entered into with Foreign Maritime Countries?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, that at present he was not in a position to give a complete answer to the Question. The recommendations of the House of Commons' Select Committee were referred to a Joint Committee, consisting of the Admiralty, the Board of Trade, and the Trinity House, which was appointed some time ago in order to revise international regulations for preventing collisions at sea. That Joint Committee had not yet reported, and after their Report had been received the matter would have to be considered by the Admiralty and the Board of Trade. Until that had been done he could not give a complete reply to the Question.

NAVY—H.M.S. "HOTSPUR."

MR. GOURLEY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, How long H.M.S. "Hotspur" has been under repair at Messrs. Laird's Dock, Birkenhead; also the nature, probable cost, and length of time likely to be occupied in completing the same; and, whether such repairs are being executed under competitive tender or otherwise?

MR. TREVELYAN: The *Hotspur* has had everything done to her for which she was sent to Birkenhead. She left the Mersey in October last for Devonport, where she is undergoing trial of machinery and fitting for sea. The construction of the boilers was put up to competitive tender in the usual way, and Messrs. Laird's tender, being the lowest, was accepted. The rest of the alterations were completed according to a schedule of prices which are considered moderate by the Board of Admiralty. The alterations which have been made in her at Birkenhead are far more than repairs, and have the effect of converting her into a fighting vessel of the newest type and of great offensive power, considering her moderate dimensions, a result which could not have been obtained if she had not been a finely-designed vessel to begin with. The sum paid to Messrs. Laird amounts to £108,753, including the cost of new boilers, and the nation has got full value for the money.

IRELAND—GRIFFITH'S VALUATION.

MR. METGE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he could give statistics showing the cost of production of the chief articles of farm produce in Ireland during the period at which Griffiths' valuation was taken and at the present time respectively, tabulating the wages of ordinary farm labourers; the cost of farm implements; the price of farm horses; the cost of hay and oats; the cost of seed, wheat, barley, oats, and potatoes; also the average rent of agricultural holdings throughout Ireland?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that Griffith's valuation was carried out under an Act passed in 1852, which provided that a valuation of landed property according to net annual value, with reference to the average prices of several specified articles of agricultural produce, should be made in Ireland. There were no statistics available to give the hon. Member the information he required.

Mr. CALLAN: Are we to understand that Griffith's valuation commenced and was completed in 1852?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: No, it was not. It commenced in 1852.

ENDOWED INSTITUTIONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—SCOTCH ENDOWMENTS—GORDON HOSPITAL PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Provisional Order for reconstructing Gordon's Hospital, in Aberdeen, now under consideration, does not propose to increase the proportion of the proposed new governing body not selected from popularly elected representative bodies from one-sixth to one-third; and, whether he will sanction this deviation from the principle enunciated by the Vice President of the Council in introducing the Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Bill, that "the municipal representation which has hitherto largely prevailed in Scotch Endowments should be maintained?"

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he had no personal knowledge of this Provisional Order. The practice in the Home Office was to be advised in these matters by the Lord Advocate, who was generally, he believed, in consultation with the Scotch Education Department. The Lord Advocate was not in London at present; but he would take care that the point raised was brought under his consideration.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—ATHY MODEL SCHOOL.

Mr. LEAHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he would explain the cause of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland giving up the land held by them with the Athy Model School, and, if it was on account of its not paying, to state the rent and losses yearly for the last four years; and, also, on what terms were the new buildings erected by them surrendered to His Grace the Duke of Leinster?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The Athy Model School was abandoned, not because of the reason stated by the hon. Member, but in compliance with the policy recommended by a Committee of that House, appointed in 1874 to inquire and report upon the general question of model school management. The farm and buildings were surrendered to the Duke of Leinster in consideration of the payment by him of a sum of £200.

INDIA—THE STANLEY COVENANTED ENGINEERS.

Mr. LITTON asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether the reductions which have been effected during 1879 in the staff of the "Stanley Covenanted Engineers" were in all cases effected under the provision of the Government of India Department of Finance and Commerce, Resolution 2079, 31 July, 1879, for voluntary retirement; if not, under what resolution or rule have the retirements been carried out; and, will he be good enough to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of such resolution or rule; and, whether it be not the fact that several of the Covenanted Engineers have memorialised the Secretary of State for India in Council, asking to have their claims under covenant carried out in the spirit in which they were entered into?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: So far as is known at the India Office the reductions effected among the engineers appointed by Lord Stanley under covenant have been made under the ordinary Rules of the Service, or the special provisions of the Resolution 2079 of the 31st of July, 1879. Some of the Covenanted Engineers have memoralized the Secretary of State in Council for special treatment. These Memorials are under the consideration of the Council; but having regard to the terms of one of the clauses of the Resolution, to the effect that no further concession would be made to any other officer with whose services the Government might be compelled to dispense, I cannot hold out any expectation of a decision in their favour.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND).

MR. DILLON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to the following paragraph in a leading article in the "Freeman's Journal" of January 20th:—

> "But, after what has happened at Tralee, Maryborough, and elsewhere, it is plain that no justice is to be expected from the magistracy;"

and, whether he will take this into his serious consideration as evidence that the Irish people have lost confidence in the impartiality of the Irish magistrates?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member asks me a Question which is really one as to my opinion with regard to a leading article in *The Freeman's Journal.* I hope it is no disrespect to that journal, but I really must decline to answer the Question. I think if Questions are asked as to the opinion of hon. Members with regard to leading articles, we shall never get beyond Question-time.

INLAND REVENUE—RESTRICTIONS ON DISTILLING.

MR. J. N. RICHARDSON asked Mr, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Board of Inland Revenue has in any case in Ireland set aside the provisions of the Act 43 and 44 Vic. c. 24, s. 24, which prohibits distillers from mashing or distilling between the hours of eleven o'clock on Saturday night and one o'clock on Monday; and, if so, by what authority has this been done?

MR. GLADSTONE: The Board of Inland Revenue are not aware of any case in which the provisions of the Act have been set aside in the manner stated by the Question; but if the hon. Member is able to supply any information on the subject, I shall take care to make careful inquiry into the matter.

STATE OF IRELAND—MARYBOROUGH, QUEEN'S COUNTY — THE LAND LEAGUE.

MR. LALOR asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If his attention has been called to a report of the proceedings of a special court of petty sessions which was held in Maryborough, Queen's County, on the 18th instant, and which appeared in the "Freeman's Journal" of the 19th instant; from that report it appears that six respectable business men of that town were summoned on a charge of having gone round to ask the shopkeepers to subscribe and become members of a branch of the Irish National Land League; according to the same report, each of the witnesses who were summoned to give evidence to prove the case of the Crown swore that they were not intimidated by the defendants; notwithstanding this denial on the part of the witnesses, the defendants were fined £10 each, or the alternative of three months' imprisonment; it also appears from the same report that the resident magistrate, Mr. Hamilton, during the trial, said that the mere denial on the part of a witness that he was not intimidated was not sufficient, in his opinion, to set aside the charge brought against the defendants in this case, if the circumstances were such, in the mind of the court, as would lead to the conclusion that they were calculated to intimidate; and, if the opinion thus expressed by Mr. Hamilton is correct in law?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): My attention was not called to the Report which the hon. Member refers to, except by his Question. I have, however, now ascertained that the defendants have appealed from the conviction, which will, therefore, be reviewed by the Court of Quarter Sessions. Under these circumstances, and as the case is still *sub judice,* it would not be proper for me to pronounce an opinion on the judicial action of a magistrate in a pending case.

RETURN OF ELECTION CHARGES.

MR. BUXTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the Return of Election Charges made to Candidates by Returning Officers, and of their total expenses, with details, which was ordered to be printed on August 31, 1880, will be laid upon the Table?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, this Return had been delayed because some Returning Officers had not sent in their papers; but, as a very large number of Returns had come in, he had directed that they should be printed at once, without waiting for these papers.

NEW ZEALAND—IMPRISONMENT OF NATIVES.

Mr. BRADLAUGH asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Governor of New Zealand was some months since directed to make a full report respecting the imprisonment of certain natives in New Zealand, with a view to such report being laid before Parliament; and, whether such report has been received; or, if not, when it is expected?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Yes, we expect a Report from the Governor of New Zealand upon this subject in or about the month of March. When received it will be laid before Parliament.

Mr. BRADLAUGH also asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he is aware that Judge Shaw, a district Judge at Taranaki, New Zealand, is reported in "The Budget and Taranaki Herald" of November 13th, 1880, to have made the term of imprisonment of certain natives dependent on the conduct of other natives not parties to the proceedings; and, if he is not aware of the exact facts, whether he will cause proper inquiries to be made?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: I know nothing of this case, except from the Report alluded to. From that Report I gather that Judge Shaw gave these people to understand that if their associates ceased from doing the illegal acts which they had all been committing together, and for which some of them had been convicted, the convicted persons would have their period of punishment shortened. We have no Constitutional power to inquire into the proceedings of a New Zealand Judge, who is responsible to the New Zealand Parliament, not to us.

STATE OF IRELAND — PROTESTANT MEETING AT DROGHEDA.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the conduct and language of Mr. Clifford Lloyd, stipendiary magistrate at Drogheda, on Saturday the 1st instant, as reported in the "Freeman's Journal," and to the statements made in reference thereto by members of the local resident magistracy; whether it is true, as stated by Alderman Daly, J.P. that when Captain Keogh, the resident stipendiary magistrate at Drogheda, consulted the local magistrates as to the propriety of allowing the meeting to be held, "they gave their opinion that they saw nothing in it to call for interference," an opinion in which Captain Keogh "entirely agreed;" whether the meeting in question was not a peaceable and legally constituted meeting; whether any informations were sworn—that the meeting was likely to result either in a breach of the peace or in the denunciation of individuals; is it a fact that Mr. Clifford Lloyd, in answer to the chairman of the meeting, called upon to disperse at the point of the bayonet, refused to show his authority, stating "I have none and will show none," and as the brake containing the chairman, the Rev. Mr. M'Kee, P.P., and a number of clergymen, were driving quietly away, Mr. Clifford Lloyd shouted to them "If you meet again I'll fire on you;" whether it is true that Alderman Daly, J.P. at the next meeting of the Corporation charged that "what Mr. Clifford Lloyd did, he did altogether against our (i.e. the borough magistrates) wishes, and contrary to our advice; if he will inform the House under the provisions of what Act of Parliament a stipendiary magistrate is authorised to over-rule the decision of the local magistracy; and, whether the course of procedure adopted by Mr. Clifford Lloyd was authorised by the Chief Secretary, or has, since the occurrence in question, been sanctioned or approved of by him; and, if not approved, has he taken any steps to communicate his disapproval to the official in question?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I believe it is true that the mayor and local magistrates of Drogheda declined to interfere with the meeting, but that was on account of the small police force available in the town. Captain Keogh had fully made up his mind that the meeting should be stopped, and, so far, his language left no doubt as to his intention on the minds of the other magistrates. The magistrates acting on the occasion were satisfied that the meeting was identical with the meeting announced for the next day, which had been prohibited by the Lord Lieutenant's proclamation, and that, therefore, it was an unlawful assembly. It was not a peaceable one. Before it dispersed the people became riotous, the police were threatened, and even assaulted. The meeting announced for the day following for which this meeting had been substituted was prohibited on sworn informations that it was called together for the purpose of denouncing and intimidating certain of Her Majesty's subjects in the neighbourhood. It is not true that Mr. Clifford Lloyd made use of any of the expressions attributed to him in the Question, and I have no information as to what Alderman Daly said on the occasion. With regard to the seventh Question of the hon. Member, which asks—

> "Under the provisions of what Act of Parliament a stipendiary magistrate is authorised to over-rule the decision of the local magistracy?"

I have to say that on this occasion the decision of the local magistracy was not overruled, and the statement that it was is not warranted by the fact. I think that Mr. Clifford Lloyd acted with praiseworthy promptitude and discretion on the occasion.

Mr. CALLAN: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered that portion of my Question which asks by what Act of Parliament a stipendiary magistrate is authorized to overrule the decision of the local magistracy.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I thought I had already answered it by implication in a previous part of my remarks.

Mr. CALLAN: I do not want an answer by implication. I want a direct answer.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member will, then, give Notice of the Question?

Mr. CALLAN: I have already given Notice of it—a week's Notice.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I thought that was another Question. I understand now what the hon. Member refers to. Each magistrate on such occasions acts upon his own discretion, whether local or stipendiary.

Mr. CALLAN: I beg to give Notice that I shall repeat that portion of my Question to the Solicitor General for Ireland on a future day.

STATE OF IRELAND—ARRESTS AT CASTLECOMER, CO. KILDARE.

Mr. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the conduct of the constabulary in the Petty Sessions district of Castlecomer, in the county Kilkenny, in arresting in the dead of the night in their beds four children under sixteen years of age, bringing them several miles to barracks in this inclement weather and detaining them until released on bail next day, instead of issuing summons in ordinary course?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said the ages of the persons arrested were from 15 to 18; they were arrested on the night of the 7th instant, and conveyed a distance of five miles. They were fed and very kindly treated, and on the following day admitted to bail. The prisoners were charged with forming a part of the crowd of young persons who followed a labouring man, named Dooley, at whom they shouted, "Boycott the land-grabber." He was followed by the crowd, who had sticks and stones. Next day Dooley swore information, and warrants were issued for the arrest of the four persons. Dooley's master had incurred displeasure because he refused to join the Land League. The arrests were made by night, as the police force was small, and as it was thought there would be less excitement by night than by day.

STATE OF IRELAND—LAW AND JUSTICE—TRIAL BY JUDGE.

Mr. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a statement that, upon the occasion of the recent prosecutions of certain members of the Land League at the Petty Sessions of Kilmacow, in the county of Kilkenny, Mr. Sub-Inspector Webb is reported to have stated to them when entering into recognisances of bail that, in their cases, trial by jury would be dispensed with and trial by judges substituted therefor; whether such language, if used, was authorised by Her Majesty's Government; and, whether his attention has been called to similar language used by a stipendiary magistrate at the Stonyford Petty Sessions, in the county of Kilkenny, when sentencing persons upon a charge of "Boycotting?"

Mr. W. E, FORSTER: I have received a Report from a sub-inspector in reference to this matter. He says that, in the course of a friendly conversation with the solicitor for the defendants, he did make the remark attributed to him; but it was made and taken in joke. I hardly think that conversations between two men in a half-friendly, half-jocular way should be made the subject of Questions in this House with reference to the intentions of the Government. In answer to the final paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, I believe it is a fact that the resident magistrate at the petty sessions in question made some allusion to reports, which I have seen in several newspapers, that trial by Judge would be substituted in Ireland for trial by jury.

OFFICIAL STATISTICS COMMITTEE—THE REPORT.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Report of the Official Statistics Committee has been considered by Her Majesty's Government; and, whether it is proposed to give effect to its recommendations?

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH, in reply, said, the Government had had under their consideration the valuable Report of the Official Statistics Committee. A small Committee had been appointed by the Treasury to draw out a final and definite scheme; but it had not yet been found possible to complete the scheme. The concluding Report would shortly be laid before Parliament.

STATE OF IRELAND—DESTITUTION IN THE COUNTY OF WICKLOW

Mr. W. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been directed to a report of a meeting of the Board of Guardians of the Rathdrum Union, county Wicklow, published in the "Wicklow Newsletter" of the 15th instant, from which it appears that the honorary secretary of the Arklow Relief Committee reported that there were 590 men employed in stone breaking, representing 1,800 persons—the men were divided into gangs, over each of which there was a competent overseer; 225 tons of stones had been broken up to the present; the total expenditure for the past week was £186; whether he has reason to believe that one of the causes of the destitution in Arklow is the ruined state of the harbour, which prevents the large fishing population of that town from following their legitimate occupation; whether it is true that the Treasury have consented to give a grant of £13,000, and a loan of £13,000, in addition to the grant for the purpose of making a good harbour at Arklow, but that the Wicklow Copper Mining Company have possession of the harbour, and that they fail to keep it in repair, and refuse to hand it over to the local authorities, to whom the Treasury are willing to intrust the above sums; and, if this is the position of affairs, whether the Government will take any, and what, steps to enable the people of Arklow to avail themselves of the advantages offered by the Treasury, and thus provide remunerative employment for those who stand so much in need of it at present?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had directed inquiries to be made, and had found that the report to which the hon. Member referred was substantially correct. He found that the late Government had agreed to make the grant and loan referred to in the Question. With respect to the harbour, as it was the private property of the Mining Company, the Government had no power to compel them to improve it or keep it in repair.

STATE OF IRELAND—FORCIBLE RE-ENTRY—KILFINANE, COUNTY LIMERICK.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the case of McDonnell, committed to prison from Kilfinane, county Limerick, Whether the authorities who gave him the information informed him that Denis Murphy, the brother, and trustee to the estate of M'Donnell's late landlord (Michael Murphy), accepted the one year's rent due by McDonnell, together with the fifteen pounds given to McDonnell when leaving the farm; and that Denis Murphy, the trustee, gave a receipt in full to McDonnell for the amount; and, whether the authorities did not further report that Murphy gave up quiet and peaceable possession of the farm to McDonnell, thereby constituting a new letting?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, in this case M'Donnell forcibly entered and forcibly retained possession. It was a henious offence, for which he was liable to be sentenced to penal servitude. Having done so, I believe he did enter into an arrangement; but it seems to me that in such cases as the present it is most important that it should be understood that persons committing offences cannot escape the consequences of their acts by entering into private arrangements. If they could do so it would be a strong inducement to the private condonation of offences.

POST OFFICE—THE CITY AND COUNTY OF KILKENNY.

MR. MARUM asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been called during last Session to the great inconvenience occasioned by the defective postal arrangements in the city and county of Kilkenny, inasmuch as amongst other inconveniences local newspapers posted in the city are not delivered in certain towns and villages within the area of the county until the day after publication, and the day after the delivery of the same in London, although a line of Railway with trains running three times daily connects the city with such towns and villages; and, whether steps will be taken to obviate such inconvenience to the public?

MR. FAWCETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Members for the County and the City of Kilkenny waited upon me last year in reference to improving the postal communication in that district by letting letters go by train, and I promised that I should be very glad to make an arrangement for that purpose if I found that the expense was not too large. I find that the expense is much too large in proportion to the advantages to be derived from the arrangement; but if the hon. Members who represent the district assist me with suggestions as to the expense, I should be extremely glad to establish day mails. With regard to newspapers, I have not received any complaint; but the only way in which their delivery would be expedited would be if we could see our way to establishing day mails.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—SMOKING ROOM OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he is aware that, on Tuesday last, the smoking room of the House of Commons was filled with snow; whether it has been brought to his notice that, in consequence of the defective construction of the room, Members belonging to all parties in the House, who frequent it in great numbers, are exposed to draughts; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will forthwith take measures to remedy these grave inconveniences?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The best answer I can give to the noble Lord is that the subject of the smoking room accommodation is now occupying my attention. I hope in a few days' time to make a proposal to the House for the purpose of increasing that accommodation, which is altogether insufficient and unsatisfactory. With regard to the specific complaint of the noble Lord, I have to say that Tuesday last was an exceptional day, and that a certain amount of snow made its way through the interstices of the door which leads on to the terrace. I think, however, it is an exaggeration to say that the room was filled with snow.

POST OFFICE—TRAVELLING POST OFFICES.

MR. MOORE asked the Postmaster General, If any steps have been taken to afford additional facilities to the public for posting letters in travelling post offices at the various stages of the journey; and, whether a uniform fee has been adopted in all such cases?

MR. FAWCETT, in reply, said, that considerably increased facilities had been introduced lately for posting letters by trains. By trains that had travelling post offices letters could now be posted at a uniform rate of one halfpenny per letter, if a letter was given to a clerk in charge of a travelling post office. He had carefully considered the suggestion that letter boxes should be attached to each train; and he must say that he did not at present see his way clear to surmounting the difficulties that would attend such a step.

SOUTH AFRICA — INSURRECTION OF THE BOERS—THE 94TH REGIMENT.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he can now give any further information of the surprise and slaughter of a portion of the 94th Regiment, and of the murder of Captain Elliott by the insurgent Boers nearly three weeks ago; and, whether he will lay upon the Table the declaration said to have been issued by the Boer Chiefs as to the origin of the present insurrection against the British Government?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: In reply to the noble Lord's first Question, I am sorry to say that we have no further details as to those lamentable events. Communication between Pretoria and Newcastle is still closed. In reply to his second Question, I have to say that Sir George Strahan telegraphed on the 15th that no authentic copy of the Boer Proclamation had reached Cape Town; but he had then sent off what he believed to be a copy. I am not sure whether the declaration alluded to is the same as the Proclamation or another document; but, anyhow, we shall lay on the Table anything of the sort which we believe to be authentic as soon as possible.

SLAVE TRADE TREATIES WITH TURKEY AND EGYPT.

Mr. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What steps the present Government have taken to secure the fulfilment of the treaties negotiated by the late Government with Turkey and Egypt for the suppression of the Slave Trade?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: With regard to Turkey a delay has occurred on a point of form in the exchange of the ratifications of the Treaty; but the Ottoman Government regard the Treaty as being in force. With respect to Egypt, there is reason to believe, from the Reports of Her Majesty's Agent and Consul General, that the Egyptian Government are endeavouring faithfully to carry out the agreement arrived at with the Khedive.

RIGHT OF PUBLIC MEETING IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

Mr. M'COAN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If there be any, and what, difference between the Law of England and that of Ireland in respect of the right of public meeting, and especially if in Ireland the magistrates and police may legally disperse by force and fire upon a meeting convened for a legal purpose, but which refuses to obey their order to disperse, or even a prohibitory proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): Sir, in reply to the first branch of the Question of the hon. Member—namely,

> "If there be any, and what, difference, between the Law of England and that of Ireland in respect of the right of public meeting,"

I have to answer that the Common Law upon this subject is common both to England and Ireland, and also that part of the Statute Law is common to both countries; but that some parts of the Statute Law are specially limited in their application to England, and other parts of it to Ireland. For instance, the Riot Act in England is the 1 *Geo.* I. s. 2, c. 5; the Riot Act in Ireland is 27 *Geo.* III. c. 15. So the Acts for preventing illegal oaths by assemblages are not the same in each country. In reply to the second branch of the Question—namely,

> "If in Ireland the magistrates and police may legally disperse by force and fire upon a meeting convened for a legal purpose, but which refuses to obey their order to disperse, or even a prohibitory proclamation of the Lord-Lieutenant,"

I have to answer that if a meeting which is apparently convened for a legal purpose is, in reality, an unlawful assembly, calling for dispersal or prohibition on the part of the authorities; or if, being in its inception a lawful meeting, it turns into such an unlawful assembly, it is, in my opinion, the duty of magistrates, as conservators of the peace, and of the police as peace officers, to call on the assemblage to disperse, and, on refusal, to use such force as is necessary for that purpose; but not more force than is necessary. And further, Sir, in reference to that part of the Question relating to the use of firearms, if riot takes place so dangerous that it cannot be quelled by other means, then, Sir, the use of firearms is justified by law; but I must add that, in my opinion, the use of deadly weapons is only justifiable in the last resort.

MR. M'COAN: I beg to say that the hon. and learned Gentleman has answered a Question which is not upon the Notice Paper. My Question had reference to a meeting legally convened.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): If a meeting is perfectly legal, I do not know of any law which justifies its dispersion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Does the hon. and learned Member know of any case in which within the last 50 years a public meeting has been prohibited in England under similar circumstances?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I have no means of making myself acquainted with those facts other than those common to all Members of this House.

MR. HEALY rose to put another Question on the subject, but

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. and learned Gentleman had fully answered the Question, and any discussion would be out of Order.

THE LAND BILL (IRELAND).

MR. P. J. SMYTH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When he will be in a position to give the House some indication as to the provisions of the intended Irish Land Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I am not at all surprised at the desire of the hon. Member for information on this important subject; but I regret to say that it is not in my power at the present time to meet that desire. My hon. Friend will, I am sure, do us the justice to reflect that, although the House has been in Session for some considerable time, yet so far as the progress of Business is concerned, we have only reached what would usually be the third day's Business of the Session. There are certain Bills to be introduced by my right hon. Friend near me (Mr. W. E. Forster) for the protection of life and property in Ireland, which in the Queen's Speech take precedence of the Land Bill, and they have not yet been presented to the House. Possibly, when the state of Business is a little more developed, the Question may be more conveniently answered.

NAVY—NAVAL TRAINING BRIGS.

MR. JENKINS asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to the following paragraph in a letter inserted in the "Times" of the 17th instant, written by Mr. William John, an official of Lloyd's Registry, who was employed by the "Atalanta" Committee to make calculations as to the stability of that ship:—

> "If, again, we connect these facts with the limited curve of stability given by the constructors of the present training brig 'Seaflower,' printed on diagram O of the Appendix, and the still more limited ranges of stability given on the same page for the heavily-masted brigs 'Liberty,' 'Nautilus,' and 'Pilot,' a source of danger is revealed which I do not think, after what has passed, can possibly go unheeded;"

and, whether any of the above-named brigs are now in commission as sea-going vessels; and, if so, whether the Admiralty will take into consideration the advisability of discontinuing to employ them as training ships, seeing that their seaworthiness for want of sufficient stability is questioned by so high an authority?

MR. TREVELYAN: The brigs referred to in the Question are at present laid up for the winter. They will never be commissioned as sea-going and sea-keeping vessels; but are used as tenders to the stationary training ships to take the boys outside the harbour in summer weather.

TURKEY AND GREECE—THE FRENCH CIRCULAR.

MR. OTWAY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether a Circular Despatch by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, on the Turco-Greek Frontier Question, which has been published in the English and Foreign newspapers, has been communicated to Her Majesty's Government; and, in that case, whether it will be included in the Papers to be presented to Parliament which relate to this subject?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The French Circular to which my hon. Friend refers has never been communicated to Her Majesty's Government, although a copy of a despatch addressed by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs to the French Minister at Athens, which is stated to be the complement of the Circular in question, was communicated confidentially to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris on the 31st ultimo, and has since appeared in the newspapers.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND).

Mr. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will have any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return of the names and residences of all persons appointed to the Commission of the Peace in Ireland between the 1st day of May and the 31st day of December 1880, specifying those, if any, who were so appointed without the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant of Counties in Ireland?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I have no objection to letting the House have the Returns asked for; but I could not let the hon. Member have the information specified in the end of the Question, which is of a confidential nature.

PRISONS (ENGLAND) ACT, 1877—SCARBOROUGH PRISON.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the following sentence, page 111, of the Third Report of the Commissioners of Prisons, 1880:—

> "The Prison at York Castle, although covering a large area, and representing an enormous original outlay, provides but little cell accommodation, and that of a very unsatisfactory kind. The place as it stands now can only be explicitly and conclusively condemned. Nothing short of complete reconstruction can remedy its many faults and disadvantages as a prison building;"

if he is aware that Scarborough prisoners, and those from other districts, are now confined in York Castle, while a commodious and recently erected prison containing ample accommodation, at Scarborough, is entirely closed; and, if he will give instructions for the re-opening of the prison at Scarborough?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that his views on the question of re-opening the prison at Scarborough had been fully explained on a former occasion to a deputation interested in the subject. Since then his views had undergone no change. Scarborough Prison was small, and the present policy was to close such prisons. The average number of prisoners from Scarborough was only 31. He had conferred with the Prison Commissioners, and they agreed with him in thinking that Scarborough Prison should not be re-opened.

PUBLIC MEETINGS (IRELAND).

Mr. DAWSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Under what Law police could enter, uninvited, private meetings of public bodies in Ireland?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): As this is a matter of law, I may be permitted to answer this Question for my right hon. Friend. The hon. Member asks under what law police can enter uninvited private meetings of public bodies in Ireland. I have to reply that if such meetings are without criminality, or suspicion of criminality, I am not aware of any law under which the police can enter the places in which they are held. But if the persons attending such meetings are violating, or are suspected of violating, the Criminal Law, then the police, duly armed with lawful warrant may enter and arrest, or, in some cases, may justify the entry and arrest even without warrant. Premises may also be entered by the police under a search warrant, whether a meeting is being held there or not.

REMOVAL OF SNOW (METROPOLIS).

Sir HARRY VERNEY asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether his attention has been drawn to a description in the "Times" of to-day, of the plan adopted in the City of Milan for cleansing away the snow, which is thereby done in a very short time, and work is supplied to men who are deprived by the weather of their usual occupations; and, whether he will adopt that or some other effectual mode of clearing the streets of London?

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: Sir, in answer to the Question of my hon. Friend, I beg to state that I have observed the description in *The Times* to which he refers; but it is not in the power of the Board over which I preside to adopt that or any other plan of clearing snow from the streets of the Metropolis, which are under the sole charge of the local authorities. I think I may say, however, from inquiries instituted in some of the largest parishes, that great exertions are being made to grapple with the present difficulty. On the Victoria Embankment, over which my Board has control, 400 men, 40 carts, and two snow-ploughs were employed for nearly three days in removing the snow, beginning work at 3 o'clock in the morning. This shows the immense quantity that fell; and I may add that, assuming a depth of six inches, the fall of snow over the whole Metropolitan area of about 117 square miles has been roughly estimated at the enormous amount of 8,750,000 tons. The House will see that to cart all this away in a few days, in many cases to a considerable distance, would be a matter of absolute impossibility.

STATE OF IRELAND—COUNTY OF SLIGO—PROCLAIMED DISTRICTS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state particularly the nature of the grounds which induced the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council of Ireland, as appears by Proclamation in the "Dublin Gazette" of Tuesday last, to declare four baronies of the county Sligo, covering three-fourths of the area of that county, to be in a disturbed state, and to require an additional establishment of police? He also asked, Whether, in view of the reported diminution of crime reported by the police in Ireland for the past month, the right hon. Gentleman still intends to proceed with his Motion for the introduction of coercive legislation for Ireland?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: In answer to the first Question of the hon. Member, I beg to say that the ground upon which the four baronies in question were proclaimed were—first, that a series of outrages had been committed in each of them, which manifested an open defiance to the law; secondly, the forces at the disposal of the county Inspector were represented by him to be totally inadequate to the carrying out of patrolling adopted in the county; and, thirdly, the number of persons requiring the protection of the police required an extra force. I must add that the condition of the baronies is generally unsatisfactory. With regard to the second Question of the hon. Member, as to my intention to bring forward the Bills of which I have given Notice, I think if he waited for four or five minutes he would see whether I have changed my opinion in that respect or not.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND) ACT — REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

MR. CALLAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland a Question of which I have not given him private Notice, but which, from its nature, does not require any. Is he aware of the fact that the Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners, who were appointed to inquire into the working of the Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870, and the Acts amending the same, and which should have been presented to both Houses of Parliament, was only presented to this House since the present Sitting commenced; and whether he is aware that the material and the most important portions of that Report were published in an article in a leading journal this morning; whether such publication is respectful to this House and in accordance with the usual practice; on whose authority was that Report communicated to the Press; was it furnished by or with the sanction of the right hon. Gentleman; and, if not so supplied by him, will he cause an investigation to be made to ascertain by whom this reprehensible act was committed?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am sorry to say that I have committed a breach of the Regulations of the House; but I was not aware of it. The fact is, that, knowing that the Report would be presented to the House to-night, I did give a copy on being asked for it. I am sorry I did it, and I will take care it shall not occur again.

Mr. CALLAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman explain why an exception was made in favour of a particular newspaper?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: It was the only case in which I was asked.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in future, when a copy of any paper of this kind is given to one newspaper it will be sent to every other morning paper in London?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I will answer that Question in another way. I shall most certainly take care not to give such a document again to any paper, if it is contrary to the Regulations of the House.

ORDER—THE BLUE BOOKS.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether his attention had been called to frequent complaints that Blue Books were sent to newspapers and others before being sent to Members of Parliament? The Blue Book on Afghanistan had only been presented to the House that day; but the newspapers had had opportunities of copying from it for the last few days—not only London newspapers, but even Scotch papers in Edinburgh.

[The Question met with no reply.]

THE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION.

In reply to Mr. Spencer Walpole,

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the Report of the Agricultural Commission was presented last Tuesday. It was in the hands of the printers, who were being pressed to complete the work, and to deliver the Report as soon as possible.

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

I thank you for your loyal and dutiful Address.

I rely on your cordial co-operation in giving effect to the Measures which will be submitted to you for the purpose of promoting prosperity and concord among all classes of My People, and for upholding the authority of the Law.

MOTIONS.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Sir, I rise to move for leave to bring in a Bill for the protection of person and property in Ireland. I am afraid that I shall be obliged to detain the House much longer than I should have wished; but my task will be less than it otherwise would have been, in consequence of the long debate which we have already had upon the Address. After that debate, I do not think the House will expect me to dwell upon the grounds why we have not brought forward this measure earlier than we now do. That objection has been stated, and I think it has been met. I am aware that it is a very serious matter to ask the House to pass such a measure as I shall have to propose; but I think that I may confine the statement I have to make to showing why, in the view of Her Majesty's Government, the measure I propose to bring in is necessary, and necessary to be passed without delay. On the second night of the debate upon the Address I ventured to state the necessity of this measure on my being able to show that persons and property are unprotected, and that liberty is unsecured in Ireland; and I am aware that I must show both the extent of the evil and the efficiency of the remedy which we propose—that, with our present powers, we cannot give this protection, but that with the powers we ask for we hope to be able to do so. In the first place, there has been much discussion as to the extent of the evil. I believe, notwithstanding what has been said and written on this matter, that hon. Members are not aware—at any rate, numbers of persons in the country are not aware—of the alarming condition of Ireland at the present moment. I am well aware that there have been many exaggerations in the newspapers, and the effect of exaggerations, when they are proved, is that hon. Members and the people generally suppose that there is no truth independent of exaggeration. I can only say that the facts which I shall have to lay before the House have not been gathered from newspaper reports. I do not think I shall quote one; but they are facts, in the truth of which I fully believe, and which, in almost every case, have been furnished to me from official information, and information which we had the opportunity of testing. Let me say one word upon the statistics which are now before the House. Statistics, I know, may be misleading, and I will not detain the House at any length upon them. But, as hon. Members have these statistics in their hands, I will give them very shortly two or three deductions from them. I have given a Return of the total number of agrarian outrages in 1880, which shows that the total number was 2,590. We have a separation of the Returns of agrarian from other crimes in Ireland since the year 1844, but not before, and the highest year during that period previous to 1880 was the first year of the great Famine—namely, 1845. In that year the outrages numbered 1,920. Consequently, last year they were 35 per cent more than they had ever before been recorded to be. I have also thought it right to give the number exclusive of threatening letters, for reasons which I will state presently. Although I do not think that threatening letters are so insignificant a matter as some hon. Members appear to think, I think it as well to keep them separate from other outrages. In 1880—exclusive of threatening letters—the number of agrarian outrages was 1,253; in 1845 they were 950—that is to say, that they were 32 per cent higher last year than they were in the largest year of which we have any special record. Hon. Members are well aware that there is now a great difference in the population. The population of Ireland is now some 5,000,000, compared with 8,000,000 in 1845. Therefore, taking into account the difference of population, the actual agrarian outrages last year, exclusive of threatening letters, were more than double what they were in the worst year we have any record of—namely, the year 1845. Well, Sir, I am also obliged to tell the House that there has been a great increase in the last three months of last year. Exclusive of threatening letters, 719 outrages out of the total of 1,253 for the entire year occurred in the three months of October, November, and December, and, including threatening letters, 1,696 out of 2,590. That is to say, that two-thirds of the total agrarian outrages occurred within the last quarter of the year, and 58 per cent of these exclusive of threatening letters. It is also right to say that the number which occurred in the month of December was more than those for October and November put together. In addition to this there has been a great increase in the extent of area over which the outrages have prevailed. At the time Parliament rose we were uneasy, certainly, about parts of Ireland; but our uneasiness was very much confined to two or three counties, and almost entirely to the province of Connaught—the counties being Mayo and Galway, and to some extent Sligo, Leitrim, and Roscommon. Since that time outrages have spread up and down the country into the counties of Donegal, Kerry, parts of Cork, and eastward, to the very centre of Ireland. In Kerry, for example, there were 298 outrages for the whole year, and 226 of them occurred during the last three months; in Limerick, there were 186 for the year, of which 149 occurred in the last three months; and in Wexford 56, of which 48 occurred in the last three months. It is not merely the number of the outrages that is the most alarming feature; but it is their effect, arising from their character. We must consider their character, their object, and their effect. Now, the chief characteristic of these outrages is intimidation, and the object is obedience to certain commands which have been issued, especially commands not to take farms, and not to pay rent, which have been issued by the Land League. Their effect is fear and terror, and submissive obedience to these orders of the Land League—to the unwritten law that has been framed, as the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) says, by himself and his friends, and of which unwritten law the local Land League Committees are the administrators. The hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) said, last Monday, that the Land League rules supreme, and yet the reign of terror, of which so much has been said, has no existence in fact. Those are the words of the hon. Member for Tipperary. I think I shall be able to show the House that the hon. Member was perfectly right in the first part of his statement, but incorrect in the second. The

Land League does reign supreme, but it reigns supreme by threats, and fear, and intimidation. If the House will allow me, I will give a sketch of the different stages of intimidation. First, there is an intimidation which is not ineffective, but which we do not suppose we shall ever meet or attempt to meet. There are hints, warnings, advice, and suggestions; we are aware that these must be passed by. Then comes the threatening letters which the law considers an offence, and visits with a heavy punishment, even amounting in some cases, I believe, to penal servitude. I am quite willing to admit that if the threatening letters are not followed up by action, and if those who receive them do not think that they will be followed up by action, they are mere waste paper. But threatening letters are not always meaningless, and when they do not intimidate enough then begin the outrages upon property and upon person. I will take first the outrages upon property. There are two forms in which these outrages are specially committed —incendiary fires—burning down hayricks or cabins, and the maiming of cattle. Now, incendiary fires, and the outrages connected with incendiary fires, have very largely increased. In the year 1880 they numbered 210, of which 108 occured in the last three months. As to the torture of cattle, it is done, not for the purpose of gratifying any particular love of cruelty on the part of the men who do it, but for the purpose of intimidating their owners; but, I must say, with a reckless disregard of humanity. I was in hopes that the attention which was drawn to that matter during the sitting of Parliament last Session, would have tended to diminish these outrages; but I am sorry to say that that has not been the case. On the contrary, they have increased. In 1880 the number of cases of maiming cattle amounted to 101, and 64 of them occurred in the last three months of the year. The highest year since 1844—namely 1845, when the population was nearly twice as large as it is now, the outrages of this class numbered only 87. Consequently, this very disgusting crime is far more prevalent than it has been in any time since the year 1844. But the outrages upon personal property may not be sufficient; and then come the outrages upon persons, and especially night visits. If hon. Members will look at the Returns, they will find that for the last 10 years intimidation by threatening letters and notices have been separated from other kinds of intimidation. Under the head of "other intimidation," there come actual threatenings by one man to another, which is an illegal act; and that applies to night visits more than to any other form of outrage. A disguised party of men, consisting of 10, 20, or even more, come to a lone farm house at night, drag the farmer out of bed, beat him, and "card" him. I do not know whether hon. Members know what "carding" means, and perhaps I had better explain it. An iron comb, used for agricultural purposes, is applied to a man's naked body, and the torture must be very great. Then the man is threatened and warned against disobeying the orders of the organization any longer. Shots are fired over his head, and sometimes at him. Let hon. Members think of the terror thus produced. Imagine a small farmer in a desolate situation—his house on the side of some hill, or near some bog. There is no help near; no police station is at hand; and the man himself is powerless to resist. Naturally, he submits to this cruel tyranny and intimidation. And no wonder, when such things as these are taking place, that the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) is right, and that the Land League reigns supreme. One such act strikes terror into a whole district, and men reluctant to be drawn into the organization, and who would otherwise be willing to pay their rents, fear to do so. Others will not work for an obnoxious landlord until the law has been set right. For the last 10 years these forms of intimidation have been separated from threatening letters; and the number for the last year was 239—that is, more than the whole number during the previous nine years. There are other serious kinds of intimidation beyond night visits—namely, firing into a dwelling-house, and hon. Members will find that class of outrage placed in the Return under a special heading. The crime of firing into a dwelling-house has greatly increased in number lately. In the year 1880 the number was 67, of which 45 occurred in the last three months of the year. In the first fortnight of this year the number was

12, which is an enormous increase. During the whole of the nine years before last year, there were only 66 outrages of this particular nature, and the highest number since 1844 until last year was 55 in the year 1845, which, as I have already said, is the only year which at all competes with 1880 as far as regards agrarian crime. Now, firing into dwellings means this. A farmer is sitting with his wife and children round his cabin fire, or perhaps he is sleeping in his bed. He hears shots fired; his windows are broken; the shots come into the house, and although they are not fired at him he may be in their way, and may be hit by them. At all events, this is a mode of alarming and intimidating him, and I must say I imagine a most successful one. Some hon. Members have said that, after all, there have been but few cases of murder or attempts at murder. But they were not necessary. The different modes of threatening and of causing fear, which I have described, make it unnecessary to commit murder or to attempt to commit murder. But, after all, there are some persons who are obstinate and who will not be alarmed—both landlords, and to their credit, let me say, farmers and work-folk. The Return of murders would have been very much larger than it is, if it had not happened that we felt it to be our duty, at any expense of trouble and cost of money, to give such men protection. Hon. Members will have seen the Return of the number of persons under personal protection. It is, I think, the largest Return of the kind ever furnished in this country, or, I should imagine, in any civilized country. On the 1st of January this year there were 153 persons under personal protection; and personal protection means having two policemen constantly with them. That is putting them into a state of life to which, I think, great danger would be preferable. I can hardly imagine a man consenting to it. I suppose if I found it necessary to have recourse to personal protection, I should consent to it; but I sometimes wonder how any man can make up his mind to endure it, for it must be almost slavery while it lasts. There were 1,149 persons watched over by policemen for protection. On the 1st of January, 1870, when a good deal of outrage was prevalent, and it was found necessary to pass the Peace Preservation Act, there were only 23 persons under personal police protection. On the 1st of January, 1871, there were 15; on the 1st of January, 1878, 6; and on the 1st of January, 1879, only 6. Now, let me ask, why are these outrages committed? What is their purpose? They are committed for the purpose of preventing men from doing certain things. Well, what are the offences? Here, if the House will allow me—and I hope they will not consider that I am wearying them—I shall think it right to place before them several cases for the purpose of illustrating the object of these outrages. One of the commonest objects is to prevent a man from taking a farm from which the tenant has been evicted, or to prevent a man from working for a landlord who has taken such a farm into his own occupation, or, and this is a new purpose which has been greatly developed lately, to prevent a man from working on a grazing farm in order that grazing farms should cease any longer to be grazing farms and should be let to the small farmers around. I will only give one case with regard to this kind of outrage, although I could give a great many more. In a Report from the county of Sligo, dated the 10th of November last, the sub-inspector of Constabulary reports—

> "I have to report that about 10 o'clock p.m. on the 6th inst., an armed party, numbering about 15, entered the house of Peter Keolahan, dragged him to the door, when one of them stabbed him under the eye with some sharp instrument. He was then knocked down and severely kicked, and struck with a spade which happened to be in the house. They then burned him on the back with some iron instrument, which they heated in the fire for that purpose, leaving three marks, one 3 inches long, two others about 2 inches. They then left, telling him not to bring them back, firing shots outside his house going away. On inquiry, I learned that Keolahan had lately worked for a man named Doherty, who had taken possession of a farm from which a man had been removed through becoming embarrassed."

MR. HEALY: Where was it?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: In the county of Sligo. One of the chief objects of these outrages, undoubtedly, is to prevent the payment of any rent which is not allowed by the Land League to be paid—such as the payment of any rent, for instance, over Griffith's valuation, or over whatever rent they—the Land League in Dublin or its committees in the country—may think ought to be paid. I must give to the House two or three cases in regard to the various outrages. I will give one of firing into a house, as it is a fair sample of all the others—

> "On the 3rd December at about 1 o'clock a.m., two shots were fired into the dwelling of Jeremiah Sullivan, farmer, by some persons unknown. The muzzles of the guns must have been held close to the window of the bedroom where Sullivan and his wife were sleeping, for the charge of shot pierced the shutter like a bullet, and passed through the curtains of the bed. The only motive for this outrage is that Sullivan paid a portion of his rent, and a notice to this effect was posted on his door by the parties who fired into his house."

I have here the details of several similar cases which have occurred in Clare, Tipperary, Cavan, Kerry, Galway, Limerick, and Mayo. All of them occurred in the month of December, except two which took place in November. I do not believe that in these cases there was an attempt to kill. But there was in each case an attempt to alarm, and a very successful attempt to alarm. I do not imagine that a man who had had his house fired into would, unless he had more courage than you would expect men in his situation to have, venture next day to do what he had been told not to do. Let me now give another case which occurred at Crossmolina, in the county of Mayo, on the 18th of December. The sub-inspector tells me—

> "I have the honour to report that about 8 o'clock p.m. yesterday a party of about 20 men visited the houses of the above-named nine persons. Five men of the party entered each house. One was armed with a double gun, the others with pistols. They asked at each house if they had paid their rent, and said that such of them as were able to pay might pay at the rate of Griffith's valuation, but to pay no more. They swore each man not to enter the shop of William Hogan, of Crossmolina, nor to deal with him. The reason is that Mr. Hogan, who is a respectable grocer, refuses to join the Land League or subscribe to it."

SIR HENRY TYLER: What number of outrages does that Report account for?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I think the number of outrages accounted for would be the number of houses visited. Each one would form a separate crime. I will now proceed to mention a case of sending a threatening letter. This case I give partly in order to show why it is not unreasonable that a man living in these districts should pay attention to a threatening letter. It rarely happens that a person is seriously injured without having received a threatening letter beforehand, and, consequently, the receipt of a threatening letter has this unpleasantness attached to it, that it brings the man who receives it within the possibility of an outrage. It is therefore not remarkable, but probable, that persons in these disturbed districts who receive threatening letters should pay attention to them. Here is a case in point which occurred in the county of Galway. The Report states—

> "On the night of the 7th of October a threatening notice was posted on the door of the dwelling-house of —— 'Pay no rents or you will be carded. Mind, now, what I say.' He nevertheless paid his rent."

Now what follows?—

> "On the 5th of January this man was returning one evening from a market, two shots were fired at him by someone who had been lying concealed behind a stone wall; and there is no doubt about the outrage. A revolver bullet was found by the police in the rail of the crib or cart he was driving."

I do not know whether the House cares to have any more of these cases or not. Here is another which occurred this year. The sub-inspector reports from Castlebar, in the county of Mayo, on the 4th of January—

> "I have to report that at some hour on last night six sheep of the best kind, value from £3 each, were maliciously killed on the lands of Ballinvilla by having the brain of each animal pierced by some sharp instrument through both eyes. The animals were then thrown into a deep ditch. Mr. Powell (the owner) is the agent of Mr. C. Fitzgerald, of Turlough-park, and this outrage is believed to have been committed because he had not given or got for them the rents at Griffith's valuation."

Again, the report of a police-constable, dated Castlerea, January 5, says—

> "I beg to state that I received a report this morning, per telegram, of an outrageous attack on Michael Kilkenny's house, John Hanly, and John and Roger Sweeny's houses, by an armed party on the morning of the 3rd instant. I proceeded at once to the scene."

Upon inquiry, he found, to state it shortly, that at about 1 o'clock on the morning of the 3rd, a party of men knocked at the door of Michael Kilkenny. No answer was given. The front door was then forced in. Kilkenny got out of bed, looked through the window, and saw about nine or ten men standing outside. He became very much alarmed, and went out, undressed, through the back door, and ran away into the fields; at the same time he heard shots fired. When the party found that Kilkenny had made his escape, they broke part of the window-sash and two panes of glass. One of them said—"We will come again." At about 2 o'clock on the same morning John Hanly heard a great knocking at his door. He got out of bed, and saw a number of men standing outside. The door was forced in, and one of the men called out his name. The wife answered for him that he was not at home. They said—"Did your husband pay the rent?" She said—"He did, as he got the reduction." They said he had no right to pay it, and they would come again. One shot was fired into the house, but no injury was done. Roger Sweeny says—

> "At about 3 o'clock I heard loud knocking at my door, and a person calling out to have it opened. I opened the door, and saw about 20 men outside. One of them asked—'Did I pay my rent?' I said—'I did, as I got the reduction.' I heard one of them say—'Give me the scissors.' On hearing this, I ran up into the room, and left my son to talk to them. There were about six or seven shots fired off. When they were leaving, one of them said—'We will come again.'"

John Sweeny was visited the same night, and asked—"Did he pay his rent?" He said he did, as he had got the reduction from his landlord, and thought it no harm. One of the men told him not to do it again. They left, firing shots, which were from long guns. The constable believes that these outrages were committed by one party, and is strongly of opinion that they were not strangers to the locality, and that some of them were known to the people whose houses they visited; but the people positively refused to swear informations in the matter. Here is another case of a very outrageous character. In the county of Clare, about 6 o'clock p.m., a shot was fired by some person unknown through the kitchen window of the dwelling-house of William O'Donnell, farmer, who refused to join the Land League. O'Donnell, another man, his wife, and five or six children were sitting round the fire. The charge of shot passed over their heads, and lodged, principally, in a dresser opposite the window. One of the grains glanced off and grazed a child slightly on the cheek. She was the only person who received any injury. There was a very bright light in the kitchen at the time, and, from the slanting direction in which the shot was fired, it was evident that it was only intended to frighten the inmates. I strongly suspect O'Donnell would join the Land League the next day. Hon. members will have heard of the Land League Courts. They are held in connection with the local Land League. They are presided over by leading members of that League; they issue summonses, sometimes in writing and sometimes by word of mouth. In some places this has been stopped since the proceedings at Tralee; but this is what they did until two or three weeks ago. They heard complaints and determined upon them; they required people to surrender farms, and they imposed penalties for infringement of the rules of the Land League, and they sometimes directed parties summoned before them to be "Boycotted." Their proceedings are reported in the public papers. I should like to give a little information as to the way in which these courts act. I read from a report of a meeting of the Quin branch Land League—

> "On Sunday last (the Sunday before the 18th of December), "a meeting of the above branch was held at their rooms, Quin. Mr. James Quinlivan appeared before the committee to refute the charge of having paid more rent than the Government valuation. In opening the proceedings the Secretary said—'Mr. Quinlivan, there is an accusation registered against you in my book, that of paying your rent which is in excess of Griffiths' valuation.' Mr. Quinlivan—'I have been informed that there was a summons soliciting my presence here on last Sunday; I did not receive that summons. I have been likewise told that great indignation was expressed by the members toward my conduct in not appearing.' Mr. Lawlor—'There were some suggestions on the occasion expressing condemnation of your conduct in treating the summons, which they thought you had received, in such a negligent and defiant manner.' Mr. Quinlivan—'I passed this office on Sunday; I met Mr. Lawlor on the road, and asked him—was there any important business before the committee that day? He answered me in the negative, and as I had pressing business to attend to I went home. I was greatly surprised on learning subsequently that there was a charge against me, so I have availed myself of the first opportunity of freeing myself from that charge. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I beg that the proof which is going to be adduced against me will be brought forward.' The Secretary—'There is no positive proof against you; it is merely hearsay; but as you know how far that will go with the public in injuring a man's character, I think the committee have adopted an advisable course in affording you, as well as others, an opportunity of proving these rumours false.' Mr. Quinlivan—"Here are my documents. They are sufficient, I think, to exculpate me.' The Chairman: They are; and we

hold you honourably free from the charge.' Mr. P. Lawlor: I propose that we pass a vote of censure on those unknown persons with whom originated this false rumour; and Mr. Quinlivan having produced satisfactory evidence to honourably free himself, that we elect him a member of our executive committee.'"

In the same paper I find several other cases. There is a case near Ennis where a man is brought up for having bought a sheep from a man who is represented as a land grabber; but he manages somehow to explain, and is let off. Then there is a case in Cork—

"The next was the most important of all the cases under consideration. The local process-server was charged with having served writs for Mr. Sanders. The culprit had to avoid the popular indignation, fled to America. His written apology was produced and the following resolution adopted:—'That we endorse the sentence of expatriation which Mr. Roger Hunt has voluntarily imposed upon himself, for having undertaken the infamous task of serving writs on the tenants of Mr. Sanders, of New Pallas celebrity; that we want words to express our loathing of anyone who assists the oppressor of the tenant; and that as by leaving Mr. Hunt has only forestalled the popular judgment, so we warn him not to return and face the just indignation which would impose upon him a second exile.'"

Then there is another case in the same newspaper—I am quoting from *The Nation*—

"A couple of Land League investigations have just been held by the Committee of the Maryborough Land League. After a full investigation, the following resolution was arrived at by the Committee:—'That having considered the question that has brought us together, and having heard Mr. Brady's explanation, we are unanimously of opinion that he has not been guilty of any violation of the rules of the Land League. At the same time, we take this opportunity of expressing our determination to accept no excuse on the part of any farmer in the future, who pays a rent that is higher than Griffith's valuation, that being in accordance with the first principles of the Land League.'"

Then there comes an inquiry at Boyle into the cases of some shopkeepers whose names had appeared in a "black list," which was circulated in the neighbourhood. Their cases were also considered. The result of this inquiry was that a man named Edward Cunningham read out a list of the shopkeepers who had not joined the Land League, and moved that they get one week to make up their minds, or be "Boycotted." A few speeches were then delivered, and the meeting broke up—

"To-day the shops of the traders whose names are on the 'black list' are entirely deserted, and parties seen entering their houses or known to be dealing with them were warned."

Various other acts of intimidation are reported. That, I again say, entirely confirms the statement of the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), that the Land League rules supreme; but it does not confirm his statement that the League does not rule by fear and terror. Let me read a letter from the county of Leitrim, dated December 7. I cannot give the name of the writer, who says—

"I have to report that, between the hours of 9 and 10 o'clock p.m., on the 7th inst., a party of about 30 men came to the house of ———, broke in his door, dragged him out on the street, and beat him with sticks on the head and body. The injuries inflicted, however, are not of a serious nature. He has two cuts on the head, and his arms are swollen and discoloured. The party left, and in going away fired some shots. The motive for this outrage is that ——— paid his rent contrary to the rules of the Land League."

According to his statement, men are appointed in each townland, called Land League constables. Their duty is to watch the doings of the inhabitants, and report to their committee any infringement of the rules of the Land League. The "constable" for the townland where he lives is ———, and he reported the fact of the former having paid his rent. He says that—

"Some days after he paid the rent he attended a meeting of the Land League Committee, expecting that his case would be tried; but it was not called, and he, therefore, thought they had overlooked his offence. He knows most of the parties who assaulted him; but I could not induce him to disclose any of their names, neither would he consent to swear informations, as, if he did so, he says he would be obliged to quit the country. He is not afraid that any further violence will be offered, except he again breaks some of the rules."

Hitherto I have quoted entirely from official Reports, with the exception of those extracts from *The Nation*. But I have now to quote a letter from a landlord. I cannot give his name; he is a courageous man, and I do not know that he would object to my naming him. But there is a power of punishing him in Ireland, and I do not wish that he should be punished. He writes this letter—

"I think it right further to say that this entire country has totally changed as regards the feelings of the people in the last two months. Two months ago, in conversing with the tenants, they all said that they had had a most bountiful harvest, and expressed themselves contented and prosperous. Since that time there have been weekly meetings of what is termed the branch of the Land League (every Saturday). This body have tried cases, cited tenants before them, ordered farms to be given up, and instituted a most complete reign of terror. The number of undetected outrages giving force to these threats, the few evil-disposed persons have completely cowed the loyal and well-disposed, who see that they have no protection to expect from any quarter, and they have been forced to join the threateners."

The reason why I allude to this is because I wish to call attention to the fact that I had a conversation with the writer, which made more impression upon me than almost anything I heard at the time. In talking over these matters, he mentioned a great outrage committed in his neighbourhood, and said—"I blame myself very much for that outrage." On my asking "Why?" He said, "Because I might have gone to the Land League and proved to them that the charge against him, from their own point of view, was not correct." That is to say, that this court, in carrying out the unwritten law of the Land League, is so powerful in its district that this gentleman actually blamed himself for not going before it in order to protect an individual whom he believed had not offended against its law. I am not going to give the name of this gentleman; but I am perfectly ready to show the letter to any hon. Member, if I am sure that the name of the writer will not be divulged. Thus much for the courts of the Land League. I now come to the position of our own Courts of Law. Hon. Members have a Return giving the total number of agrarian offences in Ireland during the three months ending with January as 2,590, and which also shows the total number of apprehensions in respect of them to have been 295. And here, again, I have taken out the cases of sending threatening letters, because I am aware that it is a crime very difficult of detection. Without them there were 1,153 agrarian offences committed, while the number of apprehensions was 182, or at the rate of 16 per cent only. I now come to the non-agrarian offences in Ireland. I have just received a proof of the Returns, which I hope will be in the hands of hon. Members in the course of a day or two; and from this it appears that the total number of non-agrarian offences committed in that country during the period named was 3,084, while the number of apprehensions numbered 1,269. But here, also, I deduct the cases of sending threatening letters, an offence more common in Ireland than in other parts of the United Kingdom; and I find that, as against 2,657 non-agrarian offences, there were 1,255 apprehensions, representing a rate of 47 per cent. I wish hon. Members to remark that, when dealing with crime of a non-agrarian character, Ireland is no worse in respect of the percentage of apprehensions than the rest of the United Kingdom—in fact, she is rather better, because the average of apprehensions in that country, as compared with offences, is generally something over 50 per cent, while the year before last the apprehensions in England and Scotland were 45 per cent. I say this partly in justice to the police, and in order to show that they do not fail as a detective body except in agrarian cases, in which I would defy any police to succeed. We now come to the subject of convictions in the cases of agrarian offences, upon which I shall not dwell at any great length. Hon. Members have probably read Judge Fitzgerald's Charge to the Grand Jury at Cork at the commencement of the Assizes; but I am not so sure that they have read his Charge at their termination. The learned Judge says—

> "I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there have been very considerable failures of justice, and failures of justice which I do not hesitate to say have been produced by external influences operating upon some of the jury."

The Solicitor General for Ireland has alluded to a very flagrant case. We all remember the outrageous and wicked murder of young Mr. Boyd. Even in that case my hon. and learned Friend had to apply for the postponement of the trial at Waterford, because out of a panel of 205 jurors only 118 answered to their names. And why? Because they dared not come. There were affidavits produced, giving the grounds of their fears. I do not expect hon. Members to pay much attention to my opinion on that point; but what did the learned Judge say at the time?—

> "These affidavits are not contradicted. No man professing to be acquainted with the state of feeling in this city has come forward and made an affidavit as to his belief that this apprehension does not exist in the minds of the jurors, that this sense of intimidation does not

prevail, or in any manner to suggest that the statements of belief expressed in their affidavits are unfounded."

The learned Judge, consequently, felt he must postpone the trial, and it was postponed. I propose to give the House but very few more cases; but there are one or two to which I must refer. One of them is very illustrative. During the month of December, a man and his wife, returning home in the evening, were attacked on the high road by six men, who threw clothes over their faces to conceal themselves. They called upon the man by name, crying out, "You have paid your rent, and we will give it you." They attacked him, but he escaped. They then cried out—

> "Stop the Black Sheep! Hurrah for Home Rule and the Land League! You will catch it."

The man informed the police; but, though he thought he knew the men, declined to swear an information, on the ground that he was afraid. He was a member of the Land League, and had not paid his rent; but they thought he had. He told the sub-inspector of police that if the prosecution went on he would leave with his family for America, and would throw up his farm. So convinced were the magistrates that the man's fear was well founded, and that he was in real danger, that one of them refused to sign the summons, and the other advised the withdrawal of the case. The following letter was written by one of the magistrates to the sub-inspector:—

> "I would recommend the withdrawal of this summons against the parties who took part in the assault. The man says he dare not prosecute; it would be as much as his life is worth. The assault was by order of the Land League, because the man paid his rent. The witnesses would prove nothing; they dare not do so. It is a perfect reign of terror, and no one has any authority but the Land League."

MR. HEALY: He was a landlord.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I dare say he was; but that makes no difference in this case; and I believe the hon. Member does not doubt the story. The House is probably aware that, by law, there is compensation for damages through malicious injury; but I will just give two cases illustrative of the effects of the terror existing in Ireland upon persons entitled to claim such compensation. On the 6th of December, at about 10 o'clock p.m., some persons unknown fired a shot close to the house of Pat Hardiman, farmer, and another shot into his kitchen. The door was pierced by two slugs; but no trace of them could be found. The only motive that can be assigned is to prevent Hardiman from seeking compensation for the loss of his mare, which he alleges was poisoned in August last. In consequence of this outrage he has made no claim. In the other instance, on the 8th of December, at about 9 o'clock, p.m., a pistol shot was fired into the bedroom of Michael Connell, farmer, by some person unknown. Both he and his wife were sitting at the kitchen fire, so that it was believed there was no intention to injure anyone, but merely to frighten Connell into paying a subscription towards defraying the expense of opposing an application from a man named Thomas Ford for compensation for malicious injury to his horse. I must detain the House for a few moments while I say a word with reference to the general lawlessness which proceeds from this state of things. It is not confined to the land only, but is beginning to affect every interest in the country. The law of the land is now replaced by a new and an unwritten law. It is a dangerous thing in any country when the law of the land is replaced by an unwritten law, and I do not know that in Ireland it is not as dangerous to the people as to the people of any other country. Well, we find that the landlords are not the only persons who cannot get what is due to them. In many districts the shopkeepers are unable to issue processes against their debtors. The hon. Member for Tipperary says his county is as perfectly quiet as any district in the country. But this is what I have heard respecting that county within the last two or three days—

> "Process-serving is, I may say, at a standstill in this district at present; and I have been informed by several shopkeepers here that they consider it wholly useless to attempt to recover their due by this means, on account of the excited state of the country. The employment of process-servers is, therefore, almost entirely suspended. On the 31st of December, in response to an application from magistrates, we had to employ 74 policemen to protect process-servers serving processes for shop goods supplied."

I now wish to enable hon. Members to realize the state of things in one district. I have informed the House that outrages had much increased in Kerry during the last few months; and earlier in this Session I stated that outrages had everywhere followed the Land League. Before October there were only seven Land League meetings in county Kerry—that is to say, one in each month from March to September. Since the beginning of October, however, there have been 15, and these have been followed by an enormous increase of crime, and the number of outrages has increased from 226 for the first nine months of the year to 298 during the last three months. The district of Castle Ireland in this county has an area of 11 square miles, with a population of 11,400. The first meeting of the Land League was, I believe, held there on the 10th of October, and was attended by the hon. Members for Queen's County and Cavan. In that district alone, from that date to the 10th of January, there have been 87 outrages of an agrarian character. It would seem that in that district they prefer deeds to threatening letters, which numbered only 14 during the period named. Let me now endeavour to describe the characteristics of the evil with which we have to deal, its mode of action, and its final result. In the first place, the law of the Land League is supreme throughout these districts in Ireland. There is a real reign of terror over the whole country. Men dare not take a farm from which another person has been evicted, or work for a man who has paid his rent, or refuse to join the Land League. Men dare not buy from, or sell to, a person denounced by the League. Men dare not claim compensation for outrages committed upon them, or inform against persons who have actually committed outrages upon them, or prosecute even in cases in which, in the first moment of anger, they have given information. They dare not give evidence with regard to these outrages, either on their own behalf or on behalf of others, and when appointed on juries they dare not convict, even on their oath. The fact is that those who defy the existing law and break it are safe, whilst those who keep it—the honest men, in short—are in danger. After all, all law rests on the power to punish its infraction; but I must acknowledge that in Ireland at the present time there is, for the law of the land, no such power. The law of the land, to a great extent, is powerless, because men fear to prosecute, fear to give evidence, and fear to find honest verdicts; but the unwritten law of the Land League is powerful, because punishment is sure to follow its infraction. Now, take away this power to punish for infraction of this unwritten law, and the unwritten law will become an empty form. The men who plan and perpetrate these outrages I have referred to are men without whose help the speeches of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), or the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), would be harmless exhortation and vapouring. It is these men who have struck terror into the minds of the people in the districts in which their operations have been carried on. And what must we do? We must strike terror into them, and outrages will then be stopped, persons and property will be protected, and liberty secured. We must arrest these criminals. We do not arrest them now because we cannot do so. They have made themselves safe by the enormity of their crimes and the power which these crimes have enabled them to acquire. Because of the intimidation which they have spread throughout the neighbourhood around them, they commit crimes with impunity, and they know they would be foolish to fear the law when no man dares give evidence against them. It is not that the police do not know who these village tyrants are. The police know perfectly well who plan and perpetrate these outrages, and the perpetrators are perfectly aware of the fact that they are known. These men may be divided into three categories. There are first those who remain of the old Ribbon and other secret societies of former days; in the second place, there are a large number of Fenians who have taken advantage of the present condition of the country, not so much as caring about the Land Question, but as hoping that trouble will come of it, and in order to promote their own particular views in regard to the government of Ireland; and, in the third place, there are a large number of men who are the *mauvais sujets* of their neighbourhood. This not infrequently happens—that the most powerful man in a district is a contemptible, dissolute ruffian and blackguard, who, his character being known by all his neighbours, is shunned by every respectable man; but who, nevertheless, is a powerful and active policeman in support of the unwritten law. To what, then, are we driven? Simply to this—to take power to arrest these men and keep them in prison, so that they may be prevented from tyrannizing over their neighbours. I have given, I think, the grounds on which we are reluctantly driven to seek new powers, and having done that, I must next state what it is we propose to do. We propose to take power to enable the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, by his warrant, to arrest any person whom he may reasonably suspect of having, either before or after the passing of this Act, been guilty as principal or accessory, of high treason, treason-felony, or treasonable practices; and also of any crime punishable by law committed in a prescribed district, being an act of violence or intimidation, or the inciting to any such act tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order; and we propose that such person may be detained in pursuance of such warrant as a person accused of a crime, but not as a convicted prisoner. Furthermore, we propose that this power for which we ask should extend until the 30th of September in next year. The House will see that power is taken to arrest and detain men suspected of "treasonable practices" throughout Ireland, and on that point I may say that the indulgence of such practices is not the great evil with which we have to contend; but we have information—and I must ask the House to believe me when I say this—that there is danger on this ground, that the men generally known as Fenians are making use of this agitation for purposes which may become dangerous; and that obliges us to ask for the power of arrest to which I allude. But as regards the other offences—those of an agrarian character and against the general maintenance of law and order—we ask for power to make these arrests in such districts as from time to time be prescribed, and in those districts only. I have great hope that it will not be necessary to proclaim any very large number of counties, by reason of the fact that in our belief the steps we shall take in certain counties will have the effect of deterring people in other counties from committing offences. Hon. Members must not suppose for one moment that we have not come to the conclusion that we must ask for these powers with the very greatest reluctance. In the course of the debate on the Address, I said, I believe, that we were well aware of the bad example that such Bills as these gave in the way of precedents for future legislation. We know very well that such measures form a temptation—which is increased with every fresh Bill—to people to rely upon exceptional legislation rather than upon the ordinary law. But what is our position? We have a fearful disease to contend with, and, while there are many powerful drugs which cure the disease, but do not strengthen the constitution, it is better that they should be taken than the patient should die. Well, so much for the precedents for the future, and now, as to the present, what we ask for is—and I will put it in the strongest and most obnoxious form—that at the will of the Lord Lieutenant, and without trial, a man may be subjected to 18 months' imprisonment. If I remain in my present Office, I suppose I shall have the sorrowful duty of assisting the Lord Lieutenant in arriving at decisions under the provisions of this Bill; and I am quite sure that there is not a man who now sits, or who has ever sat on this or the opposite Front Bench, who would not feel the greatest reluctance and the greatest dislike to have such a duty to discharge. But, after all, the House must look at the alternative. There are, in the first place, the Lord Lieutenant and the Irish Secretary who will assist him, charged with this most painful duty of saying which of their fellow-subjects they shall arrest on reasonable suspicion—and I consider that if this Bill is passed we shall be bound, upon our honour, to satisfy ourselves that in the case of all arrests there is reasonable suspicion. We shall act in the full, clear light of public opinion, and under the eyes of a Parliament of a free and Constitutional country—a Parliament not slow to criticize and punish the conduct of those of its servants who transgress their powers. What, I ask, is the alternative? Why, if we do not obtain and use these powers they will be held and exercised by the committees appointed to carry out the unwritten law. It is either the will of the Lord Lieutenant and the Irish Secretary and of a responsible Government thus fenced round and limited which must be paramount, or the will of the ruffians of a neighbourhood, responsible to no one, or, if responsible at all, to the secret committees who may hire them. The people must either be at the mercy of a responsible Government or at the mercy of village tyrants, the worst men in the district, or of the hired strangers who come in to do their bidding, in which case the liberty of honest men is at an end. We ask that the liberty of these village tyrants and hired ruffians shall be abridged. I call this Bill a Protection Bill; but many hon. Members of this House call it a Coercion Bill. It is not for those who support the unwritten law to talk about coercion. The power of the unwritten law rests on coercion, and coercion alone. We have had some other objections; and I am sorry to say they have come—whether intentionally or unintentionally I know not—in the shape of warnings and threats. The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), for instance—and I do not for a moment charge him with intentionally using threats; but I would say that, no doubt, actuated by the greatest honesty of purpose — made a speech which I deeply regretted to hear. The hon. Gentleman said that in his view numerous outrages would follow the passing of the Coercion Bill, and those outrages would not be confined to Ireland, but the Government would have to face a very similar condition of affairs in England. Well, Sir, there is not an hon. Member in this House, except, perhaps, the hon. Member and one or two of his Friends, who will pay any heed to this warning, or fear the outrages if they be attempted. The English people are a law-abiding people; they are not a cowardly people, and are not to be frightened from protecting life and property in Ireland from any fear of secret outrages in England. Well, then, there are provisions with regard to outrages in Ireland. The hon. Member for Tipperary told us that these outrages would, after the passing of this Bill, be ten times more numerous than they had been. I do not believe it. I have seen it stated in some newspapers that this power of arrest utterly failed in 1848 and 1866, that the numbers of agrarian outrages after the Acts of those years were passed were as great as they were before; but hon. Members forget that no power was given by those Acts to make arrests for any agrarian outrage. The arrests were made in those cases for purely political crimes, therefore that illustration utterly fails. But we have another illustration—namely, a similar Act to this Bill, though extending over a much smaller area, and of much smaller proportion. I refer to what was called the Westmeath Act of 1871. That Act did not increase outrages—it caused an enormous diminution of them. It was not thought necessary to make many arrests under it—only 19, I think, were made—and I must say that Lord Cowper and myself will have the experience of Lord Spencer to guide us, and I trust we may be as successful in preventing the necessity for arrests as he was. If I am not mistaken, not one of the arrests made under ths Westmeath Act was complained of as unjust. [An hon. MEMBER: Yes; Casey's.] At any rate, the result of bringing in that Act, and of making it clear that it was to have immediate effect, was not to increase outrages, but to immensely diminish them; and I am glad to say that I see signs already of a similar effect being produced through its having been made known that the Government feel they can no longer allow their law to be ignored and the unwritten law of the Land League to prevail, but that they are determined, with all the power Parliament can give them, to make the power of the Queen respected. Already, I say, we see signs of a diminution in the number of outrages. The improvement at first was only slight; but the outrages are now becoming smaller in number every day. And why are they diminishing? I believe there are two reasons for it. One is that the gentlemen at the head of the Land League are using every power they possess to put a stop to outrages. [" Hear, hear!" *from the Irish Members.*] I see that hon. Members opposite assent to that; but why did they not use those powers before? [An. hon. MEMBER: We always did.] Why did you allow the outrages to go on increasing through October, November, and December, and only take steps now to stop them—now, when it is clear that something is going to be done? I do not, however, attribute this diminution altogether to the action of the gentlemen of the Land League, who are much more powerful to incite people to the commission of outrages by careless and reckless speeches than to prevent outrages. I do not mean to say that in their speeches they have always intended to incite; but I think they have scarcely ever, if ever, had a proper sense of their responsibility in the words they have uttered. They are, however, much more powerful to incite to outrages than to control them. But I believe there is another influence at work. As in the case of the Westmeath Act in 1871, so it is now, that the men who plan and execute these outrages desist for fear of being arrested. They are aware that the police know who they are. My belief is, if you pass this Act you will cause an immense diminution of crime. These men will be careful for the first time within the past year or two; they will fear punishment for their misdeeds, and some of them, I have no doubt, will disappear. I trust the House will not for a moment suppose that because of the lull—because of the change that has taken place in the condition of the country during the past three or four days after a fortnight of very great outrage indeed—this power should not be given to Her Majesty's Government. They could not by any possibility make a greater mistake. Hesitation would now make matters far worse than ever. If, after declaring that we will contend with this organization for the purposes of outrage, after saying that we will take power to arrest the men who commit these crimes the House is misled and gives up its intention, we shall be considered as having uttered an empty threat, and these criminals will be more powerful in Ireland than they ever have been before. Well, there was another warning given to us by the hon. Member for the City of Cork. Last Monday he made use of these words—

> "If the Government adopts coercion in Ireland the first arrest of a man will be the signal for the suspension of the payment of all rent."

I do not know whether that meant that the hon. Member for Cork and his friends were going to give that order. It looked as if it did; but, if he does give it, it is an order that will be disobeyed. He will not have the power to obtain the enforcement of that order—his policemen will be gone. [An hon. MEMBER: He never said it.] He used the words I have read to the House. I do not believe the hon. Member can prevent rents being paid. There are many honest men in Ireland—we hear of cases day by day of honest men who pay their rent stealthily, and who have done so even after that warning was uttered, and there are reasons enough to make us believe that the hon. Member's threat will prove perfectly futile. I may be asked why have we not included in the Bill provisions with respect to "exclusive dealing," or "Boycotting," a word with which the English language has recently been enriched. Well, we have decided that it is not necessary to make a new offence. That which is known as "Boycotting" is, in some respects, "exclusive dealing;" and although, as far as I know, that is a moral sin in many cases, it is not a crime. It is no offence; we cannot by law compel a man to buy from another or to sell to another. ["Hear, hear!"] I hear the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) cheering, and I doubt not he will not be sorry that in order to meet the evil we do not make a new offence. But let me remind the House that although the experiences of trades unions have been quoted in favour of the Land League, I know of no case in which a trades union has organized an agitation for the prevention of the fulfilment of a contract. You cannot by law prevent a man from buying from whom he chooses and selling to whom he chooses; but you can by law try to prevent a man from so frightening a man that he dare not buy or sell as he wishes. Day after day, when I was in Dublin, people came to me with their stories of how they were intimidated by this exclusive dealing. Sir, in every case I tried to find out whether it was fear or sympathy that put them in danger. There was one most respectable tradesman whose very word would carry conviction to anyone who saw him—I shall not, of course, mention his name—who came to me and told me that he had been ordered by the Land League to join it. They said to him—"If you do not nobody will work at your mill." He was a conscientious man, and he replied—"I will take the consequences, and whatever happens I will not join it." I asked him this—"Do you think these men will not work for you?" and he said—"I don't think they will." "Why?" I asked—"Is it because they sympathize with the members of the Land League, or because they fear them?" And the reply was—"Because they fear them." Well, it is by the powers that we seek in the present Bill that we shall take away this fear. We know very well what this Boycotting is, as sketched by the hon. Member for Cork City, and what the result of his Christian method is—namely, that a man is not allowed to buy or sell from a certain person, to hold social intercourse with him, or even to sit near him in church. I have no words to express my sense of the cruel nature of that system or the speech in which it was sketched. It is not these words, nor the speech, cruel as might be its intention, which make the people fear; it is not this warning or advice that makes this exclusive dealing so powerful an agency. Men do not fear the order that their neighbours are not to deal with them, or that they are not to deal with their neighbours—they do not fear the words of the hon. Member for Cork; but they fear the ruffian who maims their cattle, who burns down their stackyard, who fires at them from behind a hedge; and with his fellow-ruffians breaks into their house at night or fires shots through their windows. Well, we shall, perhaps, be asked why we have not included in this Bill some power for the exercise of summary jurisdiction. I believe it would be better to put the perpetrators of agrarian offences under such jurisdiction, and to subject them to a small penalty rather than—to speak guardedly—to take the chance of getting a much larger penalty from a jury, seeing what our experience of Irish juries in these cases is. But that must be permanent legislation, and what we want is an immediate temporary remedy to contend against the existing evils. A permanent measure must be one of detail, and would give rise to protracted debate, and that legitimately. We want the power we ask for, and we want it at once. And for this reason—we have separated it from the other Bill which we feel it necessary to bring forward. I may say, with regard to it, that it is an Arms Bill. I will shortly say, with reference to that Bill, that what almost the whole of its clauses is designed to do is, in fact, to put the question of the possession of arms in the same position as that in which it was left by the Act which expired this year. There may be a little more than this; but there is nothing to speak of now. Under that Bill we ask for power to oblige those in possession of arms to get licences for them, to search for them, and to take them away from those who have no licences. I do not deny that this is an undertaking which we did not originally contemplate; but it is, perhaps, unnecessary for me to say much about that now. I admit that the fact of our being forced to bring forward this Arms Bill will be a subject of great disappointment to us all, for reasons which I have already described; but, of course, we must remember that it is the agitation that has made this Disarming Bill far more necessary than it was before if we are to maintain peace and order in Ireland. If we are to blame, for what are we to be blamed? That we have had more hope than we ought to have had in the Irish people and in those who seemed to have their confidence? I have occupied the attention of the House for some time, and I will not detain it much longer. I must say that this has been the most painful duty I ever had to perform. I never expected it; and if I had thought that this duty would have devolved on me, I certainly should not have been Irish Secretary: indeed, I think I may go further and say, that if I had foreseen that this would have been the result of 20 years of Parliamentary life, I think I should have left Parliamentary life alone. But I never was more clear in my life as to the necessity of a duty—I never was more clear than that a man, responsible, as I am, for the administration of the Government of Ireland, ought no longer to have any part or share in any Government which does not fulfil its first duty—the protection of the persons and property, and the security and liberty of the nation. Some persons may say that we have waited a long time before fulfilling this duty; but, after all, there does require to be shown the existence of an extreme evil, unmistakeable as to its depth and extent, and the reality of which it is impossible for a Constitutional Parliament to deny. We have waited until we are able to bring proofs before the House and the country, and I think we have abundantly shown the existence of the evil; and although I believe the enormous majority of this

House will share with me the intense reluctance I entertain to perform this duty, nevertheless, this Parliament will assist me in performing it, and the country will support them in so doing. But this House has before it another duty, and that is that while it may feel it to be the duty of Parliament to pass this measure, it is its duty to pass it at once. Every day of delay is a great increase of danger. And there remains still another duty, and with regard to that we must recollect why it is that these outrages, and this agitation, and the existing Land League have been possible. If the evils of the present land system were removed, these things would no longer be possible. I can hardly bring in this Protection Bill—or this Coercion Bill, as some may call it—without recording my belief that this further duty is quite as incumbent on us as the other, because while the one deals with the immediate presence of the evils referred to, the other deals with their future prevention. Some of our friends may be inclined to say—"Remove these evils from the land system before you bring in your Protection Bill." My answer is, that the Irish people cannot wait for protection, and they ought not to wait for protection. It is our business, in the first place, to protect persons and property and liberty; and we cannot either reward crime nor make terms with crime. But while this House is determined to do its duty in this respect, it is, I believe, also determined to thoroughly reform the land system, and to perform that duty also this Session. I suppose we are all cured of making prophecies about the future condition of Ireland. Some of us would think we have been subject to illusions in the matter. I may be sanguine; but still even now I do hope, as regards Ireland, that if this Parliament persistently determines to do its duty, it will eventually obtain success, and achieve the reward it will deserve in seeing that country become a prosperous, a contented, and a tranquil nation.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

Dr. LYONS, in rising to move the following Amendment:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard,"

said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. W. E. Forster), in almost the last sentence of his able, and he (Dr. Lyons) would say his temperate speech, had supplied him with an almost unanswerable argument in favour of the Motion which he had now the honour of submitting to the House—for he had conceded the position that, if the evils of the Land system in Ireland were removed, those outrages that he had dwelt upon at such great length would be impossible. It appeared to him, therefore, that that concession having been made, the right hon. Gentleman had destroyed, to a great extent, his arguments in favour of first proceeding to coercive legislation. He knew that in submitting his Amendment he should be received with a large amount of opposition from both sides of the House, because he was well aware that a large majority of hon. Members were in favour of coercion; but he had a duty to perform, and he believed he should be able to show that there were no sufficient grounds for proceeding with any coercive measures at all; and, above all, none to justify the putting of coercive measures in the forefront of legislation for Ireland on the present occasion. He would, at the outset, beg leave to state that no one in that House held in greater abhorrence the outrages referred to by the right hon. Gentleman, and which had been committed in Ireland during the past 12 months, and so much in the last three months; but he believed that those outrages and the whole course of action on the part of the people of Ireland had been brought into activity under circumstances which he would not now dwell upon, because, on a late occasion, he had had the honour of bringing them under the notice of the House. Many of them were not specially the result of the agitation which had been going on, but were only offences of a character which might under any other circumstances than those which now existed have been committed. They could not forget the condition of excited expectation to which the country generally was raised by the attempts at legislation during the past year; and he was one of those who believed that in those exalted expectations raised throughout the country would be found not only the true reason why this organization, the Land League, was able to raise its head until, in the words of a right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Canning), it had towered above the potency of the law of the Queen, but also that the tenant farmers fell into despair when they saw no immediate solution of their difficulties. They thus became an easy prey to agitation, and followed out, in too many instances, to their logical but most improper conclusion, the doctrines that were put before them, and outrages followed as a matter of necessity. In saying that, he was not there to palliate either the number or the character of those offences, or their extent throughout the country; but it behoved them to consider whether the condition of things they had to deal with was one that required a suspension of the Constitution, or was one, on the other hand, which could have been dealt with, or could now be dealt with, by the powers of the existing law, if carried into full effect. It certainly surprised him to find that the right hon. Gentleman cited instances in which, with a full knowledge of the crimes committed in particular localities, he refused to put the law in motion. He (Dr. Lyons) confessed that, in reference to one cited by the Chief Secretary, that was one of the most singular instances of a departure from the grave and most obvious duties of the magistracy, where, through fear and intimidation, the magistrates struck their colours to the Land League, and gave them precedence. That case was a most lamentable one to have been cited; and he could hardly imagine how the right hon. Gentleman could bring it forward as a ground for claiming extra powers. He thought also the right hon. Gentleman might have turned to another view of the subject, and placed before the House some of the circumstances which had goaded on the unfortunate people of Ireland, in too many instances, to attempt to seek redress for themselves, and not to have recourse to the ordinary process of law. They had heard last year, in most eloquent and scathing terms, expression given to the results of evictions; but the right hon. Gentleman was silent now upon the theme of those evictions which had played such an important part in stimulating the people of the country during the last five or six months. The right hon. Gentleman had forcibly alluded to one portion of the county Limerick which he (Dr. Lyons) knew well, and depicted a dreadful state of things as existing there. He would venture to supplement that picture by showing that, in that particular district, an eviction under the most cruel circumstances had taken place. The unfortunate man, having a very small holding, was obliged to supplement his earnings by labour, and was some miles off when this occurrence took place. His wife had but a few days before passed her confinement, and two or three, if not more, children, were just recovering from scarlatina. The "crowbar brigade," in the absence of the husband, cast out the helpless wife and the sick children on the road side; and when, late in the evening, the man returned, he found his family in that unfortunate condition, and his family houseless and desolate. In that particular district a feeling of general excitement undoubtedly prevailed, and an outrage of a most fearful character did follow thereon. He did not attempt to palliate such an outrage; but, looking at the immediate cause of that excitement and at the weakness of human nature, it was easy to be understood how such consequences had not very unnaturally followed. The outrages set forth in the Returns, no doubt, presented a formidable picture; but in estimating the amount of crime they must have regard to the proportion it bore to what prevailed in the normal condition of any given country, and also to the state of crime in other countries not supposed to be in a condition of excitement, for it could not be said that any community that ever existed had been known to have been wholly free from crime. Notwithstanding this, however, it would appear from the criminal statistics, that the amount of crime in Ireland committed during a period of great severity on the part of some landlords, and of great popular excitement, compared favourably with the number of offences committed in England and Wales in periods of comparative peace and tranquillity, and the proportion of murders and attempts to murder was actually less.

Crimes in England and Wales.

In the Return for 1878-9 (the latest available).

		Proportion to population.
Murder..	148	1 to 170,422
Attempts to ditto ..	60	1 to 420,586
Shooting, wounding, and cutting.. ..	754	1 to 33,407
Manslaughter	234	1 to 106,874
Burglary	2,930	
Robbery with violence	576	

The proportion would be, to 5,500,000 of population in Ireland, 29; while the proportion to population would be 1 to 750,000. Again, comparing the state of Ireland now with what it was under Earl Grey's Administration in the year 1831, when the agrarian crimes were 9,002, including 242 homicides, they would find, notwithstanding the present agitation, that a vast improvement had taken place in the state of Ireland. Earl Grey did not at the date referred to come down at the end of a month or two to ask for increased power. He said —

> "I did not listen to the urgent appeals which were made to me to adopt severe measures in the last Session of Parliament, and I plead guilty to an anxious desire to delay having recourse to them till the latest moment, and until the necessity should be such as to force itself on the conviction of all mankind."

He tried the effect of remedial measures; and it was not until he found that his efforts had failed that he asked Parliament to pass coercive measures. He (Dr. Lyons) regretted that the present Government had not followed a similar course. He was not there, as he said before, to palliate the condition of things in Ireland, or to express any sympathy with the agitation out of which it had arisen; but he did say that a free and Liberal Government would have taken a more noble course in putting forward remedial measures first; and if that course failed in producing tranquillity in the country, they might then, upon every reasonable ground, come to that House and ask for additional powers. There was another point — in former instances when the Government of Ireland found it necessary to have recourse to coercive measures, a preliminary inquiry had nearly always taken place. Since 1801, when Lord Castlereagh first introduced a Bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, it would be found that, in nearly every instance, an inquiry by Royal Commission preceded the demand for coercion. The highest Constitutional authority, both English and Irish, might be cited for that course —Sheil, O'Connell, and Spring Rice (afterwards Lord Monteagle) protested against the introduction of coercive measures without previous inquiry. Lord John Russell had opposed coercion, and had pointed out that dreadful things had occurred in Yorkshire and Lancashire, which the Government had not seen proper to meet with the weapons of coercion. That noble Lord asked what would be thought if it were reported that during 12 out of 24 hours in Austria, Russia, or Prussia the population were obliged to sit in their houses without light or fire of any kind? [Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: When was that?] In 1824. In 1819, also, the state of Lancashire was truly awful, yet no suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act took place. In 1832 a Committee of Inquiry into the state of affairs in Ireland was appointed on the Motion of a distinguished Member of that House—he earnestly wished that the hon. Gentleman who bore his name entertained the same Constitutional views, and, with all the true patriotism of his ancestor, had also some of his moderation and wisdom—he alluded to Sir Henry Parnell. Among those examined by that Committee was Sir Hussey Vivian, the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland, who advised Parliament to get rid of the cause of the excitement of Ireland, and then the country would be tranquillized, and they would hear no more of the agitation. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had given more than one instance in which crime was confined to a special locality, and yet he did not appear to have used the measures at his hand to suppress it. The right hon. Gentleman cited the case of Castle Island, with an area of only 11 square miles; but, though he had 25,000 troops and 13,000 police at his disposal, he was not able to keep order in that small district. What was that but a confession of incompetency? If, with all the power at his command, the right hon. Gentleman was unable to bring into order 11 square miles of territory, then he (Dr. Lyons) maintained that no extraordinary coercive legislation on the part of the Government would be able to do so. In the forefront of the

Amendment, which he (Dr. Lyons) had ventured to lay before the House, it was suggested that if remedial measures were designed for the country by Her Majesty's Ministers they should give them precedence; but he would now say they might, at all events, take them *pari passu* with coercive measures. To give expression to his own inner conviction, he believed that if Ireland were ruled with a firm and just hand no coercive legislation would be necessary, and that if the right hon. Gentleman had from the beginning taken a different course—if he had more fully understood, at the outset, the excitable nature of the people he had to deal with—there were many things he might have done, and many things which he might have avoided doing. The right hon. Gentleman was now probably not only a sadder, but a wiser man, and knew that "for every idle word that man shall speak he shall render an account." Many things had escaped from the right hon. Gentleman last year which would have been much better unsaid in the presence of a people singularly excitable, of most acute intelligence, and of determined character. The most immediate way of pacifying Ireland was, he contended, to place before the people a large and comprehensive measure of Land Reform. When that was done, the Government would see that there would not be the slightest need for anything like coercion. Though nothing very definite was known as yet of the contemplated land measure, yet there was something in the air which told the public that it would be of a large and comprehensive, and, at the same time, of a just and generous kind. It would, therefore, have been expedient for the Government to put forward their views on the Land Bill before resorting to coercive measures. He was prepared to give credit to the Prime Minister for an intention to bring forward as large a measure of Land Reform as the present condition of the House admitted. There was no doubt whatever that hon. and right hon. Members sitting on the Opposition Benches would give a thorough support to all coercive measures; but he would ask the Government not to build too much upon that consideration, as there was no assurance that the *entente cordiale* between the opposite Benches would be maintained when the measure of Land Reform was brought in. For himself, he should not be surprised if, after working these coercive measures through the shoals and quicksands which threatened them, hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite were found assisting in wrecking any remedial measures which might be introduced, if of a large and generous kind. *Absit omen.* But, it may be said, the Government was strong enough to carry a fair and comprehensive measure of Land Reform. He trusted that would be so; he gave full credit to the Government for their good intentions, and he desired that Ministers should place their plans on this vital subject before the country without delay. Such a statement of the views of the Government was desirable for many reasons, but especially for this—that it would carry to the minds of a great part of the tenant farmers of Ireland the conviction that Her Majesty's Government were unconditionally about to bring in a great measure for the adjustment of questions connected with the land. The people of Ireland were, as a whole, in favour of equity and justice; and, speaking from long personal acquaintance with vast numbers belonging to the tenant class, he could assure the House that the great majority of that class were not yet handed over body and soul to the guidance of the Land League. They had some remarkable proofs of that. He would only refer to one—the striking application made on Friday to the Chief Secretary for Ireland in the name of 22,000 tenants from the North of Ireland. It might also especially be said of the Southern and Western counties of Ireland. But the great mass of the inhabitants, although not slaves of the Land League, were awaiting in the most earnest manner legislation by the Government in the direction of Land Law Reform; and that state of anxious expectation, and the sullen attitude in which they waited for the proposals of the Government, afforded another and a powerful argument against coercion. There was a great danger of driving the people into the arms of the opposite Party, that of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell)—a danger which might, indeed, be avoided if recognized in time, but which would almost of necessity follow the introduction of coercive measures. In reference to the Arms Bill, briefly alluded to by the Chief Secretary, he would say that it was probable that the peace officers, whose duty it would be to carry out those measures, would unwittingly, perhaps, cause much needless irritation, and especially with regard to the search for arms. He (Dr. Lyons) feared that the exercise of that right of search would produce a great deal of mischief, and that the attempt to disarm the people would be strenuously resisted. The words of the Lords' Protest of 1834 deserved to be here cited against the right of breaking into houses in search for arms—

> "Interest, credulity, malevolence, revenge, party violence, and indiscreet zeal, equally with a sense of duty, call it into action."

Since 1844 he had witnessed the operation of all the Coercion Acts, and there had always been much resistance to any attempt to recover from the people any arms which they ordinarily possessed. In 1846 a similar measure was introduced by Lord Lincoln, who was obliged to confess that previous enactments had been found insufficient, and that measure had been more hurtful than all the others. In many instances, arms were sought and demanded from persons who would have been allowed to possess them in any country; the son of a Waterloo officer, for example, being compelled to deliver up his father's sword, while it constantly happened that persons not entitled to carry arms succeeded in concealing them. The dangerous classes, in short, on making plausible representations, succeeded in retaining their weapons, while the loyal and the peaceable were made to give them up. He might ask what immediate necessity for coercion had been demonstrated? They now heard that the magistrates were invested with powers for the suppression of lawlessness, and were using them with good results; but why was not the law vindicated some months ago? The Government by their inaction had permitted the country to be demoralized by allowing all kinds of pernicious doctrines to corrupt the people; and now, at last, when they had to face serious dangers which followed thereon, they came to the House for additional powers to enable them to cope with a state of things, which the ordinary powers of the law, as he maintained, if energetically used, should have been ample to deal with. He trusted that those powers which the Government possessed would not be idly used against imaginary antagonists, and that the Government did not credit the existence of any organized conspiracy in Ireland to resist the law by armed force. They had strategically occupied the country with troops as though a general rising in force were apprehended; while, in point of fact, the real danger was of a totally different kind, and such as might be dealt with by ordinary legal processes. He thought he had conclusively shown that it would be expedient and desirable for a measure of Land Reform to take precedence of a measure of coercion. Let Ministers remember what was said in the other House by the Duke of Wellington, after having himself employed coercive measures for Ireland, speaking of "powers which," he said, "perhaps the House ought not to have given." He (Dr. Lyons) was well acquainted with Ireland and its characteristics; and he ventured to affirm that at present there was nothing like an organized conspiracy having in view any armed insurrection or forcible resistance to the Crown. There was no necessity to provide legislation to meet local instances of resistance to the law. It was the local condition of things which the Government should be prepared to meet with a full and rigid exercise of the powers they already possessed. He would conclude by appealing to the Government, even at that eleventh hour, to first place before both countries a clear and full view of the remedial measures they proposed to bring forward. If only they were well considered and sufficiently extensive, they would at once remove the grievance and the danger, for he believed the coercive measures, even if subsequently passed, would then be found to be quite unnecessary. Once more, therefore, he appealed to the Government to bring forward their measures of Land Reform before they attempted coercion in Ireland. Actuated by that view, he appealed to Her Majesty's Government to adopt that course, by which he did not think they would be compromised; and he was persuaded—and he did not represent his own individual opinions, but those also of very many persons of great experience throughout the country—that a great measure of Land

Reform in Ireland would at once have a tranquillizing effect upon the people. It was admitted by everyone whose opinion was entitled to weight that the Land Question was at the bottom of all the present agitation in Ireland, and nothing else so stirred the people; and it was in a measure of Land Reform that an effectual remedy should be sought for the ills which now afflicted Ireland.

MR. GIVAN, in seconding the Amendment, said, that although he believed that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Government fully intended to pursue the line of legislation which they thought would most conduce to restore order in Ireland, and that, too, in the shortest time, yet he was convinced that it was a gross mistake to introduce, in the first instance, a Coercion Bill instead of a remedial measure. As an Ulster Member, representing a county which was absolutely free from crime, it could not be said that he had any sympathy with agitation of an illegal or unconstitutional character; but, at the same time, he felt deeply that the crimes which had been committed concurrently with that agitation, some cases of which had been wrongfully attributed to it, had, in most instances, resulted from the injustice sanctioned by the law of England. All men of candour must at once admit that that was the main cause of the agitation which was at present going on in the country. During the debate on the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, a noble Lord admitted that the condition of Ireland in many respects was pitiable. And in what respect was it so? The Irish people had deserved well of England in her wars and in her Senate; but they were at present, notwithstanding the well-intended provisions of the Land Act of 1870, subject to eviction and oppression at the hands of the landlords. They had no security of tenure in the soil; no certainty of retaining their homesteads, around which their affections clung; no spot, as a rule, in their native land where they could rest beyond the fear of man. The Land Act of 1870 was intended by its authors to remove some of those grievances; but the measure was mutilated by other hands. The right of the landlord to evict remained. The great statesman who brought in that measure was frustrated in his good intentions, and at present eviction was merely a consideration of pounds, shillings, and pence under that Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that the Land Act of 1870 is not the Question before the House. He is going very fully into that question, and to do so is clearly irrelevant to the subject before the House.

MR. GIVAN bowed to the Speaker's ruling, and said, that his object was to show that the agitation at present existing was against the injustice arising from the Land Laws in Ireland, even after the modification of the Act of 1870; and that remedial measures for the Irish people must be brought in and passed through the House before peace and order could be restored in that country. Previous to the Land Act of 1870 there was a very formidable agitation in Ireland, based precisely upon the same wrongs that the present agitation endeavoured to remove, and that agitation had continued until now; but the late Government had not only refused to bring in any measure of radical reform calculated to remove the grievance, but they had insulted the common sense of the Irish people, who were exasperated by the offer of such paltry palliatives as the Bill of Lord Arthur Hill-Trevor, and the electioneering Bill of the senior hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Macartney).

MR. CHARLES LEWIS rose to Order, and asked was not the hon. Gentleman going outside the Question before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I have already intimated that the hon. Member is not speaking to the Question before the House; and I must, at the same time, remind him that he is violating one of the rules of debate in reading his speech.

THE O'DONOGHUE submitted to the Speaker whether, as the Amendment suggested that remedial measures on the Land Question ought to take precedence over coercion, its terms would not cover the remarks of the hon Member?

MR. SPEAKER: I did not interrupt the hon. Member until he went into details on the Land Question; and, in doing so, I consider that he was clearly out of Order.

MR. GIVAN said, he would again bow most respectfully to the ruling of the Chair. The reason why many persons in Ireland, who deplored illegal agitation, joined the Land League, was because they saw no other refuge; they had no hand of sympathy reached out to them from England; they saw no attempt made by Parliament to take away those evils under which they had for centuries groaned; and they were glad to adopt any expedient, and to unite themselves with anybody, in order to protect themselves from injustice and wrong. It was said that there were not unjust evictions at present; but he had within the past few days, in Irish Courts of Justice, been present at several cases in which he saw that the result of respectful appeals for consideration by the tenants was the immediate service of dozens of ejectments. In the face of that, it was said that this present agitation should be crushed out before a remedy was applied. He could tell hon. Members that no power on earth would be able to crush the oppressed spirit of the Irish people, and that the only way to make them peaceable subjects of the Queen was to remove the grievances under which they laboured. He believed conscientiously that the mistake which the Government was now making, and which they would live to regret, was not of their own will, but that they were coerced into it by those who wished to see the Irish people under the iron heel before applying any remedy to the grievances which they complained of. He believed the Executive Government were now asking for unconstitutional power to punish the Irish people for evils which the government of the country in the past had produced. Surely the proper and rational course to take would be to remove the evils which had produced bitterness and turmoil, rather than to punish the people for that which was the inevitable outcome of injustice and cruelty. The Prime Minister said, in 1870, that for many years Ireland had been carrying on a struggle with those who were opposed to her; it was a struggle of weakness against strength; but in every case the end of the struggle was that weakness triumphed and strength lay prostrate. History was about to repeat itself. The Irish people now, as in the past, were resisting strength and much misrepresentation. Surely it had not come to this—that the right hon. Gentleman, whose eloquent words he had quoted, was about to use un reasoning repression, instead of holding out the olive branch? He implored the Government, before further exasperation was produced, to give them, by wise and considerate legislation, a feeling of safety and security—to assure them that they had the sympathy of England; and that in the union of both countries their common welfare lay, instead of adopting measures of repression and cruel force, which would give an impetus to the present agitation, and deepen and embitter those feelings which they all deplored. Until the Irish people had that feeling of security and contentment, no coercive measures and no armed force would restore her to that condition in which they all wished to see her. He warned the Government that the people of Ireland were looking with an earnest and anxious eye at the movements of that House, and the measures which Her Majesty's Government were about to bring in for the restoration of peace and order in that country; and he could tell them that that day there would be a feeling of disappointment throughout the hills of Ulster when it was found that the Government, from which so much was expected, had introduced a measure of coercion which might work the ruin of many of the Queen's loyal and industrious subjects.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard,"—(*Dr. Lyons,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. DILLON said, the speech which he had heard that evening from the Chief Secretary for Ireland was one of the most powerful he had ever heard that right hon. Gentleman deliver in that House.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present, MR. DILLON, resuming, said, the right hon. Gentleman had stated that the information upon which he founded the measure which he was proposing to the House was not based upon the reports of newspapers. But it was based entirely on the reports of the paid officials of Dublin Castle, in whose eyes it was a merit to find out and report cases by way of evidence of their activity. Therefore, he (Mr. Dillon) took his stand in that House for the liberties of the Irish people, declaring that the liberties of the Irish people would be voted away on the evidence of a lot of police spies. There was one thing that he had to thank the Chief Secretary for Ireland for, and that was the retrospective clause, which was meant, he presumed, to incarcerate himself and the other traversers at the State Trials now pending, so that, when they returned to Ireland to share the fate of the Irish people, they would be the first upon whom that clause would be put in operation. The right hon. Gentleman put forward, as his first ground, the fact that the outrages in Ireland had enormously increased during the last three months, and that the area over which the Land League reigned had also enormously increased; but he had failed to show the House why it was so. There was not a child in Ireland who would not have told him the reason. Before the reaping of the harvest, quiet prevailed, because there was nothing to fight for; but as soon as the harvest was reaped, the struggle for life and death began, the question being whether it should go to pay arrears of rent or whether it should be used as food by the people. That was the reason why the area of disturbance and outrage had extended. There was also another reason. The Irish people found that the Government would give them no protection when they saw the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, wretched as that was, sent back, and heard that the law was to have its course. Then they knew they were to have no protection. What would be the effect of the law having its course? He acknowledged that the law had not had its course, and he was proud to believe he was one of the miscreants who had been instrumental in preventing the law from taking its course in Ireland. It was not simply a question of eviction, but there were thousands of families who would be left to the charity of foreign nations after they had paid their rents to the Irish landlords. He would give a case. In the county of Mayo there was a Nobleman who last year, never seeing his Irish estates, drew £27,000 from the poor tenants, not a man of whom but had to obtain food by means of American charity during the whole of the winter. That noble Lord, he knew, had drawn £200,000 from those poor tenants, and yet he never subscribed one shilling to feed his starving tenantry. Last year he offered a reduction of 5*s.* in the pound, and he levied his rents to the amount of £18,000. He (Mr. Dillon) went on that Nobleman's estate, and warned the people not to let that state of things be repeated; and he was glad to say that he had not had one shilling up to the present time. It would be a crime and an iniquity on the part of that House to give that Nobleman power to tear away from those poor people the money which, from his (Mr. Dillon's) own certain knowledge, if they were forced to pay, would leave them without the wherewithal to get food. There was another reason why the outrages had increased during the past three months. The people had in their possession their food for the winter; they were advised by the League to hold that food, and he was not ashamed of having given the advice. It was not owing to the organization of the Land League or to the spread of the power of the Land League only that the outrages had increased, but it was owing to the fact that the harvest was reaped. The right hon. Gentleman had based some part of his case upon outrages taking the form of threatening letters. He denounced that as one of the most cowardly forms of outrage, and with that he (Mr. Dillon) agreed, and no man in the land had denounced it more strenuously, and from the outset he had used his influence to stop it; but it was an outrage in no way due to the Land League. It was a relic of past ages of misfortune, and the result of habits formed at a time when there was no League to put forward the tenant's case, and when they had nothing to look to but secret societies and the terror these could create by outrage; but the object of the League had been systematically to put an end to secret societies, and the means they used to teach the people to achieve their object was by open combination. This writing of threatening letters was a degraded and shameful habit, engrafted into the nature of the people, who had learned, by bitter experience, to look to nothing but the wild justice of revenge for protection. He had heard landlords say that throughout Tipperary there were thousands of homes which owed the fact of their existence to the fear of murder and outrage which cowed ill-disposed landlords. Such a state of things he much deplored; but the League had never connived at it. But who was more to blame—the poor peasant, who, in the desperation of despair, had recourse to this, or the intelligent, enlightened Parliament, which denied him the means of protection? The right hon. Gentleman roused a feeling of sympathy when he spoke of the poor tenant on the lonely hill-side or in the bog to whom he was going to give protection against the terror of the Land League. Now, he knew this class of tenant better than the right hon. Gentleman, and he would venture to say that that class would not thank the Government. There was a visit which inspired the tenant with more terrors than ever did a midnight party to intimidate him. What he wanted was protection from the terrorism of the "crowbar brigade." If the Bill did what the right hon. Gentleman expected—but which he (Mr. Dillon) did not expect from it—then at one sweep would at least 10,000 families be left homeless and hopeless; and what could then be expected but that, driven to desperation, they would pass from the Land League and its legitimate agencies to crimes of revenge? The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that crime in Ireland had been of a mitigated character; but he would have crimes of revenge committed by despairing men who had before them the fate to which the Irish farmer preferred death. He (Mr. Dillon) declared deliberately, having spent most of his life among Irish farmers, that if the House drove the Irish farmers to a state of despair, they could not expect anything but outrage and murder; and it would take the form, not of intimidation, but of revenge of despairing men. The right hon. Gentleman had absolutely felt compelled to make some kind of excuse for the small number of murders committed in Ireland. They would find that in any previous period which could be compared with this there were five times more murders in one county than there had been all through the country this year. He remembered a Return of 50 murders and homicides in the county of Kilkenny one year, and this year there were only five or six in Ireland; and he had reason to believe that the most brutal of these were not agrarian. The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to explain that, and said the Return would have been much larger had it not been for the unprecedented amount of personal protection. He protested against that argument. He protested strongly against the insinuation that the Irish people would have murdered a number of people who were now alive but for the intervention of the police. The House had learned on what baseless supposition police protection was given. They knew by what little causes some people were frightened in a time of panic. The smallest thing—a threatening letter, an evil conscience, the knowledge of having done wrong, of having evicted or being about to evict a tenant—would induce men to apply for protection from fear of murder. He was quite willing they should have it; but he denied the right of the right hon. Gentleman to bring his charge of wholesale intended murder against the peasantry of Ireland. The history of Irish agrarian affairs showed that police protection did not save men from murder. The opportunity was found in spite of it; but he (Mr. Dillon) believed that in nine-tenths of these cases police protection was given on insufficient grounds. With regard to the last form of agrarian crime—that known as night visiting—he admitted it, and he regretted it. When he was in Ireland, before Parliament met, he used all his influence, and he hoped successfully, to put an end to it in the part of the country in which he lived; but the Land League did not directly or indirectly encourage night visiting, and never had done so. It was a relic of the Whiteboy days, just as threatening letters were. The Land League could not be expected in one year to undo the habits learned in centuries of wrong and misrule. Ribbonmen and Whiteboys had influence in Ireland, he admitted; but it was being abated by the National Land League. They had used all the influence their position in the country gave them to put an end to threatening letters and to outrages generally, and above all to night visits, which he admitted to be a most intolerable form of outrage; but the right hon. Gentleman with 25,000 soldiers, 14,000 policemen, and the whole machinery and terrorism of the law at his back, could not repress these forms of crime, and had to ask for further power. How then could it be wondered at that the Land League had not entirely eradicated these outrages? But he (Mr. Dillon) was convinced that night visiting would be much less in itself and less cruel than it had been, as the result of the influence of the League; and, even now, the right hon. Gentleman had not been able to show that a single man's ears had been cut off; yet we had seen it stated by an Irish landlord in an English periodical that that was a matter of daily occurrence. He came to the last class of outrages, the houghing of cattle. Was the right hon. Gentleman aware that a century ago the people of Ireland were taught to regard cattle as their enemy? Three times, settlements of the Irish people in the West of the Shannon had been exterminated to make room for cattle; and in the latter part of the 18th century the Irish people in that district rose up *en masse,* led by gentlemen of education, and in one night houghed 5,000 cattle. Dean Swift—for in Dean Swift's day the war was going on—said that Don Quixote was thought a madman, because he mistook a flock of sheep for his enemy; but it was his opinion the Irish were insane when they made the same mistake. This war against cattle had been going on for 200 years. Cruelty to cattle in Ireland must not be judged by an English standard. Thousands on thousands of people in the district he referred to had been exterminated, and thousands of acres of the best soil torn from the Irish people, who were driven to the mountains and the bogs in order that cattle might be pastured on the land. The occupants of these crowded mountain farms, which were said to be the source of Irish misery, looked down upon the fertile plains of Roscommon and Galway, where their ancestors had happy homes and large farms—and could you wonder that the spirit of desperation arose in such a peasantry, or that cattle were regarded as the enemies of the people? He (Mr. Dillon) did not palliate these offences; but he pleaded for the character of the Irish people, who regarded this as a war of self-defence, and knew that cattle had been the most effective weapon of tyranny and extirpation. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the supremacy of "dissolute ruffians;" and, from the manner in which that expression was received, the House seemed to consider it the fair description. Yet they had enrolled as members of the Land League over 1,000 Catholic priests, besides a number of Presbyterian ministers, Unitarian ministers, Methodists, &c. In the whole of his large constituency, he (Mr. Dillon) did not think there was a single branch of the League in which there were not two or three priests acting as president, vice president, and secretary; and did the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that the parish clergy all over Ireland would lend themselves to establish the reign of the dissolute ruffians of a faction? Half the Catholic priests in Ireland were enrolled in the Land League, and three-quarters of the Irish Catholic clergy and Bishops had given their assurances of their warm approval. The right hon. Gentleman had boasted that the basis of his case was purely official. Would he consider it a proud boast to say that all the knowledge he had of England was derived from official sources? Not long ago a Presbyterian clergyman delivered a lecture in his own meeting-house, to his own congregation, in the County Down, in which he entirely approved of the Land League from beginning to end. This was a respectable man and an able speaker, and were they to condemn him as advocating the rule of dissolute ruffianism? In fact, leaving out the landlords, nine-tenths of the Irish people sided with the League; and unless hon. Members were prepared to declare that all the inhabitants of the country, with the exception of the landlords, were dissolute ruffians, they could not accept the statement of the right hon. Gentleman as correct. The right hon. Gentleman said he could not find words to describe his sense of the cruelty of the speech of his (Mr. Dillon's) hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork. In his judgment, the right hon. Gentleman gave a one-sided view of the purport of that speech, which was really a humane one, it being intended to save the lives of thousands of people, who, as the Prime Minister had observed, were sentenced to death by the Land system. He was not ashamed to say that he had comparatively little sympathy with the sufferings of the shopkeepers caused by the loss to their trade. Many of the shookeepers were very mean men, who used to take farms from which tenants had been unjustly evicted. They thought that the present, like previous popular movements, would be crushed ; but the exclusive dealing system had now brought a good many of them to reason. If he thought that the right hon. Gentleman only meant to put down outrages, his opposition to this Coercion Bill would be of a very different character ; but what the right hon. Gentleman really wanted to destroy was the supremacy of the Land League. There was a vast difference, which the right hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to slur over, between outrage and the supremacy of the League. He (Mr. Dillon) abominated outrage as much as the right hon. Gentleman. He would do all he could to suppress outrage ; but he would do all he could to maintain the supremacy of the Land League, and he knew that the first use that the right hon. Gentleman would make of the Coercion Bill would be to break the supremacy of the Land League. If he had a doubt, that doubt would be removed by the rumours which were coming thick that the landlords were already exulting on their return to power. It was true that the Land League had done much to stop evictions, and he was glad to say that West of the Shannon they had made the evictions almost impossible ; and the cause of the exultation of the Irish landlords was not that outrage would be stopped, but that they would be able to carry out evictions. He believed he did not exaggerate when he said that there were at the present moment 40,000 families in Ireland who were liable to eviction, and yet the Prime Minister of England was content to advise those 40,000 families to wait patiently for remedial measures being passed. Why, of what avail would it be to those unhappy persons that remedial measures were passed after they had been turned out of house and home? What would be the use of introducing remedial measures at the end of a long and tedious Session? Their need was most pressing. He had not heard of a single convincing argument that the coercive measure would break down the supremacy of the Land League. No; the League was now a firm and just power, which was not to be so easily overturned. It was the firm belief of the Irish people that it was the stand which the Land League had made that alone prevented them from being evicted. Notwithstanding the appeal after appeal that had been made to them, the Government had refused to bring in any measure that would suspend the right of eviction. Why did they wish to strike down the protecting arm of the poor tenants, and to deliver them bound hand and foot over to their landlords? It would be a disgrace to England in the eyes of Europe if she consented to hand over the power of her Army to the landlords in Ireland to enable them to grind down and crush their tenantry. And yet the Ministry of the day were content to apply the *clôture* to the Parliament of England and to destroy the rights of minorities, rather than to do justice to the Sister Country. He warned the Government that if once they entered into this downward course the minds of men would grow more and more excited on this subject. He was astonished that some moderate men in the House, who really meant to maintain a good understanding between the people of the two countries, did not come forward and tell the Government that they were taking the wrong course. If, however, it was the intention of the Government to attempt to disarm the people of Ireland, to place the power of a Draconic law in the hands of the authorities of Dublin Castle, and to use the power of the Army to enable the landlords to keep their yoke on the necks of their tenants, they would fail in their object. Let them pass an Act suspending eviction in Ireland, and there would be no need to pass a Coercive Bill. Both parties would rest on their arms and outrages would cease, and peace would descend upon that distracted country. But if they adopted the opposite course and trusted in coercion, he warned them that they had a larger and more powerful organization to deal with in the Land League than they supposed. Hon. Members opposite were entirely in the dark with reference to the ramifications of the Land League, and coercive measures would make the rule of that Association supreme from the North to the South of Ireland. Let the Government thoroughly reform the Land Laws, and the necessity of the League would cease to exist. But at present it would exist, and actively, and no coercive measures would put it down. Hon. Members might look incredulous; but he could assure them that these Bills would not put a stop to the supremacy of the Land League, because that was a larger organization to deal with than this House seemed to be aware of. Coercion Acts would be powerless against the ramifications of the Land League. They would simply make their rule supreme from Cape Clear to Fairhead, in Antrim. If they went on passing Bills such as these they would not be able to stop there; they must go further, and, in the words of Lord Inchiquin, they would have to "proclaim martial law." His Lordship had shown the hands of the landlords when he made that statement. They would soon come to the House and ask for martial law and the suspension of trial by jury. They knew that an Arms Act would not affect the League, as they fought without arms. The landlords were only waiting till they could demonstrate the necessity of still further measures of coercion than the Government were now contemplating; and did the Government know at whom they would be striking? He should like to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland what he intended to do with the priests? Amongst the Land League members were many priests. Were they going to arrest the priests, if these Bills passed? On the other hand, he would ask were the priests likely to desert the Land League because of the passing of these Coercion Acts? All he could say was, if the priests did desert the people now, the Church of Rome would receive the heaviest blow she had ever yet received. If they arrested a single priest in the county of Tipperary, they must arrest the Archbishop of Cashel, who was one of the most ardent Land Leaguers in the whole of Ireland. He was a man of courage, although he did not talk much, and he (Mr. Dillon) was convinced if this Bill passed, the Archbishop would place himself at the head of the Land League. The Government would hesitate before they placed themselves in such a position that they must arrest half the priesthood of Ireland, or must subject themselves to the derision of Europe. If he was not very much mistaken, the Government would also have a very great number of Presbyterian ministers to deal with. He himself had very great success in the Province of Ulster, when he was pushing the League there; but at the same time it was not quite the success he had anticipated, owing to the fact that there remained in the minds of the Ulster people a confidence that the Government were likely to do something which would relieve the distress, and so put an end to the grievances of the Irish people. He tried in vain at the time to prove to the people that their confidence was baseless; but he had no doubt that, after the passing of this Bill, it would be unnecessary for him to waste breath in urging the same point. It was said of him (Mr. Dillon) on previous occasions that he had used a sort of threat that the members of the Land League over whom he had any influence would take arms against the operation of a possible Coercion Bill; but that was simply a misconstruction that had been put upon his words. All he meant to say, and, as far as he remembered, all he did say, was that his people were not easily terrorized over. He had succeeded in establishing over 60 branches of the Land League in Ulster, in spite of the threats which were made against him if he ventured into the Province; and, speaking from his own knowledge, he had no hesitation in saying that the threats of violence came, not from the tenant members of the League, but from the landlords, who feared lest their absolute right over their tenants might be interfered with in any way. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to forget that the other side had tried the game. Did they ever hear of the case of "Boycotting" which took place with respect to a minister of the Church of England in the County Fermanagh? He was not a member of the Land League; but because he had raised his voice to prevent his people from going to create disturbance at their land meetings, he was "Boycotted" by the landlords. The right hon. Gentleman had based his argument in support of his Bill upon the failure of the ordinary law in the country; but, in this, he missed the mark, for it cut two ways. The house of the British Government in Ireland was built up by the forces of the bayonets of England; and when the stream of their influence, not of their terrorism, beat against the house it fell, and, in the words of the Gospel, "Great was the ruin of that house." Let not the right hon. Gentleman imagine that he could re-establish the house by passing a Coercion Bill. The only way of setting it up again was by going forward and digging the foundations on which to rear a new Government, finding out why it was the law was so hated by the people, that it nearly wrecked the whole structure of their power. The real reason was, that English rule in Ireland had been built upon an entire disregard of Irish feeling and opinion; and he warned the Government, before entering on a course of coercive legislation, to bear in mind that for years past English rule had caused the hearts of the Irish people to yearn after Washington rather than London. They had no confidence in England. They loved the United States of America; and he ventured to say that if the Irish people could be polled at the present moment, three-fourths of them would vote in favour of annexation to the United States in preference to continuing in union with England, and would willingly send over their Representatives to that country. If that could be achieved, was there a Member of that House who did not know that there would be peace and prosperity in Ireland, and that Ireland would become one of the wealthiest and happiest countries in the world? The law had destroyed all loyalty to the connection between England and Ireland. The minds of the Irish people were turning every day more longingly over the Atlantic, where the people were recognised and treated with sympathy and kindness, turning to a country where they might have a just and large share of directing the fates of one of the greatest nations ever seen; and no course could be devised that would tend stronger to turn the minds of the people of Ireland more and more in the direction of America than the course which the Government had now entered upon, a course which they knew not themselves. They were entering on a struggle with a power which was very great in Ireland; but once they had committed themselves to a struggle with that power, they could not draw back until they crushed it.

Mr. BRADLAUGH said, he intended, in the strongest possible manner, to oppose the measure introduced by the Government, and to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons). He was not, however, so sure that he should have taken that course if the House had, in the first place, been favoured with some statement as to the provisions of the proposed Government Land Bill. He could well understand the great reluctance with which a Gentleman of the reputation of the Chief Secretary for Ireland had made the proposition he had made; and if he (Mr. Bradlaugh) entered in the strongest terms his dissent from the course the Government had taken, and his desire to support the Amendment, it was because he felt the occasion was one on which no one should remain silent, when measures of coercion were proposed in the way they had been proposed. He was warranted in supporting that Amendment by no less an authority than the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) himself. If his memory did not deceive him, the right hon. Gentleman, in the last Session of Parliament, intimated that the Government would try and govern Ireland with the law as they found it; and he also intimated that, if they found themselves unable to do that, they should then suggest that it should be accompanied by some measure of remedial legislation. It was possible that he had allowed his hopes of what the Government would do to find weight in translating the words of the Chief Secretary; but so he understood him. He knew the Government had means of information which were not within his reach; but if their information only amounted to what the right hon. Gentleman had told the House, he must say there was no case made out by the right hon. Gentleman to entitle him to ask for measures of coercion for Ireland. In doing what he (Mr. Bradlaugh) was doing now he was only following the traditions of the Party to which the right hon. Gentleman and the majority of the present Government belonged, for they had always opposed legislation which was intended to punish rather than to redress. He submitted that there was evidence before them to show that the evil complained of in Ireland was not evil created by the Land League, or evil created during the last two months, but evil arising from the conduct of unfair landlords towards their tenants. He believed that the Chief Secretary for Ireland had altogether failed to show that the ordinary law was not sufficient to put down the offences which he had mentioned in support of his case. There had not been any offence stated that evening which the law was not strong enough to deal with. Every outrage named was already punishable. The illegal courts of the Land League could have been prosecuted under the provisions of that law; and the right hon. Gentleman himself admitted that since proceedings had been instituted against certain members of the Land League for setting up Land League courts in Ireland—a proceeding which they must all hold to be illegal—that species of crime had diminished. No hon. Member of the House would, he thought, be found to deny the fact that all kinds of illegal proceedings should be strongly reprobated. The Government, through the right hon. Gentleman, said that they could make no terms with lawlessness; that while in Ireland criminals were few, the sufferers were many. Were they sure that they were not about to make terms with fear and panic? Were they sure they were not making terms with the landed interest opposite, who preferred a policy of force to a policy of justice, and who had made the misery of the people out of which the crime spoken of had grown? It was not asserted that the ordinary law was insufficient for all purposes; what was asserted was, that evidence could not be obtained to support prosecutions, and that jurymen could not be found to convict. But what did that show? It showed that the national feeling was with the crime—not all crime, for it was admitted that in respect of non-agrarian crime Ireland stood higher than England did. Why was it that there was one class of crime sheltered by the people of Ireland? It was because the people had come by experience to think that the Government gave them no protection, and that the law afforded them no remedy for their grievances. Everyone knew how the Act brought in by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government in 1870 had been crippled and mutilated, and how it had been frustrated by men who said that the Constitution should be suspended at present, and that, instead of being subjected to remedial legislation, the people of Ireland should be subjected to 18 months' imprisonment for any crime charged against them, not before a Court of Law, but before a magistrate, and upon the mere whim of some nobody to whom the carrying out of portion of the extraordinary powers of the Government would be entrusted. It was not upon the word of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland that a man was to be deprived of his liberty, but it was upon the word of some petty constable. He believed that the right hon. Gentleman would take all the precautions in his power in applying this law; but what effectual precautions against wrongdoing could be taken when arbitrary power was brought to bear upon individual liberty? Neither the right hon. Gentleman nor the noble Lord at the head of the Irish Government could personally examine the details of every case. They must trust to others, and these, in turn, to others, until at last, perhaps, private malice might strike the one whom this House had stripped of his Constitutional right. The right hon. Gentleman said there were three classes of men who committed the agrarian crimes which they all wished to put down and prevent. It could not be the interest of anyone sitting in that Legislature to defend, excuse, or palliate crime; it was the duty of all men to address themselves to its reduction. The first class of men said to be implicated in this agrarian crime were those who belonged to old secret societies; the second, those who belonged to new secret societies; and the third, idle and very dissolute persons, who were spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman as the ruffians of their district. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman as to the first two; but if there were idle and dissolute and ill-conditioned men concerned in the movement, it was extremely difficult to explain why the general crime of the country had not swollen as well as that called agrarian. Were they quite sure that the crimes the ruffians and the dissolute persons committed were agrarian crimes; or, if they were, that they were crimes for which the Land League were responsible, or for which the people generally should be stigmatized and condemned? There was scarcely one of the offences mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland that he (Mr. Bradlaugh) did not admit to be a crime of the highest degree. But just as they had Rebeccaite outrages in Wales, poaching crimes in certain districts, and other classes of crimes in various parts of England and Scotland, growing out of alleged grievances, might it not be, as he asserted it was, that all this reluctance to convict agrarian offenders showed that the people did not consider it a crime, but as something which had grown out of agrarian wrong, and which they were justified in shielding in the absence of remedial legislation? Why should not efforts be made by Her Majesty's Government to redress it? They were making, or about to make, terms with the landlords, who depended upon force—with those who had themselves created the mischief. It was not the Land League that built the wretched hovels in which the suffering people of Ireland dwelt; it was the misery and suffering which he saw in hundreds of Irish cabins last year which had created that organ. For his part, he wished to have crime suppressed. The English people were determined to stand by the present Government thoroughly; but they asked what was the Government about to do to remedy the wrongs of the people as well as to punish the criminals to be found among them? The late Earl Russell said in that House, when he was Lord John Russell, and speaking on a measure similar to the present, that to be useful any such measure ought to be accompanied by a remedial measure; adding—

> "When they took into consideration these crimes, they should also ask themselves at the same time whether the law of landlord and tenant could not be improved."

When asking the Government for powers against midnight assassins, they ought to be armed with powers to remedy the the evils out of which midnight assassinations sprung. Sir Robert Peel, too, said, upon a similar occasion—"You must show that all the ordinary laws have been exhausted;" and he (Mr. Bradlaugh) ventured to say that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had not shown that. He had not shown that the proportion of acquittals in relation to convictions in Ireland had been greater than the proportion in England. The right hon. Gentleman had not shown that the state of crime in Ireland was such as to justify the case he attempted to make out. Comparing the statistics now presented to the House with those presented by Sir Robert Peel, he (Mr. Bradlaugh) found that whereas only three murders appeared to have been committed in the period embraced by the present Returns, Sir Robert Peel showed 139. No doubt, Sir Robert Peel included in his list cases that were not agrarian; but could the right hon. Gentleman distinguish between agrarian and non-agrarian offences, any more than Sir Robert did in making out his strong case? Sir Robert Peel had 483 cases of attacking dwelling-houses; the present Chief Secretary for Ireland had only 15. Sir Robert Peel had 138 cases of firing into dwelling-houses, and the present Returns showed but 67. He, furthermore, looked with suspicion on some of the cases reported at present, when he found that those whose duty it was to report them were not at all discouraged by their superiors. He (Mr. Bradlaugh) did not pretend that any case of crime that had been mentioned here in the right hon. Gentleman's speech had been invented, nor had the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government displayed any disposition to listen too greedily to the reports of officials; but a great many other people had. One speech had been made in that House which was characterized by exaggeration of everything that had happened in Ireland, and such a speech disposed one to mistrust almost every landlord magistrate. He appealed to the Government, as representing the Liberal Party in this matter, to be strong enough even to be generous. He did not ask them to be just; he asked them to be generous. He did not ask them to be just, because the measure of justice might be too retributive; but he did appeal to them to remember the many wrongs that in times past they had inflicted upon the Irish people—the exorbitant rents, for instance, under which they had groaned for many a year, although even wrong had sprang from it. It was the duty of the Government, he strongly felt, to hold the sword in one hand and the palm-branch in the other; but now they only held the sword in the one hand and fire in the other. At the same time, they told the people of Ireland that good should come one day; but, he asked, how were these poor unfortunate people to believe them when they last year beheld a small measure, which the Government brought forward as one of mercy and of justice, mockingly kicked out in "another place?"

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, that if the Amendment was pressed to a division he should support it. The powerful and impressive argument of the last speaker must have convinced everyone who gave him a fair and impartial hearing of the absolute necessity of at least sending remedial measures in advance of coercion. He could not, however, accept the kind of alternative suggested by the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons), and he should feel bound to vote against coercion, no matter what remedies the Government had in store for the suffering people of Ireland, because the Chief Secretary had made out no case whatever for coercion. He was quite aware it was unusual to oppose the asking for leave to bring in a Bill, and its first reading; but although it was an unusual course to adopt under ordinary conditions, it had, over and over again, been the determination of Parties and of individual Members to oppose the introduction of a Bill where there was a strong feeling against its principle—a strong conviction that the Bill was unnecessary and uncalled for. On many occasions distinguished Members had taken the lead in refusing the first reading of a measure. When the famous Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was introduced the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) declared, in the strongest terms, his determination to withhold his consent to the Bill being laid even on the Table. The right hon. Gentleman then said—

> "However much a Minister may succeed in gratifying the passions or in satisfying the prejudices of his followers and supporters out-of-doors, I see nothing but evil in the course he is pursuing, and therefore I, at the commencement, must withhold my consent from the introduction of this most mischievous Bill."

These words might well be applied to the present case. The debate on the introduction of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was continued for a whole week, and in the Division List of those who voted against the measure was the honoured name of Mr. Cobden, the not less distinguished name of Mr. Bright, and the name of Mr. Milner Gibson, then a leading Liberal Member of the House, and one who, in the debate on the introduction of the Bill, said—

> "If it were to be the last vote he would give in the House, he would do his utmost to prevent even the first reading of so objectionable a measure."

Now, the Chief Secretary made out nothing like a substantial case for proposing such a comprehensive alteration of the law as that contained in his Bill. It had been shown by the Answers to the Questions put to the Chief Secretary that very evening, that the Government possessed immense power in Ireland. They had, it seemed, power to drag four poor boys out of bed and cast them into a distant prison for shouting "land-grabber" after somebody on a road; and, by a Question put to the Solicitor General for Ireland, they learned that the magistrates in Ireland had now the power to prevent and disperse any meeting whatever; and they had it on what, he supposed, was good legal authority that if a number of men persisted in holding a meeting after they had been warned not to hold it, a magistrate was fully within his right, and even within his duty, in directing the men to be fired upon.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON), said, he had made no such statement. The hon. Member had entirely misunderstood him.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY, continuing, said, that, at any rate, the magistrates had the power to prevent any meeting at which men were to speak whose eloquence they did not wish to reach the public ear. Was that not a tolerably strong and stringent power to place in the hands of any magistrate? In the face of such facts, he desired to know on what ground Ministers could ask for greater powers? Was it alleged that there was increase of crime, or that agrarian outrages were now going on? In making out his case, the Chief Secretary was obliged to divorce the present from the past. But however far back they got into the history of the country, they found the same struggle going on between the possessors of the land and the peasants who claimed some right to live as well as to labour on it. Never before had agrarian dispute and controversy been carried on with less of serious outrage than at present. Never before had such an agitation been carried on with a more marked and distinct tendency to rise wholly to the level of open and manly combination and discussion. Irishmen were as much opposed to outrage as the people of any nationality. The Irish Members were as strongly opposed to the commission of outrages as anyone in the House—as even the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was. They had never failed to reprobate those outrages; but they knew that the intelligent and respectable farmers they addressed had nothing to do with them, and had no control, direct or indirect, over them. Those outrages were the work of the scum and residuum that belonged to every movement; they were the work of cowardly assassins, who sought to avenge their private wrongs under the guise of devotion to the Land League. The crime of houghing cattle was no new crime; it might be traced back to the time of the Norman Invasion. It was even more than once referred to in Scripture. But it was diminishing in Ireland under the action of the Land League. If, however, it should still go on, he failed to see by what process under this Coercion Bill the right hon. Gentleman proposed to put a stop to it. Did the right hon. Gentleman imagine those things were done in the open day, that the act of vengeance was proclaimed in advance from the market cross with the accompaniment of bands of music? Did he not know he had failed hitherto in bringing almost any of the people who did those deeds to justice, and how could an Act assist him to obtain a clue to those midnight offences which they all deplored? The right hon. Gentleman threw the veil of obscurity over most of his facts and details. When they asked for facts to justify such a change in the Constitutional Law of the country, he told them he would not mention names; but it was surely of some importance that the House should examine the cases brought forward to learn how much exaggeration there was in many a statement, and how insignificant and unimportant it became when brought into light out of the mists of secrecy. The right hon. Gentleman seemed ashamed to say much about threatening letters. Threatening letters were a mode of terrorism familiar to London police magistrates. They were constantly receiving them; but they did not, like some Irish Judges, read them with solemn emphasis from the Bench, to call attention to their own heroic virtue. An attempt had been made to connect the Land League in some mystic way with threatening letters. He would express an absolute conviction that no body of men in the country more entirely disapproved threatening letters than the leaders of the Land League. On these grounds the right hon. Gentleman rested his whole case. He admired the courage with which the right hon. Gentleman faced his triumphant Conservative enemies when he told the House of Commons that the Peace Preservation Act, if it had not been allowed to expire, would have done all that was wanted. The right hon. Gentleman had also complained that the Land League had superseded the law of the land; but what must be the condition of things in Ireland when an unwritten law, framed by a few men previously without influence, and some of them utterly obscure, admittedly superseded the law that the Government of England tried to carry out with all its force? There could be no stronger argument for some change in the system of land tenure in Ireland. But the right hon. Gentleman believed there was something like a Fenian armed rebellion about to break out in England. He did not know on what evidence the right hon. Gentleman spoke; but if he had been persuaded to believe such a statement, he was the only man who knew or professed to know anything of Ireland who entertained such an opinion. When coercion was last applied to Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster denounced what he called the ever-ready and ever-poisonous medicine of coercion. Yet it could not be denied that at that time there was something like a cause for dread of armed insurrection in Ireland. The American Civil War had then scarcely ceased; a great number of men of Irish birth or extraction in America had learned the use of arms; they were animated by the same feelings as many of their countrymen at home; they were unwilling to return to the pursuits of a peaceful life; and, fired by the recent habitude of war, a whole swarm of them came across to Ireland ready and prepared for insurrection. At that time the feeling between this country and the United States was strained to the uttermost; Americans, Northern and Southern, were alike jealous of the course taken by this country in the Civil War; there was a great international question awaiting settlement. It was the firm conviction of vast numbers of men on both sides of the Atlantic, that the Alabama Controversy would most assurely lead to war. Under conditions so stimulating it was natural that there should be something like an organized conspiracy, though it turned out not to be very formidable. But the state of things was entirely different now. There had long been peace in America, there was a friendly feeling between the United States and this country, and not one of the peculiar symptoms existed which at that time gave the semblance of excuse for the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. If the right hon. Gentleman really believed in an insurrection about to break forth, it must only be because he had taken his information exclusively from official sources. He lived in Dublin very much as an Austrian Governor of Lombardy or Venice lived in one of those Provinces before their emancipation. At that time the Austrians held just so much of Italian soil as their soldiers were encamped on. The right hon. Gentleman knew now just as much of the condition of Ireland as his official intelligence covered. Who but the right hon. Gentleman's officials were conjuring up this apparition of Civil War? Let this Coercion Bill be passed, and it would not answer any one of the ends for which the right hon. Gentleman intended it. It would do nothing whatever for the restoration of peace. It would not enable him to reach any one of the secret dangers of which he now complained, to stop one midnight outrage, or hold the hand of one single assassin. What it would enable the right hon. Gentleman to do was this—a thing which he and every other hon. Member would one day regret—it would enable him to put down open, honourable, and outspoken agitation, to reach the members of the Land League whenever he wanted to get at them, for they would not skulk behind hedges nor fly from the police-constable. His measure had in it something new indeed to their criminal legislation, for it was to be retrospective, in order that when his grand State Trial failed, he might then use his newly-forged weapon against the men whom an Irish Court of Law was unable or unwilling to find guilty. But the right hon. Gentleman could go further. He could suppress public meetings and free speech, and all the Land League had done in that way he had a good chance of undoing. The leading members of the Land League made it their ambition to close the era of conspiracy in Ireland; the right hon. Gentleman would now re-open that era. While these ends were being carried out, remedial legislation was to lie unprepared and unproduced. It was in vain to appeal to Irish Members and tell them they ought to be silent and put up with anything in the shape of coercive legislation, as, if they only kept quiet, they would have remedial legislation some time. They knew they were going to have coercive legislation; it would be welcomed in that House, and carried by acclamation in "another place." But what security was there, what word of promise had the Prime Minister to give them, that if his remedial measures were worth accepting that House would carry them? Did they not know that his present friends and allies, who were joined with his followers in a conspiracy of silence, would denounce him as soon as his Land Bill was laid before the House? All the combined ingenuity of his Cabinet could not so prune down the Land Bill as to make it gain the acceptance of Gentlemen on the Conservative Benches of the House. Whatever English Liberal Members might do, whatever the bulk of English Radicals, whose creed once used to be that coercion was always to be condemned, might do, it must be the duty of Irish Members to resist this measure to the uttermost, and it would be to the honour of every one of them to have given it the most determined, earnest, and persevering opposition.

MR. J. N. RICHARDSON was sure the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would absolve him from the least wish in the world to embarrass or thrust additional difficulties in the way of Her Majesty's Government at the present time; but, notwithstanding that, he respectfully submitted a fervent hope that the Government would not treat lightly the suggestion which was placed before them in the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons). The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, in the able speech which he addressed to the House that evening, with the assistance of information at his command which every Government possessed, and which information was denied to private Members, of course laid a statement before the House as to the condition of Ireland, which, however it might be treated by hon. Members on different sides of the House, must be acknowledged by every person to be sad in the extreme. The least unpleasant portion of that speech, if he understood the right hon. Gentleman correctly, was, that the operations of the measure of coercion would only be required in certain proscribed districts; and it was pleasant to him to hope strongly that the county which he had the honour to represent would not come within the scope of the proscribed districts. When crimes were committed, whether in Ireland, whether in England, whether in the Transvaal, or anywhere else, if they could be proved to have been committed, it was the first and primary duty of the Government to put them down. If the landlords of Ireland were only just and right, the Ulster farmers, whom he had the honour to represent, would be, as in times past, the very first men to come forward and say, "Help us to put all lawlessness down." But unless remedial measures in some way or other went along with the coercive measures, the Ulster tenant farmers would look upon the present action of the Government very gravely. He was quite sure now that there was not a man in that House who viewed the proposed Bill with greater detestation than the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland; and yet, notwithstanding that, he ventured to tell him that the Irish would simply regard such a Bill as the present, unless accompanied with remedial measures, as simply an engine for the collection of rents—an engine, indeed, for the collection of unfair rents. If it were an engine for the collection of fair rent, such fair rent as he trusted the new Bill would fix, he would look upon that, together with the people of Ireland, with pleasure. Such, at any rate, was the opinion of 220,000 Protestant farmers who signed the Memorial which he and several hon. Members presented to the Chief Secretary the other night. He should very much like to hear some words on the part of the Government, so that his constituents should have some assurance before he responded to the request of the Whip to go into the Lobby to vote for a Government Coercion Bill. It might be said, and it was an argument which had been addressed to him, that landlords had no intention of making use of the power under this Coercion Bill, if passed, in carrying out evictions, and that evictions would continue to be less frequent until the Land Bill was passed. He sincerely hoped that it might be so, and he believed that in the majority of cases it would be so; but, at the same time, between the passing of the Coercion Bill and the passing of the Land Bill there would remain an interval of time which would give the revengeful or the greedy landlords power to enforce unfair rents, which, with the promised Land Bill so near, it would be a pity that Parliament should permit. Lord Cranbrook made a speech at Lincoln on Saturday, in which he said the idea of the Land League was, "We will bind the strong man and then we will take his goods;" but his opinion was that the strong man would bind them. Now, that was just the fear of the tenant farmers in Ireland. If this Coercion Bill were passed, they would think the strong man was once more coming to bind them. They would not understand the Land Bill, "so near in promise," if he might quote Scripture, as well as the noble Lord. They would think Satan had been bound, and was now loosed for a season. That would be their way of looking at it. He was not insensible to the position of landlords at the present time. It was very serious. He knew many gentlemen, and ladies, too, with moderate incomes of £300 or £500 a-year, who were, in consequence of not receiving their rents, placed in positions of extreme and deplorable difficulty. But, at the same time, persons in their position could make provision for a few months at least. They could by some means exist and avoid bankruptcy; but with the tenant farmers, impoverished by unfair rents in times past, it would be a very different thing. Shipwreck was at all times a most harrowing thing, but never more so than when the mariner was in sight of port. It must have been a slip of the tongue when an hon. Member said there was no hand held out to help the tenant farmer. There was a hand held out to him, a firm, strong hand, that of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government; but it would be a pity if one family who would not be evicted under the new Land Bill should be evicted now before that Bill was passed. It would be as if the good ship, after weathering many storms, had foundered on entering harbour. Not only for the sake of the tenant farmers in Ireland, but for the sake of their own good name and fame, he would implore Her Majesty's Government to give full consideration to the proposal of the hon. Member for Dublin.

MR. DAVEY said, he thought that the course taken by the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) needed no excuse or apology. No measure had ever been before the House which they were bound to consider with greater care and deliberation. But although he (Mr. Davey) felt the greatest possible distaste for measures of coercion, nevertheless he felt himself obliged on the present occasion to support the proposal of the Government. The objection to exceptional legislation, applicable only to a part of the United Kingdom, lay on the surface. It was a reproach to the ordinary law that our rights and liberties, of which we were so justly proud, should be suspended whenever the vessel of the State got out of smooth waters. Such legislation was demoralizing to those upon whom it was exercised, and demoralizing to those who were charged with the execution of it. To the former it was demoralizing, because it taught them that under the ordinary law they might exercise a license which the ordinary law ought to be, and he believed was, sufficient to restrain. It was demoralizing to those whose duty it was to execute the law, because it taught them whenever they were in a difficulty to cry out for exceptional legislation, instead of making the best use of those instruments which the ordinary law placed in their hands. He thought there was also another objection to exceptional legislation of this kind, because experience showed that if you once adopted legislation of this kind in Ireland it was extremely difficult to carry on the government of that country without it. Were it not for the action and the attitude of the Land League in Ireland, were it not for what had been said and done in and out of the House since the commencenent of the Session, he should feel much greater hesitation about this legislation than he did. The question, however, was, Had the Chief Secretary for Ireland made out a case for the Bill which he asked leave to introduce? He thought the right hon. Gentleman had. He did not say that there might not be exaggeration; but he thought the right hon. Gentleman had made out this, that there was an organization in Ireland which set itself up against and above the ordinary law, and which the ordinary laws were unable to reach—firstly, because you could not get witnesses to give evidence; and, secondly, because you could not get juries to convict. That being so, we had this further circumstance, that this state of things was the result of a league, a formidable and remarkable organization—an organization of the most widespread character, and directed by men of determination and ability. The impression left upon his mind by what he had read and what he had heard in and out of that House was, that the ultimate object of the leaders of that organization was not to reform the Land Laws, but to repeal in some form the Union. That being so, should they play into the hands of the leaders of the Land League? He answered, No. He preferred to place his confidence in a Minister; and he asked Members on the Liberal side of the House to place their confidence in a Minister whom they had helped to place in power — who, as far as he knew, had done nothing to forfeit their confidence. He believed that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government felt the objection to legislation of this kind quite as strongly as any Member on that side of the House. He thought they might trust that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government and the Chief Secretary for Ireland would exercise with judgment, discretion, and moderation, the large powers which they asked for. But he must confess he should have been glad if the Government had been able to give the House some notion of the reforms which they intended to propose in the Land Laws of Ireland. He did not intend to separate himself from them on this occasion, because they had thought the arguments against taking that course more powerful than those in favour of it. He had confidence that the Government did intend to bring in a measure which would hold out some promise of a permanent settlement of the Land Question in Ireland. When the House met this Session there was a strong desire, at least, among Members sitting on his side, generally to support the Government in any measure it might bring forward, however drastic in character, which held out the prospect of being a permanent settlement of the Irish Land Question. What they wanted was a permanent settlement of that question. They were fully sensible that a measure such as they were now discussing would not constitute a remedy, and that the strength of agitation, by which alone it lived, was the existence of that grievance which required remedying by legislation. But he did not feel that they were called upon to postpone a measure such as the Chief Secretary now proposed, because those remedial measures could not be at once introduced. He was bound, however, to say that he only voted for those coercive measures because he believed that remedial measures were to be brought in. In conclusion, he pointed out to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite that he could quite conceive that a feeling of exasperation might be excited on his side of the House which might render it impossible for the Government to pass those remedial measures to which they looked forward with hope. He did not wish to impute motives to hon. Members; but he should like to feel more confidence than he did feel that it was the aim and the policy of hon. Gentlemen in the quarter of the House to which he had referred that the Government should be able to pass those measures.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: It is not my intention, Sir, to trespass at any length on the time of the House; but I think that, under the circumstances of the very remarkable proposal now made by the Government, it is but due to them, as well as due to the House, that I should say a very few words with regard to the views which we who sit in this part of the House take of the proposal which has been brought before us. Of course, when any Government comes forward with so strong a proposition as that of suspending a portion of the law which is justly regarded as the charter of the liberties of the subject, it is the duty of all independent Members of Parliament to watch very carefully and to criticize very narrowly the ground which may be laid for asking for such legislation. We know, unfortunately, that demands have, from time to time, had to be made by successive Governments for exceptional powers of this description, and we are perfectly prepared, on all occasions when the Executive Government, on its own responsibility, comes forward and states to Parliament that it is necessary to ask for such exceptional powers, to examine the claim thus made, and to deal with it in such a manner as the circumstances may seem to require. I do not intend to follow the Chief Secretary for Ireland in the speech which he addressed to us early in the evening. I only wish to say that, so far as I myself and others near me are concerned, we listened to that speech with very great interest, and with very great sympathy with the right hon. Gentleman in many parts of it; and we could not but feel that although, if we were disposed to be critical, we might regret that earlier steps had not been taken on this matter, still that it would be ungenerous and unwise at this moment to be going back on questions of that sort. We would rather consider the case as it has been laid before us to-night, and the action which the House of Commons is now recommended to take. Well, Sir, I feel not the slightest hesitation in expressing my own opinion that the case laid before us by the right hon. Gentleman was only sadly too strong and more than sufficient to prove the necessity of the demand which he made. And I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that, to the best of my belief, he will receive from those who sit on this side of the House all proper support in the progress of the measure. But, Sir, we are called upon, by the Amendment which has been laid before us, and we are challenged by the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down, to say that at the same time, or before this exceptional legislation is called for, the Government ought to place before us and to make some proposals with regard to what are called remedial measures of Land Reform. Now, on that point I am as ready as any man in the House to say that I am prepared to consider, and consider with perfect candour, any proposals which may be made to us for legislation on the Land Laws of Ireland, either of the character which we have heard mentioned in various discussions, or of such other character as the Government on its responsibility may recommend to us. We are most anxious that the Land Laws of that country should be of such a nature as really to suit the necessities of the people, and to provide, as far as possible, for the proper cultivation of the soil, and for the maintenance of a happy and contented population upon it. I will say, in passing, that I do not believe these ends are to be obtained by the violation of sound principles. I believe, on the contrary, that if you really are aiming at the permanent settlement of that question, as the hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke last says he desires to do, you can have no permanent settlement of it that is not founded on true principles. And it would be dangerous, if there were no other objections to such a course, to have proposals of Land Reform preceding those for bringing about the peace and quiet of the country, because you would be likely to make those proposals, not with reference to their intrinsic soundness and fairness, but with a view of disarming the promoters of lawlessness and of disorder. Having said so much, I desire to express my deep conviction that the Government are taking the right course in first of all establishing law and order. Until you have established law and order, you cannot consider these other questions. And, painful as it must be to us all, painful as it must be, not only to the Government to introduce, but painful to every Member of the House to support, a measure of the character which we have had described to us, I say, without fear or hesitation, that I believe it to be the duty of Parliament, and that it is the kindest act which we can do towards the people of Ireland themselves, that we should firmly, and without hesitation, support the proposal which has now been laid before us. I will not attempt to weaken the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman by adding anything else to it. I know perfectly well it would be in the power of myself and of scores of other Members to add case after case, and proof after proof, if necessary, to those which the right hon. Gentleman has put before us. It is not that the right hon. Gentleman has overstated his case. I believe firmly that that case has been stated with great moderation and great temperance, and, even so stated, it appears to me to afford ample foundation for the measure proposed.

MR. LITTON regretted that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had declined to give the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) any information as to the nature of the provisions of the intended measure of Land Reform, and had stated that the Government felt itself bound in the first instance to proceed with coercive legislation. He by no means underrated the difficulties with which the Government had to contend, nor was he prepared to dispute that they were adopting a wise course in proposing measures for the restoration of law and order in Ireland. They had made out a strong case for coercion, and they possessed sources of information which were not open to a private Member. At the same time, he would have felt far more satisfaction in voting for the Government measures if they had thought it right to indicate in some degree the course which they intended to adopt on the Land Question. There was a firm conviction in the minds not only of Irish but of English and Scotch Members, that any attempt to deal with the Land Question by merely extending the principles of the Land Act of 1870, would fail as a remedy for the disturbed state of Ireland. He was not prepared to say that the Government were not right in coming to the House to ask for additional powers; but, while he said that, and while he thought they were justified, to use the words of Blackstone, in asking the "nation to part with its liberty for a while, in order to preserve it for ever," they ought also to give some indication of the remedy they intended to propose. The argument of the Government appeared to be this—"We must have this coercion; the law requires to be vindicated; the local committees which usurp the Queen's authority and supremacy in Ireland must be put down." They said—"You know our intentions; entrust us with these powers first." Well, a certain place was said to be paved with good intentions. They were asked to have faith in Her Majesty's Government, and to have hope in them—to follow the leading of hon. Members who sat on the Treasury Benches, and go blindfold in any direction they might advise. He confessed that, for his own part, he felt inclined to draw down the bandage from his eyes and to look a little forward. The suggestion contained in the Amendment which he (Mr. Litton) had placed on the Paper, but which unfortunately he was, by the Rules of the House, unable to move, was a suggestion which, if it could be adopted, would, he thought, reconcile in a large measure numbers of people, not merely in Ireland, but many Liberal Members who sat near him, to the proposal of Her Majesty's Government. And why? Because they would have recognised that a just and wise principle was adopted for tiding over the difficulties and distress which would arise in the period that must intervene before the views of the Government were formulated and placed before the House. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) said he did not ask the Government for justice, but for generosity. He (Mr. Litton) reversed that sentiment. He did not ask them for generosity, but for justice; and he asked it as an encouragement to the tenants of Ireland who had kept within the law, as an encouragement to the honest man to continue to walk within the path of honesty, and as an encouragement to the loyal man to continue a law-abiding man, and to respect and regard the law. But the condition of things in Ireland was such that, looking forward to the interval that would have to elapse before a Land Bill could be satisfactorily passed through this and the other House of Parliament, they would have a period of suspense, in which a fear of injustice and of wrong might tempt persons to transgress the law. It was the duty of the House to help the Irish people forward in observance of law, rather than to punish them for breaking the law. No doubt, it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to enforce the law; but it was a far higher and more noble duty to prevent the law from being broken during the interval that must elapse before the Government Bill could be passed. If the object of the Government was to confer certain rights and privileges upon the Irish tenants, and to secure such rights and privileges by a Land Act, why, in the name of justice, were certain of them to be deprived of these benefits in the interval which must elapse before a Land Act conferred those rights and while the Government were passing coercive measures? He did not believe that the landlords of Ireland deserved the harsh language which had been applied to them. He believed they had shown great indulgence to their tenantry; that they had laboured under pressure, and been forced to take measures they were unwilling to take; that they had claims on them which they felt themselves called upon to discharge; and that they were incapable, as a class, of taking advantage of the period that would elapse before the Land Act could be passed for evicting their tenants. But, while he believed that to be true of the general class of landlords in Ireland, he was far from saying that there were not landlords in Ireland who would readily take advantage of the position, and feel themselves justified in trimming their sails and preparing for the storm which they foresaw was to follow. Such landlords would willingly take advantage of their present rights in order to deprive their tenantry of their prospective rights. He, therefore, respectfully asked Her Majesty's Government if it was too late to insert a short clause in the Bill, by which that protection would be given to the tenant farmers which was proposed to be given by the Act of last year? It was with that object that he had placed his Amendment upon the Paper. No doubt, it would be said that the circumstances of Ireland last year were exceptional. There had since been an abundant harvest—better than had been known for many years—but there still existed in some districts considerable distress; and Her Majesty's Government would have performed an act, not merely of grace, but of justice, if they had adopted the principle they carried successfully through the House of Commons in the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, and which, for a second time, they endorsed by allowing the Bill of the hon. Member for Galway (Major Nolan), which had the same object, to be read a second time. He appealed to the Government to adopt the principle of his Amendment. He could not say that he entertained any hope of his appeal being successful; but, on behalf of those who might be deprived of their rights within the next few months, he felt, seeing that the Bill was introduced as a Bill for the protection of persons and property, that some protection might be afforded to the persons and property of the large class of tenant farmers who would come under the operation of the Act, and who might be cruelly oppressed by the enforcement of the legal rights of a harsh and tyrannical landlord. What was wanted was a provision similar to that which was contained in the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year; and he regretted that Her Majesty's Government had not seen their way to the adoption of such a provision, which would simply cover the period which must necessarily elapse before a satisfactory, wise, and just Land Act was passed. Such a provision would, he believed, lead the people of Ireland to recognize that their best interests were bound up with the welfare of the United Kingdom.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the hon. Member who had just addressed the House reminded the Government that there was such a thing as the protection of a tenant's life and property in Ireland. The present Bill was not to protect the landlord's property, but to protect the existing licence of the landlords to seize the property of the tenants of Ireland. That was exactly the main object and purpose of the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. He had listened with a thorough apprehension of his position to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Stafford Northcote), and a thorough approval of the manner in which, from the right hon. Gentleman's point of view, he would discharge the functions of that position. Unlike the action of Her Majesty's Government, the action of the Conservative Opposition was perfectly consistent; and they only did their duty to their Party in maintaining their consistency on the present occasion. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Conservative Opposition stated that he would support the Liberal Administration in hurrying a Coercion Bill through the House, in order to enable the landlords to execute their legal rights without further delay, and that when the remedial measures of the Government were introduced he would be prepared to consider them. He had no doubt that the supporters of the right hon. Gentleman, and his political co-religionists in "another place," would keep on considering the remedial measures of Her Majesty's Government, while the Irish landlords were robbing their tenants of their rights and property from one end of the Kingdom to another. When they compared the consistency of the Conservative Party with the action of Her Majesty's Government—when they compared the bearing and policy of the Conservative Party, in Office and out of Office, with the conduct and bearing of the Liberal Party in Office and out of Office, he certainly thought there were few examples of political misconduct which could be compared with that of the present holders of the Treasury Bench in depriving the rightful owners of their right to sit upon it. According to all the principles of political honesty, the Government of Lord Beaconsfield ought to be sitting on that Bench that night. Perhaps it might be some consolation to Her Majesty's Government, under the scathing sympathy of the Leaders of the Opposition, to find that they had secured the warm support of the hon. Member for Christchurch (Mr. H. Davey). He (Mr. O'Donnell) congratulated Her Majesty's Government on the phenomenon of seeing, what was exceedingly rare to find, a Liberal lawyer expressing confidence in the head of a Liberal Administration. Looking at the whole programme of the Administration in relation to Ireland, it seemed that Her Majesty's Government had been reading in the police intelligence the details of some horrible incidents. The Government were in the position of a person importuned for assistance by some unfortunate mendicant, and their course of action might be described by the phrase "Give her a kick and throw her a sixpence." The Chief Secretary volunteered to give the kick to the poor mendicant, and the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was reported as promising to throw her a sixpence on some future occasion, although, probably, after all he would only throw her a halfpenny. He did not wish to speak too strongly in respect to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland and his political performances. He was aware of the position in which the right hon. Gentleman was placed; that, notwithstanding all his airs of innocence, he was but the echo of Dublin Castle speaking as the trumpet of officialism in Ireland. But while he was anxious to speak as gently as possible of so frail and feeble an administrative official, as everybody who had watched the career of the right hon. Gentleman knew him to be—— [*Cries of* "No!"] He admitted that the right hon. Gentleman might have a certain amount of ability in steering with the current, and that he was endeavouring to steer with the current on the present occasion; but he was bound to say, from all he had been able to gather from his Colleagues in the representation of Ireland—for, unfortunately or fortunately, he had been unable to listen himself to the charges of the right hon. Gentleman against Ireland—from all he heard it was the unanimous opinion of the Irish Members that the innocence of the right hon. Gentleman had been imposed upon in order to make him the vehicle of publishing to Europe as foul a catalogue of libels as were ever published by any English Minister even against the character of the Irish people. Last year the Government admitted the necessity of staying the hand of the evicting landlord. They were fully aware that at present the necessity for such a step was far greater. Why had they changed their attitude and policy of last year? The only reason was that a Liberal Ministry were always changing their opinions, and were constantly repudiating to-morrow what they did to-day. Her Majesty's Government proposed to bring in a series of coercive measures for Ireland. One set was aimed at agrarian crimes, and another set was aimed at political crimes. Her Majesty's Government, through the mouth of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, professed to apprehend an outbreak of Fenianism or an armed rebellion in Ireland. He concurred with the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon) that the suggestion of an insurrection was an afterthought of Dublin officialism to justify the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and quietly insinuated into the ear of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland in the hope and expectation that it would fill up the many gaping chasms in the case of the right hon. Gentleman. He assured the House that he (Mr. O'Donnell), and many of his Friends, were loyal Constitutionalists, even although they had no love for the Act of Union. But although he was a Constitutionalist, he confessed that among his most cherished acquaintances, among the most sincere and respected of his friends, were a number of Irish Nationalists, who did not conceal from anyone their desire to separate Ireland completely from Great Britain under an independent National Government. Hon. Members on that side of the House would bear him out as to the intenseness of this conviction among the Irish Party; but they were also aware that it was a stupid and ridiculous libel on the common sense of these men to suggest that they desired an insurrection against the authority of the British Government at the present time. There was no more approach towards an insurrection in Ireland against England in the present day than there was five years ago. If the Government were going to embark in a serious Continental war on behalf of the Greeks or of the Montenegrin nose-slicers, while they had no compassion for cattle mutilators in Ireland —if they were about to defy the world in arms on behalf of some Homeric crotchet or other, then it was quite possible that they might be on the brink of a Fenian insurrection; and that measures for bringing about an insurrection in Ireland would immediately be taken. But that was no more the case to-day than it was five years ago; than must continue to be likely so long as nothing had been done to remedy the just demands of the Irish nationality. As he had said, it would be very different if Her Majesty's Government were about to engage in foreign complications, which would bring against England the enmity of any Power of the first magnitude; but no danger of that kind need be apprehended while England remained at peace. As it was, the ridiculous information which the Chief Secretary for Ireland had obtained from some policeman X, that there was going to be an insurrection in Ireland, upon which he based his request to Parliament to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, was as false and unfounded as the story of the Cock Lane Ghost. They were told, however, that they were to have a special application of despotism against the commission of agrarian crimes, as distinguished from political crimes in Ireland. He wished to remind the House that under the political crimes that were to be dealt with by the general powers to be conferred on the Lord Lieutenant were included not only treason and felony, but sedition. Now, Her Majesty's Government, through legal officers quite worthy of them, had been endeavouring to persuade a Dublin Jury, for a considerable time past, that the stirring up of class against class was seditious, so that men might be thrown into prison for sedition, when, in reality, all the offence they had committed had been to hold up to the scorn of a public meeting some rascally evictor. This was, however, really an afterthought; the real object of suspending Constitutional liberty in Ireland being to allow the Government, under the head of political offences, to punish men who had been guilty of nothing more than defending the agrarian rights of the Irish tenantry. He now came to the question of the coercive measures to be directed against agrarian crimes. He believed, in his conscience, that by far the greatest part of the indignation vented by landlord sympathizers against the present condition of Ireland was not vented against these crimes, but against the uncriminal, but powerful organization of the Land League. What they would like, above all things, was, that there should be a terrible outbreak of agrarian crime so as to give the Government more ground than they had at present for trampling on the liberties of the Irish people. He was sorry to hear from the Liberal Benches that a number of hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House supported the Government because they thought that peaceable action of the Land League was the real object of the coercive measures of the Government! It was said that the Land League was supreme over the ordinary law in Ireland. He was very happy to see that it was supreme over the ordinary law in Ireland. The Liberal Party, in years passed by, were happy to see the Government of the day brought to their knees by the Corn Law League. Her Majesty's Ministers did not dare to bring in a coercive measure against England in consequence of the action of the Corn Law League. What did the Government believe would be the necessary action of coercive legislation in regard to agrarian offences? It was all very well to say that the area exposed to the action of the powers of the Lord Lieutenant was to be strictly limited by the Lord Lieutenant's good pleasure. Was it not notorious that the figure of speech which attributed to the Crown of Great Britain the government of this country was fifty thousand times more a fiction when it attributed to the Lord Lieutenant the government of Ireland? The Lord Lieutenant was a most insignificant person. He (Mr. O'Donnell) had even forgotten his name. [An hon. MEMBER: Earl Cowper.] Whether it was Earl Cowper, or Lord Melbourne, or the Earl of Beaconsfield, or my Lord Tom Noddy, was a matter of very little consequence, as the Lord Lieutenant had nothing whatever to do with the government of Ireland. He always went to some understrapper for information, and in that way the information reached the Chief Secretary, who dutifully expounded it to the horrified Benches of the Liberal Party. The Lord Lieutenant would proclaim precisely such districts as he was told to proclaim by Under Secretary Burke and the Commander of the Irish Constabulary, duly supplemented by the Reports of the local magistrates, who were all of them landlords. The Liberal Members were sympathetic, and showed their great respect for the reserve which the Chief Secretary of the Lord Lieutenant was professedly obliged to maintain on the matter. The Liberal Party affected to feel that it would be to expose myriads of innocent persons to the execution of the Land League decrees if the Chief Secretary for Ireland breathed a syllable that would tend to establish their identity. That was the alleged reason for the reticence of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman could not mention the names of ten magistrates in any part of Ireland on whose authority the liberty of tens of thousands of the people of Ireland were to be taken away without mentioning the names of half-a-dozen, at least, who were robbers of the property of the tenants, notorious scoundrels who, in any land in which justice was administered, would be at the hulks or in the penitentiary. There were still living among the magistrates of Ireland hundreds of men whose souls were heavy with the deeds of plunder and death they had done in the past to Ireland, and who were not now repentant of the work they had done. He could not draw any distinction between the man who committed a murder openly and directly and the man who did an act which he knew would surely lead to death. In numberless acts the magistrates of Ireland did acts which condemned to death the most helpless and frail of the Irish people. Yet these were the men who were to proclaim Ireland, and to work the good pleasure of the Lord Lieutenant. These were the men who were to obtain the full powers of coercing Ireland. These were the men who were to execute the full powers of coercion which they themselves had demanded in their own selfish interests, being at once petitioners, judges, and executioners of their own case. Was any speech ever delivered by a member of a disloyal association in Ireland so pregnant with incitements to disloyalty as the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who represented Her Majesty's Government in Ireland. Even the Liberal Members for Ulster—and it was evident how bitter it went against their very souls to embarrass a Liberal Administration—even they had, with unanimous voice, told the Government there was imminent danger that during the interval between the passing of the Coercion Act and the passing of a Land Act, which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Conservative Opposition, and all his Colleagues here and in "another place," were to consider sufficiently long—during that interval there was most imminent danger that the landlord thieves of Ireland would seize their last chance of robbing their unprotected tenantry. Her Majesty's Government said they wished to put down outrages in Ireland. For the sake of argument he admitted that they did. But he found that, including threatening letters, a large number of which were written by magistrates and policemen, there had been only a couple of thousand alleged agrarian offences committed in Ireland from three or four cases of the gravest kind down to a couple of cases of sheep-shearing. Her Majesty's Government were aware that during the same period 10,000 persons were evicted under a law which was unrighteous during the same period in Ireland. In 5,000 cases the tenantry had been turned out of their homes, among them being cases of women and children, and Her Majesty's Government—this great Liberal Government, the knights-errant of Europe—had not a word to say as to the necessity of putting a stop to these outrages, or to bring the criminals who committed them to justice. The policy of Her Majesty's Government might, to some Liberals, seem to be a policy of remedy, if it was carried out according to its present promise. It was, however, simply a policy to empower the landlords to drive their tenants to "Hell or Connaught," while the Land Bill was being debated and thrown out in "another place." He had watched over the career of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland during the last two months with paternal interest. It so happened that last year, confident in the good intentions of the right hon. Gentleman, although he knew the weakness of the character of the right hon. Gentleman, he went in opposition to some of his dearest and most cherished Colleagues, and insisted on giving the utmost possible benefit of a doubt to a Liberal Administration; but before the Session closed he had foretold the future and mapped out the career of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. On the 24th of August he told the right hon. Gentleman what he might do and what he could not do. At that time, after all the failures and protestations about the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister seemed to have forgotten Ireland when he was going about Turk hunting and Albanian hunting in the East; and he (Mr. O'Donnell) told the Chief Secretary what the necessary consequence of his desertion by his powerful Chief would be. He said—

> "You yourselves have admitted the actual necessity of checking eviction, and now that your only measure for checking eviction has been cast out in 'another place,' you propose, after having said that we were within measureable distance of civil war, that the approaching winter will be a terrible trial and temptation to the Irish tenantry exposed to wholesale robbery—you propose to drop all further consideration of the Irish case until next Session, while you go away to look after the cession of Dulcigno and other matters more near to your philanthropic heart."

He then added—

> "Here is the necessary result of your abandonment by your Chief. The situation in Ireland will still grow worse, and in the absence of remedial measures discontent will arise in Ireland, irritation will arise in England, and you will be compelled next Session to meet the Parliament of these Kingdoms with a mere Tory measure of coercion."

He said, on the 24th August last, to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, that sooner than cling to a portfolio under such circumstances of political discredit it would be better for him a hundred times, if he had any hope, even in his own selfish interest, of maintaining a reputation for any kind of statesmanship, to say to his Colleagues in the Cabinet—"Give me instant means of supplying even a temporary remedy for the miseries of Ireland, or I surrender the responsibility of the position which you do not help me to maintain." He would not say the right hon. Gentleman slunk from, but shunned, that manly and honest course; but whether the course he had taken had been more manly and more honest it was for the country to judge. Even hon. Gentlemen of the Opposition, who overwhelmed him at that moment with their patronage and most contemptuous assistance, recognized at the end of last Session the hobble into which the right hon. Gentleman's desire of clinging to his portfolio was bringing him. At the end of last Session the right hon. Gentleman had in his right hand the fate of the Liberal Party. He could even have dictated terms to the despotic Member for Mid Lothian himself. But he preferred to let Ireland drift; to leave the protection of the Irish tenantry to the Land League, who had nobly done their work; to evade his own responsibilities, and to cry "Amen!" to the Græco-Oriental prayers of the Premier. And what was the consequence? There sat the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant a hopelessly discredited politician, for whom there was no future. There was not a Member in all the Liberal Party who would intrust him with a position of responsibility anywhere except in Ireland. If hon. Members were willing to try the experiment, he could say, on the part of the Irish nation, that they would be happy to make them a present of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman on the present occasion had pursued very much the same tactics of making things as comfortable as he could for himself as he had done before. Yet he would be just as unfortunate in his present attempt to evade responsibility. He had put his hand to the work of provocation to civil war in Ireland, to the provocation of insurrection, rebellion, and permanent disaffection on the part of her people. The right hon. Gentleman did not know it; he never knew anything in time. He did not know what he ought to have done last year, nor did he know what he ought to do at that moment. He had accepted the Tory programme which had been administered to him for weeks and months past by the officials at Dublin Castle, who had never concealed in Dublin society their hearty enjoyment of the amusement which the proceedings of the right hon. Gentleman afforded them; and after having accepted that programme of Dublin Toryism, what was to be his reward? His present Coercive Bill, as the hon. Member for Tipperary had predicted, would be a failure. He might have the courage to shun the demands of the Archbishop of Cashel, the Bishop of Waterford, and the Bishop of Meath, for an open and public investigation of the crimes alleged by the magistrates, who had sent up their trumped-up yarn defaming the people of Cavan. The right hon. Gentleman had been challenged by Dr. Conaty to a public investigation, who offered to bear half the expense if the result turned against himself, if he did not convict the landlord magistrates of Cavan of falsehood to their faces. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford—for they must begin to accustom him to the unofficial position to which he was destined—declined this offer. The Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant preferred to take the words of these landlord magistrates in their own interests, and proclaim the county of Cavan, rather than grant the public investigation. Would, he asked, any Member of the most powerful Cabinet that ever sat in England dare to pass coercive measures against an English county on the mere official testimony of magistrates, if a sworn investigation were first demanded by a respectable body of the inhabitants? When such investigation had taken place, and not until then, would coercive measures be passed against an English county. He had an account of the manner in which, on the representations of similar magistrates, such regulations as were to carry out and initiate the proposed system in Ireland would act. The Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant proclaimed the county of Donegal on the representations of some of the worst landlords in Ireland; and when public meeting after public meeting, and indignation meeting after indignation meeting, had been held to demand a public investigation on sworn testimony, or a withdrawal of the proclamation, the Lord Lieutenant refused either the investigation or the withdrawal of the proclamation which placed the comfort and personal liberty of the people, in many cases, in the power of their worst oppressors. Did Her Majesty's Government imagine that these Coercion Bills would be successful against the Land League? In the first place, he had not been able to understand the precise reason why they objected to the Land League. Was it because it committed outrages? It was enough to say that the Government could not bring forward a single colourable instance in which outrage had been approved by any member of the Land League. It was well known that all its members were against outrages. Was the Government opposed to the open and lawful combination of the Irish tenantry, or did they accept the theory that British rule in Ireland would sooner be lost if, instead of conspiracies, there should exist open and lawful combination? In that case, let them look at the facts of the case, for they were attempting, as the English Government attempted in 1798, the hounding on of the people into the meshes of criminal conspiracy. There must be some vent for the feelings of the people either in combination or in secret conspiracy. Was it in these days of communication and publicity, and of freedom of so many kinds, that the Government could hope by any sort of coercion to put a stop to the Land League and convert it into a conspiracy? What had the Land League to do in order to be triumphant but to continue to impress upon the Irish tenantry the absolute necessity of combining against the taking of farms on which an unjust eviction had taken place, and for which an unjust rent was demanded? It was not necessary to hold public meetings in Ireland for this purpose. The work could be done here in England, where the heads of the Land League could consult. Scores of able men would be ready to conduct the necessary operations, give the necessary advice, and from English places of meeting, before Irish audiences, would send on the wings of the Press words of scorn and defiance for renegade Liberalism. He pleaded that evening on behalf of 40,000 peasant families that would be affected under the operation of these coercive laws. It was on behalf of hundreds and thousands of honest and innocent men in Ireland who, for having, perhaps, offended some local landlord, some "petty tyrant of their fields," some official understrapper, or some spiteful bum-bailiff, would be taken away from their families and cast into the good keeping of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. Again, what was likely to be the abiding effect of these measures? Suppose the Government crammed the gaols with ten or twenty thousand suspects, arrested on the *fiat* of the local magistracy; suppose they kept them there for 18 months, during which their families were subjected to starvation. Would that conciliate the Irish people? Had Michael Davitt been conciliated by his being kept for so many years in prison along with the greatest scoundrels in England? No. The Government were sowing the dragon's teeth, which not, indeed, next week were going to spring up in the form of the imaginary insurrection of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. But assuredly when one of those crises arrived, such as came upon England under the younger Pitt, the Government were preparing troubles for that day. Of course, their rising resources would probably allow them to dispense with Irish loyalty, for they could hire the Swazi, the Ghoorka, and all the blackguardism of three Continents; but he recommended the Government, at such a time, not to try an experiment with Irish valour or with Irish intelligence. He had always expressed his confidence that a system of free government for Ireland would be compatible with the interests both of that country and Great Britain.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out that the hon. Member is now travelling out of Order.

Mr. O'DONNELL was endeavouring to expose the want of proof in support of the policy of Her Majesty's Government. He had heard some expression of confidence from the Liberal Benches in the policy of the Government, but no proofs of its necessity; and he was about to say it would be better to avoid coercion than to introduce measures which would be fatal to the objects proposed by Government, and most dangerous to the permanent interests of the Empire. Her Majesty's Government had expressed their resolution to proceed with no remedial measures for Ireland until they had first safely placed the Irish tenantry under the heel of their landlords. The hon. Member drew attention to the pride and pleasure with which the right hon. Gentleman brought forward this programme, upon which he had consulted none of the Representatives of Ireland. The proposed legislation reminded him of another piece of deplorable legislation committed by the same Gentleman. He remembered when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian brought in his University Education *fiasco* some years ago, when he was Leader of the Liberal Administration, in his opening speech he declared to the fervent, admiring Liberalism of that day—which did not save him, a few months afterwards, from electoral consequences—that that Bill had the inestimable advantage that he had not consulted the Leaders of the Irish people upon it. He had got it all out of his own head, and it had the fate of a Bill which a pretended Constitutional Minister ventured to bring in under such circumstances. They learnt a lesson of unconstitutionalism, if from anyone, from the right hon. Gentleman. He proposed to bring in his remedial legislation; but when the most respected and venerable of the Members for Ireland—when the venerable patriot the Member for Tipperary asked for a single indication of the nature of the all-important legislation to be applied to Ireland—the right hon. Gentleman, as proud as if he were doing some smatch work for Russia, replied that he had not to satisfy the Members for Ireland by giving any indication of the nature of the legislation which his high-mightiness proposed for Ireland. That was the language of a master of many Cossacks. Evil communications corrupted good manners — and the communications which the right hon. Gentleman had been cultivating in his efforts to thwart Lord Beaconsfield might have generated an unexpected tendency towards the introduction of a Cossack policy. Her Majesty's Government, in refusing to consult the Irish Party, had ostentatiously insulted the Irish Representatives, the men who were responsible for the peace of Ireland, and who were entitled to be consulted on the wants of Ireland. The representation of Ireland in that House was thus openly treated as a sham, imposed upon the Irish people by England; and when the Prime Minister insulted the Representatives of Ireland by declining to consult them beforehand, or to inform them of the nature of the remedies he was about to apply to the grievances of their constituencies, he acted as a traitor to his Sovereign.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now exceeding the licence of Parliamentary debate.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, if the right hon. Gentleman deliberately refused—and gloried in the refusal—to inform the Representatives of Ireland of the nature of his proposals, then, in a crisis like the present, he was most false to his obligations to the three Kingdoms.

Mr. SPEAKER: Instead of withdrawing the observation on which I commented, it seems to me that the hon. Member is repeating it. I call upon the hon. Member to withdraw the observation.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, if the epithet "traitor" implied too strongly a personal statement——

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. You, Sir, have ruled that a certain expression should be withdrawn by the hon. Member, and I expect the House will require your ruling to be respected.

Mr. O'DONNELL would withdraw the word "traitor;" but he said that the policy of the Prime Minister was incompatible with his duty to the three Kingdoms. He violated the first principles of Constitutionalism, and he justified the predictions of the gloomiest pessimist on the subject. He told the Irish Representatives that their representation was a sham, and that he had no intention of consulting them; that he would not consult them, and would place the Irish constituencies bound, fettered, and helpless at the feet of despotic coercion, and not give them the slightest glimpse of the remedial measures which were required for the Irish grievances. He might withdraw the word he had used with regard to Ireland; but if he used it with regard to similar conduct on the part of the Premier upon an English question, although he might be compelled to withdraw it, tens of thousands of Englishmen would say "Aye" to it. Let them try it; let them venture to bring in a measure of coercion for England, and boast that remedial measures required for the removal of some English grievance had been concocted without consultation with the English Representatives. Such a measure would not pass before the House had felt that the Minister introducing it was condemned by public opinion. The right hon. Gentleman had set the worst example to unconstitutionalists in Ireland—if there were such. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had endeavoured to justify the attitude of the Prime Minister by reference to anonymous reports of interested landlords; but that was mockery superadded to the insult which the conduct of the Premier had offered to the people of Ireland.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

LUNACY LAW ASSIMILATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. LITTON, Bill to extend to Ireland some provisions of English and Scotch Law as to the care of Lunatics, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. LITTON, Mr. FINDLATER, and Sir THOMAS M'CLURE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 75.]

CORN RETURNS (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ASHLEY, Bill to amend the Law respecting the obtaining of Corn Returns, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ASHLEY and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 76.]

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 25th January, 1881.

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR—LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD INCHIQUIN rose to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether they are in possession of any memorandum containing the views of Lord Napier of Magdala in reference to the retention of Candahar; and, if so, whether they will lay it on the Table of the House; and, if not, why they have not consulted so high an authority on all questions military and political affecting India, and required him to state his opinion officially for the use of Her Majesty's Government? The noble Lord said, his object in placing the Notice on the Paper was not to anticipate in any way the debate which was to be brought on on Friday by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Waveney); but rather for the purpose of obtaining what appeared to him a most important document bearing very materially on the issues raised by the proposed evacuation of Candahar. It had appeared to him to be a document which should not only be placed before Parliament, but also before the general public. It was not his intention in any way to express an opinion in reference to either the retention or evacuation of Candahar; but it must be evident to their Lordships that there was at this moment in this country very great interest taken in the question. The movements on the part of Russia which had recently occurred in Central Asia had very materially affected the state of affairs since Her Majesty's Government appeared to have decided on the course which it would be advisable for them to pursue with reference to Candahar. It therefore seemed to him to be essential that Her Majesty's Government should take every pains to become possessed of the fullest and best information before they came to a final resolution as to the permanent occupation or evacuation of Candahar. It was unnecessary for him to call to their Lordships' recollection the great services and high position of Lord Napier of Magdala. They were all aware of the important military posts he had held in India. He was quite justified in saying that from his ability, experience, and the positions he had filled, there was no man better qualified than the noble and gallant Lord to give an opinion on the subject. He was aware himself that a Memorandum such as that to which his Questions referred was in existence. He thought there were other Members of the House who also had seen the document. Their Lordships might, perhaps, be told that it was a private document, that it was in no way official; and on that ground, perhaps, Her Majesty's Government would refuse to produce it. Well, in anticipation of such an objection, he might say that if the existing Memorandum was not one which the Government felt at liberty to lay on the Table, they might consult Lord Napier of Magdala, and obtain from him one which might be laid before Parliament and be made known to the country.

LORD WAVENEY said, that before his noble Friend proceeded to answer the Question, he wished to say that he (Lord Waveney) had received a great deal of important, though not official information on this subject. He was, therefore, anxious to press on Her Majesty's Government the desirability of obtaining for themselves and the public all the information which could possibly be acquired. He had looked through the Papers that were last presented in reference to Afghanistan, and, with the exception of the despatch of the noble Marquess who was at the head of the India Office, he found that they had only the opinions of two distinguished persons connected with India, one of whom was the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Frederick Haynes. He did not wish to go further into the question of Candahar, as he had given Notice of his intention to bring it before their Lordships on Friday next; but he was anxious to impress on the minds of Her Majesty's Government that this question was exercising a very considerable influence throughout the country; and, as appeared from a correspondence in *The Times* of that morning, which might be taken as accurate and of high value, it was exercising great influence in India also.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD: The noble Lord opposite has asked me three Questions with regard to Candahar, and I shall endeavour to answer them all. In reply to his first Question, I have to say that the Secretary of State for India has received—not officially, but through the instrumentality of a third person, a distinguished officer at the Horse Guards—a Memorandum written by Lord Napier of Magdala; but that Memorandum my noble Friend does not propose to make public, or to have laid on the Table of this House. Her Majesty's Government have not referred on this subject to Lord Napier. With every respect for the distinguished military position of that gallant officer, and with every recognition of the intelligence which he has always shown in military matters, the Secretary of State for India has not thought it necessary to consult him on the subject, because he is not at this moment, and has not been for some time past, officially connected with either the military or the political affairs of India.

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 25*th January*, 1881.

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—THE POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he can say in how many cases Her Majesty's postal service in Ireland has been stopped or interfered with by armed persons; whether there are any districts at present without the usual postal delivery in consequence of the disturbance of the peace; and, what steps have been taken to protect the servants of the Post Office?

Mr. FAWCETT: In reply to my hon. Friend the Member for North Shropshire, I beg to state that the only case in which the postal service in Ireland has been stopped or interfered with by armed persons during the past year and up to the present time is that of the Limerick and Tralee mail car, which was attacked by four armed men on the morning of the 12th instant, the bags seized and cut open, and the letters scattered about the road. A registered letter containing a watch was stolen; but this, so far as has been ascertained, was the only letter lost. Since this occurrence the mail car has been accompanied by a police escort. In one instance a post office has had to be closed in consequence of a threat of intimidation; but I have given instructions that a post-office at this particular place should at once be re-opened, and, if no suitable person can be found to undertake the duties, arrangements will, I hope, be made to have the post office at the Constabulary barracks, so that the inhabitants may not be deprived of their ordinary postal facilities. This is, so far as I am aware, the only instance in which the regular postal service has been interfered with by any of the causes referred to in the Question of my hon. Friend; and, except in the case I have mentioned, it has not been necessary to give any special protection to persons employed in the postal service in Ireland.

INLAND REVENUE ACT, 1880—DRAWBACK ON MALT.

Mr. WATNEY asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What is the total amount of drawback on malt for the last three months ending 31st December last; and, where such amount is shown in the published weekly statement of accounts?

Mr. GLADSTONE: The hon. Member uses the expression, "what is the total amount of drawback on malt for the three months ending 31st December last?" in perfect knowledge, I presume, that there is no drawback for that quarter in particular. The whole drawback became payable after the 13th of September; and the whole drawback, except the merest trifle, was paid in the month of November. The sum paid was £1,318,000, which could not be discerned in the accounts of the Revenue, for this reason—that the accounts of the Revenue are founded upon Exchequer payments, and that drawback was paid out of Excise receipts arrested on their way to the Exchequer. Consequently, the Revenue that is credited to the Excise is after deduction of this drawback. It is, therefore, not shown in the published weekly accounts of the Revenue.

NAVY—LIFEBOATS—THE HARWICH LIFEBOAT.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether, in view of the perils of the English Coast during storms, and the high importance of keeping the access to this Country for seamen, ships, and merchandise as safe as possible, he would consider the expediency of employing steam tugs and Coastguardmen as supplementary, in case there is peril of wreck, to the Volunteer Lifeboat Service, and in substitution of private tugs, wherever it may be practicable?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, on Friday last I explained to the House that to provide steam power round our coast for the purpose suggested in this Question was beyond the present resources of the Admiralty, and I will refer my hon. Friend to what I then said. Short of providing and working steam tugs, it is hardly possible to overrate the services performed by the Coastguard in saving life. There are 290 stations for rocket life-saving apparatus on the coasts of the United Kingdom, most of which are manned entirely by the Coastguard, while of the remainder the majority are worked by our admirable volunteer brigades and companies, acting under the instructions of the Coastguard. We have the Returns of the services rendered by this apparatus during the gale with which the month of October last closed, and in the course of the three days and nights 264 lives were saved by this apparatus, in the management of which the Coastguard takes so leading a part. Of these 229 lives were saved in the Hull district, which lies along the east coast of England, from Berwick to the Wash. I may state that the attention of His Royal Highness the Admiral Superintendent of Naval Reserves is closely and constantly directed to this department of the duties of the Coastguard—duties for the discharge of which habits of discipline are as necessary as for any service in the world.

STATE OF IRELAND—GRANARD, CO. LONGFORD.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that, during a fair held for three successive days, the 13th, 14th, and 15th instant, at Granard, in the county of Longford, where a branch of the Land League has lately been established, there were but three policemen on duty in the town, and they had not to deal with a single breach of the peace; and, whether the magistrates in petty sessions did not publicly congratulate the people of the district on their quiet and law-abiding demeanour and conduct?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that for some days the town of Granard was left in charge of three policemen, the rest of the force being away protecting process-servers in another part of the county. The first of those three days was a fair day, the second a Sunday, and the last a market day. The circumstances were brought under the notice of the chairman of petty sessions, who regarded them as speaking well for the state of the town.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD ACT—COMPOUNDS RESEMBLING BUTTER.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked the President of the Board of Trade, What steps, if any, are being taken or contemplated in order to protect British producers from unfair competition caused by the importation from America of spurious compounds resembling, and in many cases sold to and by retail dealers as, butter; and, whether, in view of the rapidly increasing exports of oleomargarine, sulne, soapstone, &c. from America to Holland, and the rapidly increasing exports of dairy produce by the latter Country to this Country, any safeguards are maintained against the importation of such spurious compounds from Holland?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Baronet asks a Question with regard to oleomargarine and other compounds which resemble butter, which have been imported into this country, and in reply I have to say that the subject has for some time past been engaging the careful attention of the Board of Trade; and very recently the hon. Baronet will have seen a Paper which has been printed and circulated, and which gives a considerable amount of information with respect to the manufacture and character of these compounds. But it would appear from the statements of experts that, in the majority of instances, these manufactured butters are not unwholesome; and, under these circumstances, it is difficult to see how their importation could be prohibited. At the same time, it is no doubt very desirable, for statistical and other reasons, that they should be imported under their right names. The hon. Baronet refers in his Question to cases in which he says that these compounds have been sold to and by retail dealers as butter. I can only say that if such is the case I think the Adulteration Act affords a remedy against such misrepresentations.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL was understood to ask if, in the right hon. Gentleman's opinion, the substances in question were proper to be sold for human consumption?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not speak from personal experience, but merely from the Report which has been furnished to me, and has been circulated among hon. Members.

TREATY OF BERLIN—THE MONTENEGRIN BOUNDARY.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any prospect of the Frontier between Turkey and Montenegrin being agreed to; and, whether he will state the present condition of negotiations upon that subject?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: According to the arrangements which have been made the International Boundary Commissioners were to have met on the spot for the demarcation of the Frontier between Turkey and Montenegro; but it appears, from a telegram received this morning from Captain Sale, that the weather had been such as to render all demarcation impossible. Two of the

Commissioners who were on their way have, consequently, gone on to Corfu without landing. Captain Sale has, however, been instructed to remain at Antivari; and Her Majesty's Government are about to consult the other Powers as to the best means of arriving at a settlement of the Frontier question.

STATE OF IRELAND—DISTRESS IN LOUGHREA.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to a letter from a nun in the convent of Loughrea, which appeared in the "Freeman's Journal," according to which a woman resident in that town recently remained for three days without food after child-birth; and, whether any representations have been made to him by the Most Rev. Dr. Duggan, Bishop of Clonfert, with respect to the prevalence of severe distress in the locality? The hon. Gentleman also asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the accounts in the "Radical" and other newspapers to the state of the poor in the village of Barna, outside Galway; whether 90 per cent. of the people of this district were in receipt of relief last year; whether the same number are in the present year threatened with famine; and, whether he will introduce a short Bill for the suspension of ejectments?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had received a report of the case referred to in the Question, and found that the sufferings the poor woman had undergone were entirely due to the husband, who not only left her without food, but neglected to apply for assistance to the local authorities. Finally he did apply to the relieving officer, and the woman was promptly attended to. His attention had been drawn by the Bishop of Clonfert to the condition of the poor of the county, and he feared that great distress did prevail at Loughrea. The Local Government Board had taken steps to meet it by using the powers vested in them in regard to the distribution of out-door relief and by giving employment. With regard to the other Question of the hon. Member as to the distress in Barna, he had not time to obtain information on the subject; but if the Question was repeated at a later date he should be happy to reply to it.

ARMY—MEDAL FOR THE ZULU WAR.

Mr. O'SHEA asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether medals have been issued to civilians who took part in the Zulu War, and refused to men of the First Class Army Reserve and to pensioners who were engaged before the enemy during that War?

Mr. CHILDERS: I believe that my hon. and gallant Friend alludes to the fact that medals for the Zulu War were not granted to officers' private servants, a few of whom had formerly been soldiers, and were either pensioners or Reserve men. But these men did not go to South Africa in any recognized military capacity, and it would be contrary to all established precedence to give them a medal. Civilians actually employed under the orders of the General Commanding have received medals —for instance, acting chaplains, doctors, and interpreters, and two staff officers, who, though civilians, were appointed by the General.

IRELAND—THE COLDSTREAM GUARDS.

Mr. DALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that at Inchicone, near Dublin, on the morning of Sunday the 16th instant, between one and two o'clock, a savage assault was committed on a Mr. Williams by twenty soldiers of the Coldstream Guards now stationed in Dublin; whether it is true that, on that occasion, Mr. Williams was knocked down and kicked by those soldiers until he was rendered insensible; whether, of the twenty soldiers implicated, only three have been made amenable to justice; and, whether, with a view to the vindication of order, the Government will direct the Military authorities to restrain the soldiers by confining them to barracks?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, a conflict took place between a few civilians, of whom Williams was one, and 10 or 11 of the Coldstream Guards. It was true that Williams was knocked down and kicked; it was not true that he was left insensible, and he was not, it was believed, seriously injured.

Three constables appeared at the commencement of the affray, and upon their appearance seven or eight of the soldiers ran away, three being arrested. They were charged before the magistrates; two were sentenced to two months' imprisonment, with hard labour, and one, having received a good character, was sentenced to one month, with hard labour. With regard to the latter part of the Question, he trusted that this was a very exceptional case, and he did not suppose it would be necessary to make the order referred to.

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR—LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether any despatch has been received from Lord Ripon's Government on the subject of the abandonment or retention of Candahar; and, if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table, with any opinions that may have been separately recorded by individual members of the Council of the Governor General; and, whether he will lay upon the Table the full text of the document given to Abdar Rahman and summarised in paragraph 7 of the Despatch of the 3rd of December 1880?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: My hon. Friend will see that the despatch on the subject of the retention of Candahar contained in the Blue Book was not written in answer to any despatch from the Government of India, and no reply to that despatch has yet been received. I have reason to think that before long a reply will be received, and then, of course, I will consider whether any inclosures which it may contain can be laid upon the Table. The full text of the document given to Abdurrahman is contained in the despatch of December 1880, and will be found on page 40 of the Blue Book, which has been issued. The hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) is anxious that I should take the opportunity of stating whether a Return, which he has given Notice of his intention to move for, of Minutes relating to the occupation of Candahar, will be given as an unopposed Return. We are not in possession of any Minute recorded by His Excellency the Viceroy of India or his Council upon the subject of the retention of Candahar. Any memoranda upon this subject which have been written by members of the Council in this country have been of a confidential character. The hon. Member is aware that it is not the practice to lay on the Table Minutes by members of the Council, unless they are recorded in a despatch. No instruction on the subject has been issued to Lord Ripon except that contained in the despatch which has been printed.

MR. E. STANHOPE: Do I understand the noble Marquess to say that Her Majesty's Government have ordered the abandonment of Candahar without consulting the Government of India?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I do not think it desirable that I should enter into a discussion of the question now. I have stated that the despatch to be found in the Blue Book was one emanating from Her Majesty's Government, and was not in reply to anything from the Government of India. Of course, communications have passed between the Governor General and myself; but they were not of a nature that can be published.

MR. ONSLOW asked whether there was any objection to lay on the Table the Memorandum of Lord Napier of Magdala on this question?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Lord Napier of Magdala is not at present connected with the Government of India in any official character, and no Memorandum written by him upon the subject has been officially communicated to me. I have reason to believe that such a Memorandum has been written and circulated unofficially by Lord Napier. I do not believe it would be desirable that papers of this description, emanating from persons, however eminent, who have no official connection with the Government of India, should be laid on the Table as Parliamentary Papers.

TREATY OF WASHINGTON, 1854—THE FORTUNE BAY FISHERY DISPUTE:

SIR HENRY HOLLAND asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any reply has been received from the United States to Lord Granville's Despatch of October 27, 1880, with reference to the Fortune Bay Fisheries dispute; and, whether, if such reply has been received, he will lay it upon the Table of the House?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: No reply has been received up to the present date from the Government of the United States; but Sir Edward Thornton has reported that Lord Granville's despatch was alluded to in favourable terms by the President of the United States in his Message to Congress at the opening of the Session. Her Majesty's Government have, therefore, reason to expect a reply which may show that the divergence of views between the two Governments is far from irreconcilable.

STATE OF IRELAND—AGRARIAN OFFENCES IN THE COUNTY LEITRIM.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will direct the Inspector General of Constabulary, Ireland, to procure the following information relative to Returns (Agrarian Offences, Ireland) Nos. 2 and 3, dated respectively 17th January and 20th January, 1881: viz. in what particular districts of the county Leitrim, and on whose property, occurred the different agrarian offences mentioned in the above Returns?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that the Return which had been issued that day contained most of the information required by the hon. and gallant Member up to the date to which they extended (31st of October, 1880), and similar information would be found for November and December in the Returns which he had promised.

JOINT STOCK BANKS.

MR. MACLIVER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government, after suppressing the publication in the newspapers of the lists of shareholders in Joint Stock Banking Companies, will provide for an official audit of the accounts of such Companies, in order that customers and shareholders may be more fully informed of the state of their affairs?

MR. GLADSTONE: In answer to this Question, I should like to refer, for the sake of greater clearness, to the expression used in it that the Government have

> "Suppressed the publication in the newspapers of the lists of shareholders in Joint Stock Banking Companies."

The meaning of that is, that it has been discontinued in pursuance of a clause in an Act of last Session, which was introduced for the purpose upon grounds which, I think, were generally approved by the House. But that is not the main part of the Question; it is whether the Government

> "Will provide for an official audit of the accounts of such Companies, in order that customers and shareholders may be more fully informed of the state of their affairs."

My answer to that Question will mainly consist of a reference to what was done by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. The late Government considered the subject of the audit of the accounts of Joint Stock Banking Companies, and the Act which was passed in 1879 contains a provision rendering an independent audit of such accounts obligatory upon all Companies. Therefore, the principle is laid down, and the obligation is imposed by statute on those Companies for the security and satisfaction of shareholders. But the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, while making that proposal to Parliament, which was accepted, made himself very distinctly understood upon this question, that he repudiated in every way Government interference with such audit, and deemed it to be a matter in which, when once provision had been made for that audit, the function of the Government terminated, they having fulfilled their duty. We have considered that matter, and we entirely agree with the view on which the late Government acted; and therefore do not propose to disturb the existing arrangement as it has been made by the late Government.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON OF THE EXCHEQUER.

MR. H. H. FOWLER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will arrange for the discussion of the Motion for an Address to the Crown relative to the Order in Council under the Judicature Acts prior to the expiration of the period when the Order will become Law unless either House of Parliament objects?

MR. GLADSTONE: I gave a general reply to the right hon. Gentleman opposite on a former evening, to the effect that I was aware that this was a matter which would require consideration, and

I shall adhere to that reply. I think that under the existing suspended state of arrangements for the Business of the House it would not be convenient to proceed further in the matter at the present moment; but in the course of a day or two I shall probably be prepared to say more on the subject.

IRELAND—THE DISTRESS IN THE KANTURK UNION.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. PARNELL) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to a description in the "Observer" of December 23 of the distress and misery exhibited at the Kanturk Union Workhouse; if he will inform the House of the names of the unions where the administration of out-door relief has been authorised; whether one of the conditions of the administration of such out-door relief was correctly stated by the clerk of the Kanturk Union, that

> "Out-door relief could not be administered to able-bodied labourers, but that, if they came into the house, their families could be relieved outside;"

Whether any portion of the grant allocated by the Relief of Distress (Ireland) Amendment Act of last Session has been given to any Poor Law Union, and how much; and, whether he proposes to adopt any other means for the relief of distress in Ireland than the authorisation of extra presentment Sessions and of out-door relief under the restrictions mentioned in the Poor Law Circular issued by the late Government?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I saw the account in *The Observer* on Sunday last, and sent at once to the Local Government Board to get information with regard to it. I have not yet received a reply to my inquiries; but expect to do so to-morrow or Thursday.

MINES (COAL) REGULATION ACT, 1872. THE PEN-Y-GRAIG EXPLOSION.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will cause to be printed and laid upon the Table of the House the Report of the Commissioner sent by the Government to watch over, and the evidence taken before the coroner at, the inquest as to the death of the 101 persons who lost their lives by the Pen-y-Graig explosion?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, these Papers had not yet reached the Home Office; but when they did they should be printed.

INLAND REVENUE—COLLECTORS OF TAXES.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is in consequence of instructions from the Treasury that Receivers of Inland Revenue have demanded from the Collectors the payment of taxes on January 18th, instead of allowing as formerly one clear month for collection; and if they are justified in so doing.

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH: No orders have been issued either by the Treasury or the Board of Inland Revenue for accelerating the receipt of taxes. The receiving officers of Inland Revenue, who attend at different places in their districts to receive the taxes from their parochial collectors, fix the days—within certain limits ordered by the Board—for the receipt at each place, and it seems that at Exeter the day is earlier than usual, other places in the district being visited later. The collectors are only called on to pay over what they have received.

POST OFFICE—THE RECENT SNOW STORM—CONVEYANCE OF MAILS.

MR. R. N. FOWLER asked the Postmaster General, Whether, while the country roads are impeded by snow, he will arrange for the mails to be conveyed by train from all towns possessing railway communication?

MR. FAWCETT, in reply, said, strict instructions had been given to send the mails by rail instead of by cart or messenger when the former mode of conveyance was more expeditious. As to the delay, of which he had been informed by the hon. Member as existing in Wiltshire, he should make inquiry and see that it was remedied.

SOUTH AFRICA—ZULULAND.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he has received any information concerning the serious Famine which is raging in Zululand; and, whether any steps will be taken by the Home Government for the relief of the starving population?

MR. GRANT DUFF: The Governor of Natal was recently informed by the Resident in Zululand that there was a serious scarcity in that country; and he has told us that he proposed to take such steps to alleviate it as he thought he could take without disorganizing the usual course of trade by which, as he conceived, scarcity or famine can be best met, except in extreme cases. The Home Government has no means of communication with Zululand except through the Government of Natal.

STATE OF IRELAND—LAW OF PUBLIC MEETINGS.

MR. DILLON asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether he will state the various circumstances which cause a meeting in Ireland to be an unlawful assembly, of such a nature that the magistrates may disperse it by force?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Mr Speaker, it is not practicable within the reasonable limits of an answer to a Question in this honourable House to give a legal dissertation which shall exhaustively state—as the Question asks—

> "The various circumstances which cause a meeting in Ireland to be an unlawful assembly, of such a nature that the magistrates may disperse it by force;"

but generally it may be stated that if riot occurs it is the duty of magistrates to quell it (and, if necessary, by force), and even when no riot occurs it is also the duty of magistrates to disperse (and, if necessary, by force) an unlawful assembly. If magistrates are guilty of criminal negligence in not doing so, they are liable to prosecution for breach of duty. The commonest form of such an unlawful assembly is a meeting of three or more persons which, from its character and the circumstances in which it is assembled, is likely, in the opinion of men of reasonable firmness and courage, to prove dangerous to the peace of the neighbourhood, or is calculated to excite terror, alarm, and consternation. Of course, this definition, which cannot be said to be exhaustive, necessarily comprises a variety of distinctions and details, depending on the circumstances of each particular case, which must accordingly be judged of at the time by the authorities charged with the conservation of the peace on their own responsibility.

AGRICULTURAL LEASES (IRELAND)—FORM OF LEASES.

MR. CALLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will have any objection to procure and lay upon the Table of the House, Copies of the forms of Leases known as the Lansdowne Lease in Kerry, the Leinster Lease in Kildare, the Bath and Shirley Leases in the barony of Farney, county Monaghan, and of the Dufferin Lease in Ulster?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: In reply to this Question, I have simply to state that the leases to which the hon. Member's Question refers are all private documents, and it is no part of the duty of the Government to procure copies of leases for production in this House.

MR. CALLAN: Are any of these leases registered in the Courts of Dublin; and, if so, is it not in the power of Government to produce them?

[The Question was not answered.]

STATE OF IRELAND—DISTRESS IN LOUGHREA.

MR. A. MOORE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland a Question of which I have not given him private Notice. It is, Whether his attention has been directed to a statement in this morning's "Times" respecting the distress prevailing amongst the labouring classes in Loughrea district, and that 600 families are in a famishing condition, and what steps the Government intend to take in the matter?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I have already answered a Question with regard to the condition of Loughrea district, and I have stated that employment is being given, and that out-door relief is being distributed on a large scale.

POST OFFICE—RE-DIRECTED LETTERS.

MR. CARBUTT asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will authorize letters addressed to Members of this House to be re-directed to any other address in the United Kingdom, without additional postage being charged?

MR. FAWCETT, in reply, said, that Members were not charged for letters sent on to them from the House of Commons to any part of London. The privileges conferred on Members of Parliament with regard to franking of letters by statute 1 *Vict.* c. 35 were abolished by 3 & 4 *Vict.* c. 96. A Treasury Warrant was issued in 1864, laying down regulations with reference to the forwarding of letters. He had no power to issue an order that letters should be sent on, free of charge, to Members beyond London.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE REPORT.

Mr. CALLAN: I wish to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will give a direction that at least one copy of the Report of the Irish Land Commission, which has been laid upon the Table of the House, shall be furnished to the Library for the use of Members?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I hope the Report will be delivered in a day or two; and, for my part, I certainly do not wish to have anything further to do with the distribution of it.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH said, that copies of the Special Report of the Duke of Richmond and Gordon's Commission having reference to Ireland would be issued on Thursday afternoon.

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. GLADSTONE rose, according to Notice, to move the following Resolution:—

> "That the introduction and the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill and the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise order."

Mr. GRAY: Sir, I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask your ruling as to whether the Resolution about to be proposed by the right hon. Gentleman is in Order or not. The point on which it strikes me that the proposed Motion is irregular—and it certainly is highly inconvenient—is that it assumes the decision of the House upon a matter still under its consideration, and which will subsequently be the subject of division. As a matter of fact, no such Bills are before the House as those mentioned in the Resolution. The only question which, as I say, is before the House, is whether the House will give permission for the introduction of those Bills. In order to put my point clearly and with as much brevity as possible, I am entitled to assume that the House may refuse permission. Then the House will be in the position of having anticipated a decision of the House on a subject under its consideration, and of having put by formal Resolution on its Books an Order that all stages of two non-existent Bills shall have precedence. I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, whether this is in Order, or whether this is convenient? I trust the right hon. Gentleman will excuse me for having interrupted him. I thought it would be very much better to do so before he made his statement than to have the appearance of interrupting the statement itself.

Mr. SPEAKER: The objection of the hon. Member is to the phraseology of the Resolution.

Mr. GRAY: And to the substance.

Mr. SPEAKER: He objects especially to the words "the introduction" of these Bills.

Mr. GRAY: And to "the several stages of" the Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: And to "the several stages of" the Bills. The expression, "introduction of the Bill," is well understood in Parliamentary procedure, and we also speak of "the several stages" of a Bill. I am bound, therefore, to say it appears to me that the terms of the Resolution proposed by the right hon. Gentleman are quite regular and in Order, and I see no ground for interposing between the right hon. Gentleman and the House.

Mr. GLADSTONE: You have decided, Sir, the question that the language of this Motion is in Order. But I wish the hon. Member to believe that it has not been adopted without some regard to the convenience of the House. No doubt it would have been possible to insert in the Motion the parenthetical clause after "each successive stage," these words, "in case the House shall have assented to the preceding stages." But that would have greatly encumbered the Motion. It would certainly have been absurd to renew the Motion at each of these stages; and the short answer, I think, to the objection is, that if the House thinks fit, as, of course, it is entitled to decide, to refuse the introduction of the Bill, then there are no several stages to proceed with, and the objection falls to the ground, as having no aim to which it addresses itself. The Motion I make is one which will not require from me any lengthened statement. It should be remembered by some Members of this House that I gave Notice of this Motion on the first day of the Session. That Notice was based upon general grounds, which were wholly free from anything like an admixture of polemical or controversial matter. It implies no accusation, no imputation against anyone. I do not, indeed, Sir, deny that, in my opinion, the reasons for this Motion, which appeared to us to be strong enough to warrant action at the commencement of the Session, have derived a great accession of strength in consequence of the slow progress which has since been made in the Business of the House. It is not necessary for me to dwell upon that accession of strength. So far as I am concerned, I simply wish to direct the attention of the House to the general grounds upon which the Motion rests, and which, as it appears to me, are quite sufficient to recommend it to the common sense of the House. Sir, the House will remember that we have met at an unusual period of the year, much before the common day for the assembling of Parliament. That meeting has been founded, according to the direct expression in the first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, upon the ground that certain arduous and urgent matters required the attention of Parliament. From the Speech itself it is not less evident that first amongst these urgent and arduous matters, and, in fact, emphatically first, were the proposals which were about to be made, by which the Executive Government, upon its own responsibility, and for the purpose of strengthening the hands of Her Majesty in the maintenance of order in Ireland, will be armed with powers unknown to the ordinary law of the land. It is impossible to overstate the gravity of the responsibility undertaken by the Government in making proposals of that description. They are bound, as I admit, not to make them too late—and there is a difference of opinion, at least in one part of this House, upon the question whether the Government are not chargeable in that respect. But they are bound, also, not to make them too soon; and while both those propositions must be accepted in their general terms, this, I think, evidently flows from them—that when the Executive Government of the country have arrived at the conclusion that there is sufficient evidence to convince Parliament that a demand for extraordinary powers ought to be made and acceded to, it becomes the duty of the Executive Government—and I would also humbly presume to say the duty of the House of Commons, in conjunction with the Executive Government—to use every lawful and proper means for giving due despatch to the consideration of that demand. There are, of course, two points of view from which the matter may be regarded. From our point of view the question presents itself thus: that the state of Ireland is one in which the administration of justice has failed, and in which, to a very considerable extent, the influence of terror places in abeyance the discharge of civil duties and the exercise of civil rights. From our point of view, and from that of all who agree with us, it is perfectly manifest that when the evidence of such a state of things has reached, as we think it has done, the point of demonstration, not one day ought to be wasted while the deliberations of Parliament upon a subject of so much gravity are proceeding towards their issue. When I say that not one day ought to be wasted, do not let it be supposed for a moment that I intend to convey that liberty of speech, liberty of discussion, liberty of objection to our proposal ought to be in the slightest degree curtailed within the bounds of usage and of reason. I mean no such thing. I do not call time wasted which is bestowed *bonâ fide* upon the careful and searching examination of that proposal, and in the sifting—and, if need be, re-sifting—of the evidence upon which it is founded. But this I do say—that the obtrusion of matter of secondary consequence—either of secondary consequence in itself or in reference to the circumstances of the moment—would be fairly considered as a waste of the time of Parliament in a state of urgency such as we allege exists. For, Sir, if our allegation be right—if it be true that those whom we have been appointed to govern, those whose highest civil interests we are put in charge of, are debarred from doing that which they have a right to do, and are intimidated into doing that which it is their duty not to do—who can doubt that every day added to such a state of things is the addition of a great public mischief to the number of such mischiefs already accumulated? But let me look at the question from another point of view—from that of those who think that this proposal is either altogether unnecessary and ill-timed, or that a wrong place has been chosen for it in the order of subjects, and that what is termed remedial legislation ought to have preceded legislation for the purpose of restoring law and order in Ireland. Well, I will take first the objection of those who contend that our proposal is altogether bad; that there is no warrant for it; that there is no terror existing in Ireland; and that there is very little, if any, agrarian crime in that part of the Kingdom. Those are not allegations which this is the place to discuss; but even granting every one of those allegations from the point of view of those who make them, it is not the less necessary that the judgment of Parliament should be taken upon this subject without any unnecessary delay, for Ireland should be cleared—a portion of it at least—from the reproach of having a proposal of this kind hanging over it; and if, indeed, it be true that the Government have, without sufficient consideration, pledged their responsibility to a plan of a nature so exceptional, the sooner the day arrives when they are to be detected and exposed by the force of argument, and when the judgment of the House of Commons may be taken against them, the better for those who are objectors to the proposals now before the House. Again, there are some Members of Parliament who say—"No; we will not go so far as to state that exceptional measures for the protection of life and property in Ireland are entirely out of the question," who admit the condition of Ireland to be grave, and even in parts of the country to imply the existence of something of a nature dishonouring to our fame and character as a civilized people, but who say that the Government have made a great mistake in giving the first place in the deliberations of Parliament—at least, the first place in the proposals laid before Parliament—to a subject of this kind; and that they ought to have commenced the Session by an attempt to deal with the intricate question of a Land Bill, and all the manifold points of view from which it has been approached during the last few months. Well, it is impossible for us to accede to any proposal of that kind. I may, however, observe that I perfectly appreciate the motive of those hon. Members who have taken objection in this mitigated and secondary form to the proposal of my right hon. Friend near me (Mr. W. E. Forster). But from their point of view it is equally obvious that as the Government have made this mistake, as they call it, it is a right judgment, as I shall contend it is, of putting first the proposal relating to the protection of life and property, and as the Government are not prepared to make a declaration on the subject of the Land Bill until they see their way with regard to this proposal, the sooner it is possible for us to arrive at the judgment of Parliament upon the great question now before us, as opened by my right hon. Friend last night, the sooner we shall reach that which those hon. Members conceive to be the one great and vital question—namely, the question of the manner in which we may propose to deal with the Land Laws. I therefore would say that, from whatever point of view we look at this Motion, it is a reasonable one. I will, however, make this admission—that great as is the evil of the prolongation, even for a day, of this state of things in Ireland, had this proposal been made to the House at a period of the year when we were already engaged in the miscellaneous business of the Empire, it might have been doubted whether we should have been justified in asking hon. Members to make the sacrifice which I do not doubt their acceding to such a Motion will involve. But it must be borne in mind that even now the time has not arrived at which it can be said, with substantial truth and accuracy, that we are depriving Members of this House of their usual facilities for the discussion of subjects in which they may be interested. It is not ordinarily till the first week in February has elapsed that Members find themselves in a position to make use of the facilities to which I have referred. When I gave Notice of this Motion there was one full month before us available for prosecuting the measures for the restoration of peace and order, and, I may add, of freedom, in Ireland, without curtailing or interfering with the liberty of private Members. That period has been abbreviated—I will not inquire into the cause; but a portion of it still remains, and undoubtedly the necessity which existed for giving this Notice of Motion at the commencement of the Session is a necessity not mitigated, but aggravated, by the delay which has already taken place. When I look at the crop of Amendments which has been sown by the busy hands of Gentlemen all sitting within a narrow precinct of this House, I am fain to acknowledge that the Motion of which I have given Notice has exhibited wonderful fertility, and produced a very large family of children of whom I am not particularly anxious to claim the parentage, and of whose fate I am not disposed to be very careful. The exceptions which it is proposed in these Amendments to insert in my Motion would altogether destroy its intended effect. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), for instance, proposes to insert the words "except on Tuesdays and Wednesdays." Well, if we except those days, why should we not also except Fridays, which it would be more natural to except, inasmuch as they are already in a manner excepted under the Standing Orders of the House for discussing Supply? If these exceptions were admitted the upshot would be that the usual days for Government Business—namely, Mondays and Thursdays—would alone remain available for the discussion of the measures relating to Ireland. Now, I put it boldly to every section of this House that it would not be politic or expedient or becoming—I would almost say it would hardly be decent—in the face of this country, or in the face of Ireland, that we should—for I will presume we have got the Bill on the second reading—that we should have the second reading proposed, the debate adjourned, taken up again, and again adjourned; and that in a subject of that kind dealing with the peace and order of the country, dealing with propositions of a character so exceedingly grave, that the discussion should be postponed from Monday to Thursday, and from Thursday to Monday, and from Monday to Thursday again, fresh crops of speeches being in process of germination between those days, and so on, *toites quoties,* through the weary stages of the Bill. I do not think that the House will allow this. It doubtless knows the ingenuity of hon. Gentlemen opposite. There is an old phrase of "drawing blood from a post," and it is possible they may make arguments out of a stone; but, notwithstanding my experience on previous occasions of their power, and the high estimate I have formed of it, I am really at a loss to know how it can be seriously thought by any Members of this House that it is expedient, having a grave and capital question of this kind before us—a capital charge either against certain persons in Ireland, whom I will not now nicely define—or Her Majesty's Government, that the House should not deal with that subject as an impeachment, either on the one side or the other, as of the first order in weight and importance, and should not give it all the time which Imperial questions will admit it to appropriate. In that case I will no longer detain the House. I do not found my proposals upon imputations or matter of controversy or charge, but upon considerations of general propriety and policy—I may add, decency and necessity. I trust upon these grounds that the House will be inclined to accede to the Motion. Allow me to say that I cannot help hoping that, in spite of the number of printed Amendments on the Paper, the House will accede to the Motion with promptitude.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the introduction and the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill and the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise order."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he rose to propose an Amendment which stood in the name of his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell), who was not then in his place, namely—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That,' in order to insert the words 'the present state of Ireland does not afford sufficient justification for depriving the Members of this House of their usual facilities for the discussion of public business, and of their constitutional right of initiating and proposing legislative alterations, and of demanding the redress of grievances.'"

The hon. Member said he had a particular claim on the indulgence of the

House, as he had been asked to propose this Amendment unexpectedly.

MR. SPEAKER: When an hon. Member formally gives Notice of an Amendment, and thus obtains precedence on the Notice Paper, the House expects that the hon. Member giving Notice of the Amendment should himself move it. I am, therefore, bound to say that the hon. Member, in the course he is now taking, is out of Order.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he was not proposing an Amendment of another hon. Member, but an Amendment of his own, which very conveniently happened to be printed for him on the Notice Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The terms of the Amendment are identical with those which stand in the name of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Does the hon. Member assure me that is not so?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The terms of the Amendment which I wish to propose are identical with the terms of the Amendment placed on the Notice Paper by my hon. Friend the Member for Cork.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I am bound to say that the course which the hon. Member is now taking is clearly out of Order.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Under these circumstances, I shall confine my observations to the general question.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to say distinctly that the hon. Member is not entitled to move the Amendment which stands on the Notice Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Cork City.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that, in obedience to the ruling of the Chair, he was not going to move the Amendment, but would speak in general opposition to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. He wished to call the attention of the House to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had not quoted a single precedent for the course which he asked them to take. On the 30th of March, 1846, Sir James Graham proposed a Motion somewhat similar in terms to that of the right hon. Gentleman; but the Motion only referred to a particular stage of the Coercion Bill then introduced, and to a particular period, and did not ask for the postponement of all the Business of the House. The right hon. Gentleman said it would be indecent of the House to postpone the discussions on this Bill from Mondays to Thursdays, and from Thursdays to Mondays; but the right hon. Gentleman was in Office in 1846, and therefore was, to some extent, responsible for the order of Business. At that time the House of Commons was engaged in the discussion of the Peace Preservation Bill, and that measure was introduced at all times and seasons, which fact formed the main arguments for its opponents. The right hon. Gentleman sought to justify his action on the ground that a grave and capital charge against Ireland was involved. He might more correctly have said a "grave and capital sentence." It was, indeed, a grave and capital sentence which was about to be pronounced upon Ireland, for the result of the trial was a foregone conclusion; and, that being the case, he did not think hon. Members for Ireland were bound by any laws of political warfare or—to quote the right hon. Gentleman's word—Parliamentary decency, to hasten the passing of that sentence. The Motion of the right hon. Gentleman amounted to this—that all the legislative Business of the country should be at a standstill until those proposals were carried. That proposal interfered with the Orders of the House, which were the protection of the House, and especially of the minority. It asked not merely that they should discuss Bills which would make it more objectionable, but by asking them to assent to the course pointed out—namely, that the Bills should in their various stages have precedence over all the other Business of the House—it virtually asked them to pass the measures with speed through the House. In 1846 Sir James Graham's Motion was opposed by the united strength of the Liberal Party; and the contention was exactly the contention of the Irish Members to-day—namely, that the Government were giving precedence to the wrong Bill. Sir James Somerville, who led the Opposition, then defended Irish Members from the charge of delaying remedial Irish measures; and his argument was, that, by desiring the introduction of remedial legislation first, the Irish Members showed their anxiety for remedial legislation, whereon the Government showed their want of anxiety for remedial legislation by proposing to enter upon a dilatory and embarrassing course in reference to a measure of that kind. Therefore, on the Government of to-day, which gave the same embarrassing choice to the wrong measures, rested the responsibility of impeding the progress of remedial legislation for Ireland. Again, it was manifest that since the Session opened indications were sufficient to show that the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman would not be carried without severe and protracted discussion. He might, therefore, assume that the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman entirely destroyed whatever good effect might be produced by calling Parliament together a month earlier than usual. The effect would be that the Session would be reduced to its ordinary duration, and accordingly they had the prospect before them of all the great financial traditions of the country being put off, to the detriment of the Public Service, or carried with that smallness of discussion which was the best cover for Ministers who wished to pass unpalatable proposals. To-day the Chief Secretary had admitted, in reply to a Question, the existence of severe distress in certain parts of Ireland; and it was certain that the landlords were already, under the encouragement given by the proposed Coercion Bills, preparing to put their powers into relentless operation. He thought, therefore, the Irish Members had a right to demand priority over the right hon. Gentleman's proposal, either for a Bill for relieving distress, in the form of a change in the Poor Law, or a measure to prevent the eviction of tenants from their holdings. The Chief Secretary acknowledged the other night that there had been a considerable diminution in agrarian crime. With the smallest exercise of political foresight the right hon. Gentleman might have seen that this diminution was inevitable from the meeting of Parliament alone, without any coercion measure whatever. He (Mr. O'Connor) laid it down as a general proposition that the meeting of Parliament alone exercised a tranquillizing influence upon the people, not alone in England but in Ireland, and that the Session of Parliament was the time for the discussion of proposals for removing, and not increasing, the excitement which arose during the Recess. He asserted that there was not alone a diminution of agrarian crime in Ireland, but that agrarian crime did not exist at all to any large extent, either before or after Parliament met. The proposals of the Chief Secretary were not proposals for the protection of life and property in Ireland; but they were proposals for the protection of his own Ministerial life. By the Prime Minister's own Returns it was apparent that there was a suppression of the truth. Some offences appeared upon the Returns twice, and the same criminal was made to have committed two different crimes upon the same place and at the same time—in fact, there never before was a total of crime made up by so large an extent of sham and misrepresentation. On this point the Chief Secretary had been guilty of entirely misleading the opinion of this country, though he would not say the right hon. Gentleman did so intentionally. Not one in ten of the alleged crimes ought to have found their way into the Blue Book. The right hon. Gentleman was mocking Parliament and mocking public opinion. Among the cases of mutilation of animals was one in which a portion of a cow's tail was cut off; and he would put it to the House whether there was any disregard of humanity in cutting a few hairs from the tail of a cow. Under the head of "Intimidation," it appeared that a party of men threatened a person named Tighe with death if he did not give up a meadow he had taken. That was, no doubt, a serious offence; but in another column, under a different heading, it appeared that "same party broke Tighe's window." Case 110, "Firing at the person." Mr. Welsh was fired at, but not injured. That was a perfectly fair case for the police to put down; but the next case, 111, "Aggravated assault," was not, as it was the same offence, as Mr. Welsh, when dismounting, was struck by a stick and knocked down. When the same party visited several houses on the same night, each visit to each house was put down as a separate outrage. Not only that, but each separate act by each member of the band was put down as a separate offence. Did any man in his senses believe that because a cow was stolen, because a man had a spite against a particular landlord, society was in a disturbed state? It was absurd to describe the breaking of a window, the knocking down of five yards of a wall, or the cutting of a telegraph wire as agrarian crimes. If they were to go into any town in England where there was a large number of operatives, and if every window broken and every bag of tools stolen were put down they would find a larger total than that which the Chief Secretary had so unfairly put down for Ireland. He considered he had shown to the House that the whole basis of the right hon. Gentleman's position had taken away the argument of the Chief Secretary

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is now referring to some observations made in the course of debate by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and that course is irregular. I wish also to point out that the observations which he is now making have no relevance to the Motion before the House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR, said, he was sorry to have been betrayed into a breach of Order. It was not always easy, on a complex subject like this, to keep in the discussion within the strict limits of Order. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and the proposal of the Prime Minister seemed, to a large extent, to hang together. The basis of the proposal of the Prime Minister was that he was convinced by evidence which was before him that there was urgent necessity for the immediate discussion of the Coercion Bills. Now, he thought he had shown that the whole position of the Government was false—that the evidence before the Prime Minister's mind was untrustworthy. But perhaps he was wrong in saying that the right hon. Gentleman had this evidence before his mind. He did not believe that the Prime Minister could ever have seriously looked through these Reports. Had he done so he would have been ashamed to come down to the House and make such a Motion. The Prime Minister had remarked that some said the Government had made their proposals too soon, and others said that they had brought them too late. The argument used in answer to the objection that they brought them forward too late was that had they brought them forward earlier they would have been guilty of irritating passions. The Government, therefore, admitted that proposals which would irritate passions should be avoided; but could the Prime Minister deny that their proposals had irritated passions in the House and in the country; and could he fail to see that since putting these proposals on the Paper a dangerous state of public feeling had arisen? Out of their own mouths Ministers, therefore, were condemned. Their proposals were deferred on the ground that if they were brought in earlier they might lead to a serious division of Parties. Had not the proposals led to a serious division of Parties in the House? He did not mean to say that these proposals were not supported by any Members of the Conservative Party. He did not mean to say that they were not supported by hon. Members who sat behind the Treasury Benches. He was aware that, in one sense, they had not created a division but a union of Parties; and he had to offer the Prime Minister his painful congratulations on that union which he had effected between Conservatives and Liberals on the common basis of coercion. He believed that he would be justified in congratulating the Prime Minister on the return of the hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. F. S. Powell). That hon. Member was a Conservative, but he was a coercionist, and his Liberal opponent was an anti-coercionist. A coercionist Conservative ought to be dearer to the Prime Minister than an anti-coercionist Liberal. His chief object in undertaking the duty he was then performing was to see whether there was any use in making a final appeal to the Prime Minister. There never was an era when there was such an opportunity of beginning a new epoch of peace and national conciliation; and there never was a man more fitted to exercise the power he possessed over the English and Irish people. He would detain the House no longer, but would make a final appeal to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government to stay his hand while there was yet time, and to make himself the herald of reconciliation, instead of the herald of new bitterness, new animosities, and a new epoch of differences with the Irish people.

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN said, the present condition of things with which the Prime Minister had asked them to deal was one which none of them had ever experienced before. It was vain and useless to attempt to minimize the extent of agrarian crime in Ireland. To talk of breaking a pane of glass or knocking down a few yards of wall as indicating the state of outrage in Ireland was to trifle with the House. Hon. Members opposite might depend upon it that the House knew far too well what was the condition of Ireland to be in any way influenced by statements of that character. He strongly advised hon. Members who desired to discuss the question to deal with it in a more serious and honest spirit. The proposal before the House was, no doubt, of a very serious character. It took from individual Members of the House rights which they justly held most important; but he thought that the Prime Minister was justified in the proposal which he had made. If ever a Leader of the House was justified in making a proposal of this character he was confident that the present Leader of it was. At the same time, he was of opinion that the House had a right to ask the Government to give it an assurance that the time which they required the House to give up to them for this most important subject should not be wasted. What was the use of giving up the whole time of the House to Her Majesty's Government if the Government took no steps to insure that that time was not wasted? He was anxious, and hoped to hear, before the discussion closed, from the Prime Minister, or from some other Member of Her Majesty's Government, not anything in the nature of a threat as to the stifling of free discussion—that he should certainly deeply deplore—but an assurance that, so far as it was possible, and with due consent from the great majority of the House, that the time so given up should not be wasted in useless and needless discussion. The country was seriously alarmed lest its great institution of Parliament should be rendered ridiculous in the eyes of the world. He had recently been among his constituents, and he would say most unhesitatingly that men of all sides and all parties had assured him that they viewed the present condition of Parliament as most alarming. He would tell the Government that if they were not prepared to deal with the matter with a firm, strong, and judicial hand, they would lose the confidence of the country, and, in his opinion, they would lose it justly. He was one of those who would not, in the least degree, endeavour to stifle fair debate or to curtail fair discussion; but when debate and discussion went beyond the limits of that which was right, then it behoved them to intervene and stop it. The rights of minorities were, he thought, very frequently exaggerated. If they went back to the earliest periods of their history they would find that the majority had always governed the minority. He failed to see how any Public Business was to be conducted unless, after due discussion, the minority was compelled to accept the verdict of the majority. Such a principle was recognized in every assembly. He was of opinion that the time had now come when the will of the minority must be made to yield to the will of the majority. Now that the Government asked hon. Members to give up to them the whole time of the House, and to cancel all those rights and privileges which private Members possessed, they ought to have some assurance that, within reasonable limits, steps should be taken to prevent any of that time being wasted.

Mr. FINIGAN remarked, that he felt that the ordinary law had been passed over, and that the House was asked to give up all its privileges, and that private Members were asked to give up all their legislative ideas whilst a measure of injustice and coercion, or rather two measures of coercion, were passed through the House under the false guise—he might say—of passing to what was called the Business and Orders of the House. He begged, therefore, to move as an Amendment, to leave out all the words after "that," in order to insert the words—

> "The present state of Ireland does not afford sufficient justification for depriving Members of this House, for an indefinite period, of their constitutional right of initiating and proposing legislative alterations, and of demanding the redress of grievances."

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound to inform the hon. Member that the Amendment which he now proposes is similar to the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for Cork, which I have already ruled to be out of Order. The slight alteration which he proposes to make in that Amendment is of a colourable character, and would not make it in Order.

Mr. FINIGAN said, he was only too happy to bow to the ruling of the Chair; but he had thought that the words he had added might be considered to convey a different meaning. It appeared that even an alteration of the verbiage of the Amendment of his hon. Friend would not warrant him (Mr. Finigan) in discharging what he deemed to be his duty. As the Chair had ruled him to be out of Order, he would withdraw the Amendment, and confine himself to the general question. The Motion before the House set forth that it was one for the protection of property and for securing liberty; but it was a Motion for the protection of the property of the minority, armed with unjust rights, and for enslaving unfortunate tenants. Hope had long been extinguished in those National Irish Benches by the action of Her Majesty's Government. Since 1832 to 1875 no less than 48 measures of coercion had passed through that House. Since 1848 the Habeas Corpus Act had been suspended seven times. From the first year of Her Majesty's reign up to 1875 there had been no less than 37 Coercion Acts. Those Acts had been drawn up in different names—such as the Crime and Outrage Continuance Act, Arms Act, Unlawful Oaths Act, and several, as the Peace Preservation and Protection of Life and Property Acts. He would explain the nature of these Acts. In England a person brought before the local magistrate, or the highest judicial authority in the land, was deemed innocent until proved guilty, and the onus of proof of guilt lay upon those who were instituting proceedings; but in Ireland the law was to be reversed. It was to lay upon the man arrested, either by a justice or a constable, or any other person whom he suspected of illegal acts, the onus of proving his innocence. Therefore, in the two countries the position of the unfortunate culprit was exactly reversed. He asked that Liberal House of Commons not to arm a Liberal Government with such an arbitrary and unjust power.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that the Question before the House is, whether certain Bills shall have precedence over Notices of Motion and the other Orders of the Day. The hon. Member is not at present keeping himself to that Question. He will have an opportunity subsequently of discussing that Question.

Mr. FINIGAN took it that the House was asked to lay aside all public and private legislation until two certain Bills, both of which had been placed on the Paper by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, had been passed by the House. He was trying to prove that there was no necessity for those Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that he is going too much into detail upon that matter. The Question before the House is of a very simple and limited character—namely, to give precedence to certain Bills.

Mr. FINIGAN said, he would do his best to discuss the question on the two lines kindly marked out by the Chair. He wished, however, to refer to one or two matters connected with the so-called crimes and outrages which had been alleged to be committed in Ireland. The hon. Member went on to contend that the ordinary law gave to the Executive Government in Ireland ample power to deal with outrages, Land League meetings, and any other form of supposed transgression of the law. In support of this view he proceeded to quote from a Circular—issued last year by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, containing instructions to the magistracy and Constabulary Forces, when——

Mr. SPEAKER, again interposing, said: I must point out to the hon. Member that what he is now reading has no relevance whatever to the Question before the House. The simple Question before the House is the mode in which certain proposals shall be proceeded with.

Mr. FINIGAN said, he only wished to quote from the Circular to which he had alluded in order to show that, in his view at all events, the Government had already in their hands ample power to do all that was necessary to secure order in Ireland. The Government were, he could not too strongly urge, to be severely blamed for not having put the ordinary law into execution before they had recourse to arbitrary power. The same Circular to which he had referred contained full remedies against that which was known as "Boycotting" in Ireland; and, therefore, the Government were not justified in asking for Coercion Bills, which meant, not law, but despotism and anarchy. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh; but he was not afraid to declare that Ireland was in a state of anarchy for 50 years, during which period not fewer than 48 Coercion Bills had been brought in, and he could trace the direct connection between force, which out of the House was no remedy, but which inside the House was urgently needed, to be directed against the best interests of the Irish people. The Circular contained five other provisions, which he would read. ["Question!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I have again to remind the hon. Member that he is not confining himself to the Question, which is of a limited character, and has reference to the course of procedure to be adopted with respect to particular Bills.

Mr. FINIGAN went on to say that unjust laws had prevailed so long in Ireland that there never could be that respect for the law which prevailed in England. Where the law was in accordance with the wishes of the people it was respected, because it was administered with a just and equitable hand, and with a fairness which challenged the admiration of all men. But the law was despised in Ireland because it was unjust. If crime had been committed by the tenants, he asked, had no moral crime more deep than legal crime been committed by the landlords? It was in the interests of the bad landlords and their legions that they were now asked to postpone the Public Business in order to give them further power to continue a system of crime and outrage on a par with the worst crimes and outrages to which they had recourse in the Famine years 1847 and 1848. He asked the House seriously to consider whether they would give to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, or to the magistrates, or to the police, the power of carrying out maliciously the provisions of a tyrannous and arbitrary law. The hon. Member then proceeded to read extracts from the letters of *The Times* Commissioner in Ireland, published in the year 1847, when——

Mr. SPEAKER said: I must point out to the hon. Member that the extracts which he is now reading have nothing whatever to do with the Question before the House.

Mr. M'COAN submitted that the hon. Member was only arguing that the Bills for which precedence was asked were unnecessary.

Mr. MILBANK: I rise to Order. This is the fourth time that you, Sir, have called the hon. Member to Order, and I move that he be no more heard.

Mr. FINIGAN was obliged for the warning he had received from the Chair. If he were permitted, he would only read one quotation from a speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman said——

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member disregards the authority of the Chair I shall have only one course to take.

Mr. FINIGAN took that intimation to mean that he was out of Order. If, therefore, he were to continue in the same course, he would merit the castigation which the Chair had suggested. He was quite unwilling to place himself under such a ban. He would endeavour, therefore, to keep himself well within the liberty of speech allowed to hon. Members. What he wished to urge upon the House was that it would have well become a self-styled Liberal Government to have carefully avoided all resort to coercion. The House had been led to form an erroneous judgment by statistics drawn from corrupt and prejudiced sources. ["No, no!"] If the House would listen to Irish Members on Irish matters, as it listened to English Members on English matters, they might arrive at a more pacific solution of their difficulties. He had said before in that House that he was not a Liberal, and he thanked God he was not, because, although he recognized that there was a certain section within the Liberal Party truly Liberal and honest, yet he preferred to be governed in that House and in his own country by coercion put down in the name of coercion by Conservative statesmen, and not by coercion put down in the name of liberty and in the name of that Liberalism which had found such ignoble exponents in the present Ministry. As no case had been made out for these measures, and as the ordinary law was ample to carry on the government of Ireland, he should use every legitimate means to delay measures which were opposed to liberty, to justice, and to Constitutional government.

Mr. J. W. PEASE said, it was with reluctance that he troubled the House. Her Majesty's Government had come down to the House and asked it to give up, for purposes of Irish legislation, that time which was usually devoted to Business introduced by private Members. It seemed to him that Her Majesty's Government had no alternative but to ask that concession of right of private Members, although he trusted that no Irish Member would accuse him for a moment with a want of sympathy for Ireland. His first experience of the country was while travelling through it after the terrible Famine to which reference had so often been made in the course of that debate. No one with the heart of a man could look on their sufferings without having firmly fixed upon his mind a deep sympathy with a people who bore their trials with so much firmness, even through such terrible times. There had been a very strong attempt made, especially by the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), to minimise the crime of Ireland, and he could not think that there could be a greater mistake. Let them look boldly at the question, admit the facts, and then try to find the remedies. These Bills which were before the House were, it was true, Coercion Bills to a certain extent; but he thought they were better called Bills for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland. Anyone who even threw aside the statistics brought before the House, who had any knowledge of Ireland at the present time, must be aware that there was a state of things prevailing there which the House could not allow to exist for a single moment longer than it could help. When Irish Members put upon the Paper seven distinct Motions of Amendment to the Resolution of the Prime Minister, he thought the Irish people, who, as they were told the other night, read the papers so closely, were entitled to inquire what dictated a policy which placed further and further in the distant future a radical treatment of the evils of Ireland. The opposition of the Irish Members, as he understood it, was based upon the fact that they disliked the Bill for which the time was now asked; but they seemed to forget that the Bill was but a temporary measure, while the Bill dealing with the Land Laws of Ireland would be permanent in its character, as soon as they could get at it, and he hoped it would go to the root of the Irish land grievances.

MR. CALLAN: Has the hon. Member any authority for making this statement?

MR. J. W. PEASE said, he was only repeating what had been said by the Chief Secretary. The present measures were not such as those described by the hon. Member for Ennis, for they touched the Press. This Bill did not touch the Press. This Bill, it was true, granted great powers to the Lord Lieutenant in cases of treason and treason-felony; but in the case of agrarian crime the warrant of the Lord Lieutenant could only run in districts already proclaimed. What were hon. Members afraid of? Were they afraid of being arrested? He could not help thinking that the manner in which the Irish Representatives were trying to avoid dealing with this great matter, which the country was resolved to deal with, was awakening in the minds of the most Radical Englishmen feelings of antagonism to the Irish people. They came to the House upon a summons from Her Majesty the Queen, in order that they might deal with questions affecting Ireland; and, so far as the Coercion Bill was concerned, he looked upon it as a measure which would be limited in its operations by the fact that they had a public Press, and that the House of Commons itself would rigorously watch the operations of a Government intrusted with the power which the passing of such an Act would bestow upon it. Those whom the Irish Members agreed in describing as wild and unthinking people would be the persons to be arrested. Irish Members were apparently trying to avoid dealing with the graver matters which lay behind. Delay was the natural consequence of their policy, and he had received letters from his constituents deploring it. The liberties of the people of Ireland must be protected against misadventure by taking up the "village tyrants" whom, at present, as the Chief Secretary said, there was no evidence to convict.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I rise to Order. There must be the same measure of Order for one side as for the other. The hon. Member opposite is referring to a discussion which took place the other night; and you, Sir, have already ruled that course to be out of Order on the part of the Irish Members.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member was referring to the debate of last night he was clearly out of Order.

MR. J. W. PEASE would only add that the Irish Members would best consult the interests of their country by voting for the proposals of the Government, and so expediting the consideration of a remedial measure of a permanent character.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it appeared to him that there was a preliminary question which was of sufficient importance to engage the attention of the House; and he could not help thinking that in the future the course adopted that evening would be looked back to with surprise by those acquainted with the history and past characteristics of the House. The proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister was one which he believed was entirely without precedent in the Records of the proceedings of that House; and it certainly did appear to him an extraordinary thing that the right hon. Gentleman should not have felt it incumbent upon him to have introduced some precedent for the line of conduct he had taken. He proposed that all the Business of the House should be postponed in order that coercive legislation for Ireland should be introduced and passed through the House as quickly as possible. He, however, thought the right hon. Gentleman would find it exceedingly difficult to justify that proposal by any similar proposal in the history of the House. In the natural order of things Notices of Motion given by hon. Members even sitting on his side of the House would and should have taken precedence, yet after a number of these had been already put upon the Paper, the right hon. Gentleman placed his Notice upon the Paper, and it was at once given precedence. He knew that the words "Business of the House" placed at the head of it furnished a colourable pretext; but, at the same time, he ventured to say that, as far as he had been able to investigate precedents of the House on the point, precedence in the past had only been given in cases in which the Notices referred to Business of the day. Yet the Prime Minister now proposed to affect the whole course of the Business of the House for an indefinite period. Such a proposal was at direct variance with the traditions and with the ancient character of the House. The Motion itself involved a suspension of Standing Orders. The Standing Orders of that House, however, had been arrived at after long experience and investigation, and yet they were now at convenience to be set aside. The right hon. Gentleman only made the Motion in the terms in which it was given upon the Paper; but, if for no other reason than that he (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) belonged to the minority of the House, he felt it incumbent on him to rise in his place, and protest against a Motion which was aimed at the rights of the minority. He wished to quote the opinion of, and the language of, one of the most illustrious and enlightened men that ever occupied the honourable position of Speaker in the House. Mr. Speaker Onslow, speaking on that very point, said that—

> "Nothing tended more to throw the power into the hands of Administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of or departure from the Rules and Orders of the House—That the forms of proceeding, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and controul on the actions of Ministry; and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority, against the attempts of power."—[*Hatsell*, ii. 237.]

If Mr. Speaker Onslow had been Speaker at the present time he could not have more fittingly described the present position of affairs. A learned commentator, Mr. Jeremy Bentham, who was a respected Member of that House, in commenting upon the remarks of Mr. Speaker Onslow, said—

> "This maxim is certainly true, and it is founded on good sense, as it is always in the power of a majority to stop any improper measure proposed by their opponents. The only weapon by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the Forms and Rules of proceedings which have been adopted as they have been found necessary from time to time, and have become Standing Orders of the House, by a strict adherence to which either Party can be alone protected from those irregularities and abuses which those Forms are intended to check, and which the wantonness of power has but too often suggested to large and successful majorities."

No language could more aptly describe the majority on the Opposition side of the House than the words of Mr. Bentham. The right hon. Gentleman was endeavouring to establish a most dangerous precedent by threatening the freedom of discusssion in the House, and by interfering with the freedom and the rights of minorities in that House. They were invited by the Prime Minister to make way for the introduction and passing through of a measure which was at present only within the sphere of possibility; and he thought it most unadvisable to attempt to scramble Bills of the importance of this one through the

House. Jeremy Bentham said that the advantage of reiterated debates was maturity in the deliberations arising from the opportunities given to a great number of persons speaking on different days after they had profited by what they had heard in the previous debates. Adopting Mr. Bentham's argument in favour of continued debates, he maintained that the English public were not fully informed, and had not the means of being informed, on Irish affairs. Another point in the same argument was that it was a precaution against the effect of eloquence, which might enable a speaker to obtain votes. He was prepared to admit that the right hon. Gentleman last evening did produce a great effect with his eloquence; but he was perfectly convinced, having examined that speech more fully on the following day, that there was hardly a point in it that did not admit of the most complete refutation. That furnished a proof of the value of Mr. Bentham's argument. Fourthly, that argument held that it was necessary for the protection of the minority that they should have different periods in which to state their opinions. In the interests of legislation itself, in the interest of the minority existing in the House, in the interests of freedom of discussion in the future, in the interests of the House and of the country, he trusted the Government would hesitate before they forced a decision on this proposal, which involved so grievous a departure from past history and the spirit and character of the proceedings of the House, and which was fraught with so much danger. In order to furnish an opportunity for this question to be settled, he would take refuge in a Motion, the only one that he believed was admissible on the present occasion, and he therefore begged to move—"That the Orders of the Day be now read."

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY, in seconding the Amendment, said, he perfectly agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that the affairs of Ireland ought to be discussed in that House without interruption from any other Business. It would not be decent to do otherwise. The state of things in Ireland was so extraordinary and deplorable that it was the duty of the House to try, by every means, and as soon as possible, to bring it to a more satisfactory condition. Neither landlords, tenants, nor the commercial community were benefited by the present state of affairs. His best wish was that Her Majesty's Government should make speed in settling it and bringing back peace and harmony to the country. But what were the evils which Her Majesty's Government desired to remedy? They were told, and it had not been contradicted, that the Common and Statute Law of the country was at present in abeyance in Ireland, and that another law proceeding from, and administered by another authority, was taking its place. That had not been denied; and it was against such a state of things, more than against any outrages resulting from it, that the measures of the Government were directed. But suppose Her Majesty's Government succeeded, as they ultimately would succeed, in passing those measures; what he feared was that disorders of another and more dangerous kind might take the place of those which existed at present, as the direct result of the proposals of the Government. Therefore, he hesitated to give those proposals precedence over others which ought to be laid before the House. The Government had, through the mouth of the Prime Minister, pressed the House to give precedence to this measure, on the ground that by delaying it they delayed those Land Reforms that the Chief Secretary had said were so necessary for the peace of Ireland. That was a reason given for the coercion measure being disposed of. But he urged, in the first place, that, in order to prevent that injustice which inevitably would be done to a multitude of tenants pending the passing of the Land Act, they should give the precedence not to the Coercion Bill, but to the Land Bill. If the reform were an adequate one, if the Government dealt with the question thoroughly and reasonably, then he ventured to say that as soon as that Bill became the law of the land there would be no necessity for passing a Coercion Bill, even for a week. He should support any Amendment that would give precedence to a measure of Land Reform over a Coercion Bill, believing the latter to be unnecessary, unjust, and impolitic, and not at all adequate to put down the agitation in the form it had assumed, and that it was a measure that would be dangerous to peace in Ireland.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. P. J. SMYTH said, he hoped that the House would not hastily accept the Motion of the Prime Minister, inasmuch as it involved the important principle of representative government, which required that Members should meet together to discharge their duties to their constituents. That principle was abridged, if not abrogated, by the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. The right of Members of that House was not merely to support or oppose Government measures; but themselves to initiate measures they might deem to be of public utility, and if that right of initiation were taken away popular representation became a shadow. The power of legislation would, in fact, become vested in an oligarchy. In the reign of the present Sovereign any encroachment by the Crown upon the privileges of the Commons was happily impossible; but it seemed there could be a usurpation by the Cabinet of the functions of the Legislature. The House of Commons was asked by the Prime Minister's Resolution to begin by coercing itself, in order that it might end in coercing Ireland. On the Order Paper for the following day there were half-a-dozen Bills relating to different parts of the United Kingdom. If the Resolutions of the right hon. Gentleman were carried, those Bills would probably be shelved for the Session; and, to that extent, a number of constituencies would be virtually disfranchised. Amongst the Bills was one in which he felt a personal interest, and in which the Chief Secretary was not without a feeling of personal interest. He alluded to the Local Inquiries (Ireland) Bill, which was one dealing with Private Bill legislation. That Bill was discussed last year, and the opinion expressed was unanimously in its favour. Although no division was taken upon it, an assurance was given on the part of the Government that it should engage their earnest and immediate attention. He should like to ask, was it quite fair that he should be deprived of an opportunity of testing the sense of the House of Commons on the second reading of that Bill?

Mr. DALY regarded the Resolution as a grave interference with the rights of Members, and it had a graver and more serious aspect, as evincing a desire on the part of the Government to impose silence on the minority. He asked, was there any use in sending men to Parliament at all, if they were not allowed a fair expression of their views? If they assented to the proposal of the Premier it would be establishing a very bad precedent, which would affect not only Irish but English people; and he asked that English Members of the House would regard it in that light, and would not assent to the proposal merely for the sake of the temporary advantage they might gain in overcoming the resistance of the Irish Members. He now came to what made this question a dangerous one in his eyes. The measure which the Government wished to introduce was one which he considered most unwise and impolitic—one which was wrong in itself, and which was merely the commencement of bad legislation for Ireland. It was a measure which was to enable the Lord Lieutenant or Chief Secretary for Ireland to arrest on reasonable suspicion persons for treasonable offences, or for offences against law and order; but on what did the Lord Lieutenant or Chief Secretary found their reasonable suspicion? The only means they had of forming an opinion was from the official Reports, and the official Reports were the Reports supplied by the police of the districts, assisted, in some degree, by the resident magistrates, to the Irish Executive. He maintained that such information must necessarily be tainted, because there lay at the bottom of the persons giving the imformation a tendency to exaggerate the offences. The promotion of a policeman rested in the resident magistrate; and, therefore, it was natural to expect that the police would exaggerate everything that occurred in the districts. It was upon information derived from such a tainted source that the Government proposed to introduce a measure by which personal liberty throughout Ireland was imperilled. A man in Ireland was rendered liable to be cast into prison for 18 months on the *ipse dixit* of the Lord Lieutenant or Chief

Secretary for Ireland; and that in itself was a sufficient reason for the Irish Members requiring that in passing a measure of that description there should be no departure from the ordinary Rules of that House. The Bill which the Government were about to introduce was no ordinary measure, for it was far more severe than the measures introduced in 1848 and 1866, inasmuch as it placed a greater power in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant or Chief Secretary—namely, that of arresting for offences against law and order. On such an occasion as this, he considered that the Liberal Members below the Gangway ought to take a more impartial view, and join hand in hand with the Irish Members in insisting that a measure of the description of the Coercion Bill should not be allowed by any departure from the ordinary Rules of the House to be hurriedly passed into law. He did not think that there was before the House evidence of any such overwhelming and paramount necessity as should induce them to go outside their ordinary forms and accept the proposition of the Prime Minister. Even their zeal to support the Government in maintaining law and order ought not to allow them to transgress the principles of the Constitution. He admitted that terrorism existed in Ireland; but he thought it had been exaggerated. Extra police had been sent down to the disturbed districts; and why, he asked, had the members of that force, if outrages were so rife, not succeeded in arresting more of the perpetrators in the very act? He believed that the police had looked upon themselves more as Government reporters of outrages than as real detectors of crime. In some instances, the police had even, he feared, gone the length of manufacturing outrages. In illustration of his argument, he might refer to a letter which appeared in a Cork newspaper, in which it was stated that a house, having quite accidentally taken fire, and the flames having been extinguished, the police arrived on the scene. They were informed of the facts, when a constable asked the owner of the house whether he had any connection with the Land League. The reply being in the negative, the constable suggested to the owner of the house that he would have no difficulty in getting consideration by only applying for it. The owner answered that his conscience revolted against such a thing. Nevertheless, he was visited afterwards by the police twice. *Ex uno disce omnes.* If any persons were to blame for the state of things existing in Ireland it was Her Majesty's Government. If they had proposed a fair and simple measure of justice some months ago they would have cut the ground from under the feet of the Land League, and the agitation would never have come to a head. But they had not had the courage to pass a Bill temporarily suspending evictions, accompanied, if they pleased, with compensation to those who might be injured by it. He did not think that the Government ought to be permitted to set aside the Forms of the House merely because they had shown incapacity and an incorrect appreciation of the situation. This measure had been aptly described as an engine for the collection of rent. That carried a dreadful meaning to the Irish tenants, for they knew that under the influence of that coercion the most terrible cruelties would fall upon the Irish peasant and his family. The Government know that this measure would result in unspeakable misery to the people of Ireland. The Irish Members had been asked why they delayed measures of relief by opposing this Bill. Now, in the first instance, Members had sought, and sought in vain, for an authoritative expression which would lead them to believe that the Government meant to introduce a good Land Bill for the country. It would be easy for the Government, without transgressing Ministerial etiquette, to give some hope to the Irish Members that they should not be always pleading in vain for that which was so essential to the welfare of the country. The hon. Member was proceeding to refer to M. Gambetta's treatment of the Communists, when——

MR. SPEAKER, interposing, said: I must remind the hon. Member that he is not keeping himself to the Question before the House.

MR. DALY said, he regretted he had offended; but it was the first time he had been called to Order. It was a reproach to the Government that they were now bringing forward, not remedial, but coercive measures for Ireland. He protested against the assault on the rights and liberties of the Irish people. When they were asked to support this 49th measure of coercion introduced in 50 years they had a right to remonstrate. He was one of those who were beginning to lose faith in Parliamentary representation. He protested against the fruitless and unjustifiable prosecutions which had been carried on at Bandon; and, calling the attention of the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland to the subject, he should like to ask what was the meaning of those prosecutions of respectable men, seeing that in every case the charges were so groundless that they were dismissed. The Government seemed desirous of establishing a reign of terror in Ireland. He had a strong feeling with regard to the manner in which urgency had been asked for; and, even at the risk of offending against the courtesies of the House, he would do his utmost to strain the Forms of the House so as to resist the proposal of the Government.

Mr. BARRY rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. BARRY was proceeding, when——

Mr. M'COAN said: I beg leave to ask the Solicitor General for Ireland if any confirmation has been received of a private telegram——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is entirely out of Order.

Mr. BARRY said, the Prime Minister had made out no case of urgency beyond this—that the Government thought it necessary to adopt the course which they had followed. The course adopted was an invasion of the privileges of private Members. The Prime Minister had not informed the House that there was any widespread crime in Ireland. On no other ground would it be justifiable to depart from the ordinary path, or to entertain coercive measures. The Returns laid upon the Table, so far from justifying the action of the Government, proved that there was a considerable diminution of agrarian crime in Ireland. During the last 14 days there had been only two cases of what was called agrarian outrage in Ulster. In Leinster there were four cases—all of them trivial; in Munster 12 or 14, and half of them threatening letters; and in Connaught there was a similar diminution. In the face of such facts as these, the proper and most sensible course for the Prime Minister to adopt would be to withdraw his Motion. He was well within the truth when he stated that the actual perpetrators of all agrarian offences would not number more than 500 persons. The Government had at its disposal 40,000 men, police and military; and was it not a burlesque for the Government, having already this force, to ask for extraordinary measures for the purpose of dealing with 500 disturbers of the peace? In the county he was connected with there was an utter absence of agrarian crime; last month there was only one case, and that was the writing of a threatening letter. It was said that there had been a great increase of such crime in Westmeath; but when the Returns were analyzed it was found that of 56 offences 47 were the sending of threatening letters, and nine were some other trivial offences. When the Government based their demands for concession of time on such grounds, Irish Members were justified in resisting. They knew well that the majority of Members had formed a foregone conclusion, and that the concession was wanted; not to discuss the measures, but simply to hurry them through the House. If Irish Members had to appeal to reason, and not to prejudice, they would gladly hasten discussion. So long as they knew the feeling which actuated the House they were bound to offer determined opposition. The proposed legislation would seriously affect 50,000 of the very poorest and most wretched of the population. The evidence of that was furnished by the utterances of landlords within the last few days. One had declared that he would immediately enforce evictions, and the most terrible consequences must ensue. No reasonable urgency had been shown by the Government, or he would readily have assented to the Motion of the Government.

Mr. BIGGAR warned the Government and some of the Radical Members below the Gangway on the Ministerial side of the House that the time might not be far distant when the Tories might be in power, and when they might avail themselves, in a most inconvenient way, of the precedent the Liberals now sought to establish. For his own part, he was perfectly ashamed at the conduct of the Government in this matter. He had once been under the impression that there was some honest political principle in the Liberal Party; but the proposal now before the House had undeceived him, for he now found that they were ready to sacrifice the interests of truth and justice to the mere interests of Party. He was also thoroughly ashamed of the Radicals below the Gangway, as he had a right to expect that they, at any rate, would have placed principle before Party; but, except in a few honourable instances, he had been grievously disappointed. It was said that the Irish Members were injuring a good cause by their proceedings; but it was a strange thing, if that were so, that the appeal of the hon. Members for Ulster that remedial should precede coercive measures had as little influence as if it were made by the hon. Member for Cork. An hon. Member who represented a Welsh constituency charged them with wasting time. His reply was that the liberties of the Irish people were of much more importance than the time of the House, and that the Irish Members would be justified in occupying the time of the House until that day 12 months in stopping the nefarious projects of the Government. The hon. Member said his Welsh constituents were alarmed lest Parliament should be made ridiculous; but he thought the Gentleman who adopted that line of argument could hardly understand what Parliament was intended to do. In his opinion, it was intended to give Members an opportunity of expressing the feelings of their constituents; and it would become ridiculous if the Minister of the Crown were entitled to come down and say that such and such a measure should be adopted without giving the Members who were interested an opportunity of offering arguments against it.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that he is travelling from the Question before the House. The hon. Member must confine his remarks to that Question.

MR. BIGGAR said, he was simply replying to the observations of the hon. Member (Mr. Hussey Vivian), especially with reference to making the institution of Parliament ridiculous. They were all agreed that the majority should rule the minority; but it had often been found that the minority, although overpowered for the time, was in the right. Parliament had sometimes legislated in a panic, and in those cases the majority had turned out to be in the wrong, as an illustration of which he might mention the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. At the present time an outcry had been raised against the people of Ireland, based first on the falsehoods published in English newspapers, and next on the false statements made by the Irish landlords, which had caused the Government to believe that the state of Ireland was very different from what it really was. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had not shown any reason for passing a Coercion Bill; and, therefore, there was no real urgency for agreeing to the Motion before the House. If there were any urgent measures in the hands of the Government they should have been brought forward first, and, no doubt, the House would have dealt with them. Under the circumstances, it could not be said that the Government had acted in the most judicious manner. They were disgracing themselves as a political Party, and he could say with perfect candour that he was sorry to see the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster allied with a Government which made such an utterly unreasonable and indefensible proposition as that before the House. As to the question of coercion, they must sift all the evidence produced for it. The Irish Members were justified in going carefully through all the official Returns, and looking at them they were justified, too, in using all the means in their power to convince hon. Members—if they were open to conviction, and would not vote as the Leaders of Parties directed them—that coercion was not required in Ireland. He would, from time to time, give his reasons why Coercion Bills should not be proceeded with. The question of Land Reform was not now before the House, and they had no idea what Land Reforms the Government were going to propose; but he thought that the First Lord of the Treasury would have acted with far more judiciousness if he had introduced a Bill for that purpose first, and then, perhaps, the Irish Members would have compromised the matter, and would, though opposing coercion, have said less if the Land Bill had been satisfactory. He must not be misunderstood. A large proportion of his Colleagues would oppose coercion whether the Land Bill were satisfactory or not; but less time might have been occupied in opposing the views of a tyrannical majority. The statement made the other evening by the Prime Minister was not based on facts, but upon fraud and falsehood. ["Order!"] He was in Order. The Prime Minister said that terrorism prevailed in Ireland, and that the ordinary law was in abeyance; but that was not so. He did not impute to the right hon. Gentleman any statement which he did not believe; but the truth was the right hon. Gentleman had no opportunity of sifting the facts of the case—he was obliged to take a good deal upon hearsay, and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland might be said to be in the same position. Referring to statements made on the part of the magistrates of Cavan, the hon. Gentleman was about to produce some counter-evidence, when——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call on the hon. Gentleman to keep to the Question before the House. The details into which he is now entering might be in Order if referred to in the course of the adjourned debate on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but they are distinctly out of Order on the Motion now before the House.

Mr. BIGGAR said, his object was to show that the basis on which the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government rested his Motion, that all other Business should be postponed until these Coercion Bills were passed into law, had no foundation. He wished to show that no Coercion Bill was necessary, because the whole of the case of the Government was founded upon fraud and falsehood. He undertook to do this before he sat down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The observations which the hon. Member is now making are out of Order.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he would not refer to the case of any particular landlord; but he wished to show that the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, on the authority of certain magistrates, was entirely contrary to the statement which was made by persons of influence and importance in the county of Cavan, who had quite as good an opportunity of knowing what the facts were as the magistrates in question. He wished further to show that no real case had been made out for the proposition which was now before the House. He held in his hand a declaration from the Town Commissioners of——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must insist upon the hon. Member keeping himself to the Question before the House.

Mr. BIGGAR: May I ask you, Sir, as a point of Order, whether or not I am justified in showing that in point of fact——

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member proceeds with his address I shall not interrupt him so long as he keeps to the Question before the House. But if he wanders from that Question it is my duty to interrupt him; and I must, therefore, insist on the hon. Member confining himself to the Question.

Mr. BIGGAR: I wish to speak to a point of Order. May I ask what is the point of Order before the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member continues to disregard my authority I shall have but one course to pursue.

Mr. BIGGAR: I have not the slightest intention, Sir, of setting your ruling at defiance; but I wish to know what is the point of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I call upon the hon. Member to proceed with his address, and to keep himself to the Question before the House. If he conforms to the Rules of the House I certainly shall not interrupt him; but if he is out of Order I shall consider it my duty to interpose.

Mr. BIGGAR: May I be allowed to say, without wasting further time, that I have had from different parts of the county of Cavan a declaration that the statement of the magistrates of Cavan which I have read is entirely contrary to the fact. I will do more, Mr. Speaker, I will show that this declaration, which is signed as I have mentioned, is not consistent with the facts, and that the statement as to the alleged outrages is untrue. This I can show from the published Blue Book.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has been repeatedly called to Order by me, and he insists on pursuing the line of argument which I have informed him more than once—several times in fact—is out of Order. I have now only one course to take, and that is to Name the hon. Member. I now Name you, Mr.

Biggar, as disregarding the authority of the Chair.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: After what, Sir, you have stated, and after what has happened, it will be my duty to move that Mr. Biggar be suspended from the service of the House during the remainder of this day's Sitting.

Motion made, and Question put, "That Mr. Biggar be suspended from the service of the House during the remainder of this days' sitting."—(*Mr. W. E. Forster.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 160; Noes 30: Majority 130. [B.M.]

AYES.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Alexander, Colonel C.
Allen, H. G.
Archdale, W. H.
Armitstead, G.
Arnold, A.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Aylmer, Capt. J. E. F.
Baldwin, E.
Balfour, Sir G.
Balfour, J. B.
Barnes, A.
Barran, J.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Biddulph, M.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Bolton, J. C.
Bradlaugh, C.
Brand, H. R.
Brassey, H. A.
Brett, R. B.
Bright, rt. hon. J.
Brinton, J.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, rt. hon. Lord C.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Burt, T.
Caine, W. S.
Campbell, J. A.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Carbutt, E. H.
Cartwright, W. C.
Causton, R. K.
Cheetham, J. F.
Churchill, Lord R.
Clarke, J. C.
Coddington, W.
Compton, F.
Corry, J. P.
Cotes, C. C.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Craig, W. Y.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, J. K.
Cunliffe, Sir R. A.
Davenport, H. T.
Davey, H.
Davies, R.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Donaldson-Hudson, C.
Duckham, T.
Duff, rt. hon. M. E. G.
Ewing, A. O.
Fairbairn, Sir A.
Fawcett, rt. hon. H.
Feilden, Major-General R. J.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fowler, H. H.
Fry, T.
Gardner, R. Richardson-
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Glyn, hon. S. C.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gorst, J. E.
Gourley, E. T.
Grafton, F. W.
Grant, A.
Grant, Sir G. M.
Greer, T.
Gregory, G. B.
Harcourt, rt. hon. Sir W. G. V. V.
Hastings, G. W.
Hay, rt. hon. Admiral Sir J. C. D.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henderson, F.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hill, T. R.
Holker, Sir J.
Holms, J.
Hope, rt. hn. A. J. B. B.
Hutchinson, J. D.
Illingworth, A.
Inderwick, F. A.
James, W. H.
Jenkins, D. J.
Johnson, E.
Johnson, W. M.
Joicey, Colonel J.
Laing, S.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leake, R.
Leatham, W. H.
Lee, H.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Leigh, hon. G. H. C.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lloyd, M.
Lowther, hon. W.
Mackie, R. B.
Maclver, P. S.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Intyre, Æneas J.
Mappin, F. T.
Milbank, F. A.
Moss, R.
Mundella, rt. hon. A. J.
Murray, C. J.
Newport, Viscount
Nicholson, W. N.
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
Norwood, C. M.
Onslow, D.
Paget, T. T.
Parker, C. S.
Pease, J. W.
Pemberton, E. L.
Playfair, rt. hon. L.
Powell, W. R. H.
Pugh, L. P.
Pulley, J.
Ramsay, J.
Rathbone, W.
Reed, Sir C.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Reid, R. T.
Repton, G. W.
Roberts, J.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, M. D.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Stanton, W. J.
Stevenson, J. C.
Story-Maskelyne, M. H.
Summers, W.
Tennant, C.
Thomasson, J. P.
Thompson, T. C.
Tillett, J. H.
Trevelyan, G. O.
Verney, Sir H.
Walter, J.
Warton, C. N.
Watney, J.
Waugh, E.
Webster, Dr. J.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Wiggin, H.
Willis, W.
Wills, W. H.
Wilson, I.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolff, Sir H. D.
Woodall, W.
Woolff, S.

TELLERS.

Grosvenor, Lord R.
Kensington, Lord

NOES.

Barry, J.
Biggar, J. G.
Byrne, G. M.
Callan, P.
Corbet, W. J.
Daly, J.
Dawson, C.
Gray, E. D.
Healy, T. M.
Lalor, R.
Leahy, J.
Leamy, E.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Coan, J. C.
Marum, E. M.
Metge, R. H.
Molloy, B. C.
Moore, A.
Nolan, Major J. P.
O'Connor, A.
O'Donnell, F. H.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Gorman Mahon, Col. The
O'Kelly, J.
O'Shaughnessy, R.
O'Sullivan, W. H.
Power, R.
Smithwick, J. F.
Smyth, P. J.
Synan, E. J.

TELLERS.

Finigan, J. L.
Sexton, T.

The numbers having been declared—

MR. SPEAKER said: Observing the hon. Member for Cavan in his place, I must point out to him that, in obedience to the vote of the House, he must now withdraw.

MR. BIGGAR withdrew accordingly.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. HEALY begged to move the adjournment of the debate. He had thought that some hon. Member of the Party with which he had the honour to act would have taken the course which he had felt it his duty to take. He proposed that until the debate was rehabilitated by the return of that Member of the House who had just retired, they should not pursue—and certainly, he for one, should not have any part in pursuing—the debate upon the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. He merely desired to say that that Party with which he acted was in this House a very small minority. No doubt, English Members had always liked to deal with small minorities. ["Oh, oh!"] They had never in the whole course of their experience dared to face their match. ["Oh, oh!" *and* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has stated that he proposes to move the adjournment of the House. In doing that he is bound to confine himself to that Question, and to the Motion moved by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. HEALY observed, that until the Irish Members had every available Member of their Party in his place, they declined to go on with the discussion of the Resolution. If the Party was to be crippled by suspensions of this kind, although it might suit hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite to go on, the Irish Members intended to resist the tactics resorted to, and to show by moving adjournments the spirit in which they regarded them. He was very glad that the Prime Minister, who was not in his place when the Motion for suspending the hon. Member for Cavan was made, was now present.

MR. SPEAKER: I must again remind the hon. Member that he is not speaking to the Question before the House. The suspension of the hon. Member for Cavan is not the Question before the House.

MR. HEALY said, the House, as the Speaker was aware, was precluded upon the Motion for the suspension of a Member from raising a discussion. He, therefore, humbly ventured to lay before the House some reasons why he asked for the rehabilitation of the debate. ["Order!"] If he was not in Order the Speaker would call him to Order. He had stated that he felt, in spite of the painfulness of the situation, some satisfaction that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had not to play the odious part of executioner on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already cautioned the hon. Member twice to speak to the Question before the House. He is not now speaking to the Question before the House.

MR. HEALY said, that as it appeared to be such a limited question—["Order!"]—and as hon. Gentlemen opposite were exhibiting their usual intolerance, he would content himself with moving the adjournment of the debate.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY seconded the Motion for adjournment, and said he would be glad if it were carried, in order that hon. Members might, on a future occasion, come in a less excited mood to the consideration of the main question. It was unfortunate that the incident which had just occurred had taken place when very few Members were present. He himself was not in the House at the time, and, therefore, did not know in what way the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) had offended. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now making observations which call in question the vote just given by the House. He is not entitled to question that vote. I must call upon him to speak to the Question before the House. He is not now speaking to that Question.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he had no intention of calling in question the vote just given by the House. He asked for the indulgence of the House while he made a few observations on what he understood had taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: Any observations bearing on the vote just taken by this House will be out of Order. Do I understand the hon. Member seconds the Motion for the adjournment of the debate?

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY: Yes, Sir.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Healy.*)

MR. O'DONNELL said, he supported the Motion for adjournment. The Prime Minister had that evening made a demand for urgency with a view to impose restrictions on the liberties of the

Irish people. Charges were adduced against Irish constituencies in support of that demand, and the Irish constituencies would require that their Representatives should have the fullest opportunity of pointing out the errors and falsehoods which were to be found in the statement on the faith of which the freedom of even the smallest Irish constituency was sought to be curtailed. What were the so-called proofs at the disposal of the Government? They were merely the statements poured into Dublin Castle and repeated in that House by the mouthpiece of Dublin Castle, the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant —statements of the same character as the notorious Memorial of the magistrates of Cavan, which was an insolent misrepresentation of the state of the county. If there was any voice entitled to be heard in behalf of the people of Cavan it was surely that of their duly elected Representative, of whose valuable services that House had just been deprived.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is the Resolution moved by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. The hon. Member is wandering very widely from that Question, and I must call upon him to adhere strictly to it.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he understood that he had risen to speak to the adjournment of the debate; and without referring to the nature of the accident which had deprived the House of one of its Members—["Order!"]—it must be regretted that the absence of an important witness to the condition of a considerable part of Ireland——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is calling in question a vote of this House.

MR. O'DONNELL: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I must warn the hon. Member that if he proceeds with that line of argument he will be disregarding the authority of the Chair.

MR. O'DONNELL disclaimed all intention of disregarding an authority which they were all bound to hold in such high esteem; but he must repeat that the liberties even of the smallest constituency should not be trampled upon without the greatest care and deliberation. The hon. Member for Cavan had been desirous of calling attention to a statement which had been drawn up by certain influential inhabitants of that county in contradiction of the statements made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The suspension of the hon. Member for Cavan had the effect of closing the mouth of the hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is again calling in question a vote of the House.

MR. O'DONNELL begged to assure Mr. Speaker that such was not the case. He was strictly speaking to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, and he had not the slightest intention of questioning the decision of the House. There was quite enough objectionable matter in the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister to occupy their attention without wandering to any other subject, however important that might be. It really amounted to an endeavour to close the mouths of the Irish Representatives. If he put on the Paper for Wednesday or Friday an important Motion, virtually affecting the interests of his constituents, he would not, if the Motion of the Prime Minister were carried, be able to open his mouth on the question to which his Motion referred, because the Government had appropriated the nights usually devoted to private Members for the purpose of facilitating coercion. Her Majesty's Liberal Administration might imagine that the weapon they were forging was one to be reserved for their own delectation and their own particular use; but when Liberalism laid the foundation of despotism, why should not the Party whose antecedents more inclined them to make use of such a weapon take advantage of Liberal precedents in order to complete that work which, a couple of Sessions ago, was described as the establishment of Cæsarism in these Realms? The coming Cromwell would find this weapon ready to his hand, though he could scarcely use it more despotically than the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. In these circumstances, it seemed to be the duty of private Members to save the Liberal Government from itself; to prevent it from turning tail to its old traditions. He concluded, from the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, that the Government itself had not yet had time to master the whole facts of the case. A few sentences were all he had to say for his extraordinary Motion. His golden voice soon stopped, and the great champion of all the liberties had little or nothing to say in defence of his proposal to suspend the liberties of Irish Members and the rights of the Irish people. It was the duty of the Government, in making such a proposal, to state clearly and fully their whole case. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman deliver his *apologia pro vitâ suâ?* He could have had no more splendid opportunity for exhibiting the most extraordinary results of his gifted genius. The right hon. Gentleman not only left them without arguments, but without the presence of the Ministerial Party. The Government were not entitled to make this demand on the forbearance of Irish Members. The Blue Book which had been circulated that morning could not be studied with that minute care which it required to enable them to criticize the proposals of the Government. The Irish Members had superior information upon the affairs of Ireland, and could point out the hollowness of the Government case. He therefore appealed to the House, in all impartiality and fair play, to give them and the constituencies they represented a full opportunity of stating their grievances. The greatest and most solemn principles of Irish liberty were at stake. "Force was no remedy" was the parrot-cry of Liberalism the other day; force was the only remedy a Liberal Government were prepared to give to-day. He appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober. He appealed from the Liberal Party intoxicated by the wine of an unexpected triumph—and the most adulterated wine they drank to the dregs, if the Reports of Election Commissions were to be believed—he appealed from them to the same Party in a more sober mood to allow time for the study of the Blue Book which had been sent round only that morning, so that Irish Members might have an opportunity of exposing the falsehood by which the liberties of Ireland were sought to be overwhelmed. By the memory of all that was great and glorious in their history, he appealed to hon. Members. If they felt a noble spirit within them, why not assume that there was a noble spirit in the breast of that race which had given them their ablest generals and noblest soldiers in many a gallant fight and many a desperate charge. [*Laughter.*] The reference to those glorious deeds was received in mocking tones by the Liberal Members opposite. When Sir Charles Napier cried—"Magnificent Tipperary!" on an Indian field, he did not expect that that would be the response to a reference to Irish valour. He trusted the would-be recruits of Her Majesty's Army in Ireland would not read of those mocking shouts of the Liberal Members. Would Her Majesty's Government enter into a detailed account of the reasons which induced them to bring forward their extraordinary measures, for he did not call reasons such statements as that that unknown person had been terrified, or that heroic persons, wearing the uniform of Her Majesty, were afraid to come forward, and state that they authorized their friends to say that they were witnesses of a particular occurrence. He had risen to support the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, and he had entered more fully into the matter than he thought would be necessary when the Motion was first made. When the demand for more time and fair play came from the lips of an Irish Representative, he trusted that some English Liberal Members would be found to support it.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I must say it was an act of Christian charity on the part of the hon. Member to remind us, just before sitting down, that he had risen to support the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, for if he had not reminded us we should be at a loss to know for what purpose he had risen. He indulged in such flights of imagination, travelled over such wide fields of thought, and altogether accomplished a distance almost so immeasurable from the subjects before us—looking at them in a practical point of view—that it would not be easy to find the connection between the strain of his impassioned speech and the somewhat homely Motion that this debate be now adjourned. I must say, however, there was one astonishing thing accomplished by the hon. Gentleman. The hon. Gentleman contrived to do that which, before his rising, I should have believed to be totally impossible. He contrived to make an allusion to the valour of Irishmen, and to the services which they had rendered to this country in the field, without eliciting from this House an expression of pure and enthusiastic sympathy. I did not believe it would have been possible to achieve anything of the kind; but he contrived to do it by the peculiar manner of his presentation of this subject to the House—a subject which of all subjects finds its way straightest to the heart and to the thoughts of every Englishman and Scotchman, as well as Irishman. The hon. Gentleman, having contrived to establish an invidious association between Irish valour and the general strain of his remarks, turned round upon the House and said, in effect—"This is the way in which you treat the services rendered by Irish valour." That is the only remark that I shall pass on that portion of the hon. Member's speech. The hon. Gentleman supports the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. What are his arguments? I did not rise at the first moment, because I was anxious to know whether a fair plea could be addressed to our understanding in support of the proposition. To what did the arguments of hon. Gentlemen amount to? In part they were irrelevant, and in part destructive of the proposition itself. They were irrelevant in this respect. It has been established beyond all doubt, to our great regret, that a particular Member of this House cannot take part in what remains of the Sitting this evening. [*Cries of* "Order!"] It has been alleged, on account of his absence from the debate——

Mr. O'DONNELL: I rise to Order, Mr. Speaker. Any attempt by an Irish Member, which was understood by you, Sir, to refer to that question, was ruled to be out of Order; and, in the discharge of your duty, you peremptorily forbade any reference to that matter. As a point of Order, therefore, I object to the right hon. Gentleman assuming anything in regard to what had to remain unspoken.

Mr. GLADSTONE: If you, Sir, correct me I shall stand corrected.

The O'DONOGHUE: I rise to Order. I believe that you, Sir, were rising from your seat when the right hon. Gentleman also rose. ["Order!"] I am perfectly in Order. I have risen to Order. I wish to ask the Chair for its decision. You were about to rise, Sir, when the right hon. Gentleman assumed that you were not going to do so. I now venture to appeal to you for your decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that it is not in Order to call in question a vote of this House; but I did not understand the right hon. Gentleman to do so.

Mr. HEALY: I wish to say a word upon the point of Order. You have ruled, Mr. Speaker, that as long as any hon. Member made a reference to the recent incident which occurred in this House, and did not propose to challenge the ruling of the Chair, he would so long be in Order. The right hon. Gentleman appears to take that course. ["Order!"] I am speaking on a point of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of Order to which the hon. Member is now referring has already been determined.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I made no reference whatever to the matters which you had ruled out of Order, in referring to an argument which had been made, and which was perfectly in Order—namely, the argument that in consequence of the absence of a particular Member, this House was disabled from pursuing, with full advantage, a particular subject in which the interests of the constituents of that hon. Member were supposed to be specially involved. That argument was not, in the slightest degree, affected by your ruling, seeing that it did not question the vote of the House; and I was perfectly in Order in referring to it as an argument, though I am bound to say it is perfectly worthless, because it would amount to this, if it were to be prosecuted to its logical sequence, it would be pronounced unreasonable, that whenever an incident of this kind happens—which we must all regret—the House should pay the penalty of being totally precluded from proceeding with its Business as regarded that particular discussion. Let me, therefore, dismiss it with that observation. Well, the other argument of the hon. Gentleman—if, indeed, there was an argument to be discovered in the midst of his redundant declamation—was this, if you would only give him the opportunity, he would show how false were the statements, how untrustworthy were the statistics, how worthless were the arguments and the reasonings upon which my right hon. Friend near me had founded his proposition last night. But that is exactly the opportunity we want to give him. The whole charge against us is that we want to give him that opportunity, without stint and without limit; and that we have even requested private Members of this House, for a time, to abate their peculiar privileges, in order that the hon. Gentleman may enjoy, in a measure never before afforded to him, the means of making his case known. That is the case for the adjournment of the discussion; and, as Leader of the House, wishing to preserve, above all things, the good humour of this debate, I must say I think I am not over-stating the matter when I say that a portion of the reasoning of the hon. Gentleman was wholly irrelevant, and the remainder is utterly self-destructive.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 35; Noes 269: Majority 234.—(Division List, No. 10.) [B.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GRAY, in rising to move the adjournment of the House, said, he was very glad to learn from so high an authority as the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that it was perfectly in Order to discuss, on a Motion of that kind, the question whether it was desirable to continue the discussion on the Main Question before the House in view of the incident which they all regretted so much, and which had just occurred in the suspension of one of their brother Members. In view of what had occurred previous to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, he (Mr. Gray) was of opinion that that was, in fact, the real question; and it was the only question which induced him, as an individual, to move the Motion he now proposed to the House. He was very glad that that question might, upon that Motion, be fairly brought before the House. He certainly should endeavour to keep free from the censure of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair, because he should be very sorry to incur it by questioning the previous decision of the House, and he had no idea whatever of questioning the propriety of that decision, although it was notorious that four-fifths of the Members who came to decide it knew nothing whatever of the merits of the question. ["Oh, oh!"] It seemed to be the function of hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Benches below the Gangway on the Liberal side to interrupt, no matter whether the speaker was a Liberal or a Conservative; but really that was a sufficiently grave question to induce hon. Members, even though they were in the irresponsible position of sitting below the Gangway, at least to listen for a few minutes while a small minority, placed in a very invidious, and to many of them, certainly himself, in a very painful position, pleaded for what they considered to be rights of the most vital character. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, and which he had himself stated to be of supreme importance, was a very simple one—namely, that day by day they should sit until they should take away every shred of Constitutional liberty from every man living in Ireland. The proposal of the Government was a very short and a very simple one. It was that the liberty of every man in Ireland should be placed for 18 months at the absolute discretion of two men. He supposed that, in the United Kingdom, there was not a man who commanded, or who more deservedly commanded, the respect, the confidence, and the affection of the people than the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House; but he would ask hon. Gentlemen sitting above and below the Gangway upon that side of the House whether, if it was suggested that the rights and liberties of every man in England should be committed to the absolute discretion of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, high as was their regard for him, and great as was their confidence in his discretion, his honour, and his patriotism, what would they say to such a suggestion? If this proposed measure of the right hon. Gentleman passed, its result, as they all knew, would be that in a fortnight or three weeks the liberty of every man in Ireland would be gone; and he (Mr. Gray), when he returned to Dublin in a month's time, would have no guarantee that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland would not order him to be sent to prison for 18 months. There was no man inside or outside the House upon whose honour he would place more reliance; but suppose a proposal to place his (the Chief Secretary's) liberty at his (Mr. Gray's) discretion for 18 months, or that any man should have the right to lock him up, even as an untried prisoner, with or without the plank bed and the other amenities with which up to the present they had treated their political prisoners, he wondered what would be thought. And if an hon. Member of the House, on the preliminary discussion of such a question as that, endeavoured to bring forward evidence to show that some of the proofs upon which the Government relied in making out their case for withdrawing all liberty from 5,500,000 people for a long period were not well founded, and should not be accepted as gospel, even although he might not put his case as artistically or as skilfully as the more experienced speakers on the Treasury Bench, surely that should be no reason why he should be suspended from his right of speech. Would hon. Members, then, think it very unreasonable that his Colleagues should ask for a little time, until he was given an opportunity again of bringing forward his case, feeble and poor, and unworthy of their consideration though it might be? That was their position now. The Liberals and Conservatives were a united band of brothers in their determination to withdraw liberty from Ireland. Now that they, who had never voted together before, found themselves arm in arm together to crush some 40 or 50 men, surely the knowledge of their power should incline them to use it with mercy. Surely, if the Irish Members sometimes lost their temper, and occasionally exhausted the patience of Parliament, most certainly there was some excuse for it. It was the opinion of the men with whom he acted that they should not barter away the rights of their countrymen for any concession whatever. It was not a question of expediency with them. It was not a question whether the Chief Secretary for Ireland would not be able to bring in such a good Bill on account of the resistance he met with. Their position was, that they were asked to sacrifice the rights of the Irish people in such a way that it was a matter of conscience to them to resist to the last. All that they asked was that the debate should not proceed until their little Party was again complete. They held that every argument capable of being adduced by the most insignificant Member of the Party should be heard; and though it was quite certain that the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) was out of Order, seeing that that was the ruling of the Chair——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is out of Order. He proposed to move the adjournment of the House, and he is bound to speak to that Question. He is now reviewing what has taken place in the House, and calling into question indirectly the vote of the House. He must confine himself strictly to the Question before the House.

MR. GRAY said, he was endeavouring to show that it was quite right that the House should adjourn until it was itself completed; and he should have thought that, on an occasion of such importance, hon. Members should not only not be unfair, but should avoid the slightest appearance of unfairness to the Irish Party. He did not wish to stand between the House and what it wished to consider; but he thought the present was an occasion when a point might be strained. It was on that ground that he appealed to the Government to allow some such Motion as that he had moved to be adopted, in order to avoid the slightest appearance of unfairness even to the most insignificant Member of the Irish Party.

MR. LALOR seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Gray.*)

MR. CALLAN said, it was desirable they should understand the position in which they stood. He had a Notice on the Paper for that evening with regard to Irish magistrates, the men in whose hands the House proposed to place unlimited power. He maintained that no case for urgency in the matter of coercion had been made out by the Prime Minister; and he desired to avail himself of this occasion to complain of the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He (Mr. Callan) had put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman on the previous day, and it would be in the recollection of the House——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite aware that in discussing questions that are not before the House he is altogether out of Order. He is bound to confine himself to the Question, and not to the Order Book of the House.

Mr. CALLAN: I was not referring to the Order Book of the House, but to a Question which I had given Notice of.

Mr. SPEAKER: If so, the hon. Member is clearly out of Order.

Mr. CALLAN, resuming, said, they might as well have the *clôture* instituted at once, for that was what the action of the Government amounted to in silencing the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). He should support the Motion for adjournment in consequence of the intolerance of the Radical section of the House, if for no other reason.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, it was clear that the House was not asked to adjourn for any of the usual reasons for that course, as they were only just approaching the hour at which that Motion was generally made. It would seem, then, that they were asked to adjourn because of the occurrence of what had been called a "melancholy event." In these circumstances, he felt bound to resist the Motion for the adjournment of the House. If there was an attempt to close the discussion upon the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, he (Mr. Mitchell Henry) would resist it; but he never had, and he trusted never would, do anything to reduce the House of Commons as a legislative and deliberative Assembly to contempt. The Motion for the adjournment was based upon the fact that an hon. Member, whose duty it was to observe the Rules of the House, had violated them. If that course was made a precedent, a Member would only have to conduct himself in a disorderly manner in order to have an appeal *ad misericordiam* brought before the House, and all Business be stopped. Against that policy he strongly protested. To do such a thing would be trifling with the interests of the country, and with the interests of all free Representative Legislatures in the world. He had left the House before the former division, because he had not understood what the Motion was, as he had not been present when the "melancholy event" referred to took place. But he would not countenance the procedure involved in the present Motion; and he should, therefore, vote against the adjournment.

Mr. DAWSON said, that in the few observations he proposed to make he should place himself unreservedly in the hands of the Speaker, and, by that means, endeavour to avoid the irregularities into which some of his hon. Friends had fallen. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had assumed that the measures which the Chief Secretary had proposed to introduce on the part of the Government were of a most urgent nature; but the right hon. Gentleman failed to show the urgency which he claimed. Many of the crimes which were alleged as creating the necessity for these measures were non-agrarian in their character.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to point out to the hon. Member that he appears to be replying to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who brought in the Bill. To refer to a past debate, as the hon. Member knows, is irregular; and I am bound to say that, although the observations which the hon. Member is now making on the speech of the right hon. Gentleman would be perfectly in order when the adjourned debate on the right hon. Gentleman's Motion is resumed, yet that, on the present occasion, that Question is not before the House. The hon. Gentleman is bound to confine himself to the Question immediately before the House.

Mr. DAWSON said, that what he wished to show was that the outrages were not so terrible in their character as they had been described by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Forster). It was not his wish to exasperate any hon. Member, much less to exasperate the Chair; and if the Speaker decided that when he was addressing the House he was not in Order in attacking the groundwork of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and that in so doing he was evading the Rules of debate, he would bow at once to the Speaker's decision. The proposal before the House was that the Irish people should give up their special liberties; that special powers should be placed at the disposal of the authorities; and it was further proposed that at such a time the rights of private Members should be suspended, and all their privileges wiped out. It was under these exceptional circumstances that he had desired to reply to the appeal of urgency put forward by the Prime Minister, because it was only a plea of urgency that would justify such a course of procedure. Was he not, therefore, in Order if he presumed to say that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, which hon. Members said was so terrible, was not terrible; that the statement which they said was urgent was not urgent; that the picture which had been painted in such terrible colours could not bear the test of examination. Was he not, therefore, within the Rules of the House if he said that, taking the alleged murders as a whole, the number was few; that if they took the maiming of human beings in 5,500,000 people during 12 months the total was only 10; that if they took the killing and maiming of cattle the total was only 100.

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is answering a speech which was made last night, and that he is not addressing himself to the Question now before the House. The observations which the hon. Member is now making would be perfectly relevant and in Order if made in the adjourned debate upon the Bill which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland proposes to introduce; but, in my opinion, the hon. Member is not in Order in making these observations upon the Motion at present before the House, which is simply to give preference to certain Bills over the other Orders of the Day.

MR. DAWSON remarked, that he had simply risen to speak to the question of urgency; and if the Speaker ruled that he could not show that urgency did not exist he bowed to the ruling. At the same time, he wished the House to understand that while he bowed to the ruling of the Chair he did so firmly convinced that when a case was said to be urgent, those who said it was not could get no opportunity of laying their views before the House. He should resume his remarks, and he intended them to be of a calm and business-like character. Indeed, he was prepared to go through every item of the right hon. Gentleman's statement which struck him as of importance; and, as he should not like to do that to an unwilling and irritated audience, which evinced no desire to listen to him, he should not press his "analysis" at present. He thought the Irish Members were justified, on the present occasion, in the opposition they were giving to the Government measures. They were measures of an extraordinary character, and they had been introduced on the ground of urgency. He was prepared to show that urgency did not exist; but it seemed that he could not proceed with his remarks, as they would be out of Order. He was a new Member of that House, and he had been under the impression that he was entering an atmosphere of freedom and fair play. He had, however, been very much struck indeed by the number and complexity of the trammels by which private Members were surrounded. He could only say that as he should have another opportunity he should certainly make use of it; and he should then be prepared to prove that there had been, upon so important an occasion, so baseless a case put before the House. He should be prepared to prove that the maiming of cattle, and the injuries to property, were not only of an ordinary, but, in some cases, of a very ridiculous aspect. He thought the House, when the proper time came, would be considerably surprised at the want of foundation and superstructure upon which the measures of the Government were based. At that moment he would not trouble the House further.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 34; Noes 277: Majority 243.—(Div. List, No. 11.) [11.55 B.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, that having vindicated their position so far by the two divisions which had now been taken, the Irish Members had no objection to resume the debate until the usual hour which the Government accepted for adjourning it. He opposed the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, because he considered it unprecedented to adjourn the ordinary Business of the House for the purpose of passing a Coercion Bill. So far as his acquaintance with Parliamentary history was concerned, he believed it was not in accordance with the practice of the House to have all the other Business put aside, except for the purpose of passing a Coercion Bill for Ireland. Before he became a Member of that House the Business was, he believed, suspended on one occasion, and a Coercion Bill passed through all its stages in both Houses of Parliament, and made law in less than three days. Her Majesty's Government could pride themselves at present on having the support of the Conservative Party in pushing forward their Coercion Bill for Ireland. They were quite sure of having that support, because the Conservative Party had always felt it their duty to vote in favour of a suspension of the liberties of the Irish people. Upon many questions of detail on other measures there would be strong battles between the Liberal and the Conservative Parties; but when it came to a question of coercing the Irish people it would be found that the English Members would be ready to bury the hatchet and walk as one man into the Lobby. He had already referred to the fact that at one time a Coercion Bill was passed in the course of three days; but at that time Ireland had only a few Representatives in the House of Commons to speak the wishes of the Irish people. He was glad to see surrounding him now on those Benches many men who would not tamely allow the liberties of the Irish people to be made away with in a few days, and it would be found that many weeks would be necessary before the Government would be able to do it. Her Majesty's Government said they required coercion for Ireland. What had been brought forward to show that. The Returns showed, at the most, 26 murders in Ireland during the last 12 months. According to *The Standard* of that morning, the coroner for one county in England had held 66 inquests during the past year, of which 9 were cases of murder, and 5 of manslaughter—while, for the whole of the 32 counties of Ireland, the Returns showed only 26 murders, and only 5 of them were agrarian outrages. Under these circumstances, if they wanted coercion at all, they required it for England, where, in one district, there had been 9 verdicts for murder and 5 for manslaughter, against 26 in the whole of the 32 counties of Ireland. What, then, was the meaning of this desire to suspend all the other Business of the House in order to bring in a Bill for the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland? It would be a better name to call it a Bill for depriving the Irish people of their rights and liberties, and not a Bill to preserve those rights and liberties and to protect their property. It was said that the control of these measures would be left to the Lord Lieutenant and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but he knew, from experience in 1867, that the liberties of the people were not left to the Lord Lieutenant, nor to the Chief Secretary, but were in the hands of every policeman, and of every police magistrate in Ireland, who carried them out with a vengeance. Many men were arrested and thrown into prison on the mere recommendation of a policeman, and seven or eight days elapsed before the Lord Lieutenant's warrant came down for their arrest. He maintained, without fear of contradiction, that if the Government brought in a good Land Bill instead of their measures of coercion it would be found that there was no necessity for coercion. If, however, they persisted in forcing the present measures through Parliament, every advantage would be taken of the Forms of the House to prevent them from becoming law. Coercion was not needed in Ireland; but he had no objection that the debate upon the Prime Minister's Resolution should now go on until half-past 12, when, in accordance with the usual practice, he presumed the debate would be adjourned. But, as a Representative of the Irish people, he warned the Government that, in the interests of those people, he should feel it his duty to oppose the present measures in all their stages, whether first, second, or third reading.

Mr. LEAMY said, the Prime Minister had expressed a hope, which he addressed to hon. Members for Ireland, as well as others, that the very grave and important Motion he had made would be considered with all possible speed. In the course of his remarks, he mentioned, also, the difference of opinion which existed between Her Majesty's Government and the Members of the Conservative Opposition, as to the time when the Motions for exceptional legislation should have been brought before the House. Several hon. Members were of opinion they should have been made some months since; while, on the other hand, the Government considered that they had not, at that time, sufficient grounds on which to rest the case; in fact, that the case at that time had not been made out. Now, the Irish Members had also their opinion upon this question, and they maintained that no case for coercion had been made out even at that moment; and upon that vital question he thought that the Liberal and Home Rule Members of this way of thinking had as much right to their opinion as either Her Majesty's Government or the Members of the Conservative Opposition. They believed that no case had been made out, and even the most hasty glance at the Return of agrarian crimes in Ireland, on which was based the case of the Government for coercion, would show that there were included therein offences of a most trivial character. Indeed, the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had at once ponited to two cases, one of which was the breaking of a pane of glass, and the other the cutting of a telegraph wire. It had been said, very truly, that such cases as these would be very misleading as causes for legislation in the direction proposed; and, supposing such small matters were taken out of the hurried Return furnished by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, it would be found that the total of crime for the year 1880 compared very favourably with those for other years. Again, the Return furnished for the present year also showed that there was a very marked decrease in crime as compared with other years. It would be argued that the intention of the Government to apply to the House for exceptional powers had had a deterrent effect upon the promoters of these crimes; but he thought it might be as truly stated that the hope of Land Reform had also produced a good effect. It had been primarily admitted, both in and outside the House, that agrarian crime sprang from, and was caused by, agrarian wrong, and it was the most natural thing that men who suffered such wrong should attempt, when all other just methods had failed to procure them relief, to redress it for themselves; and, failing that, try to take some vengeance on the wrong-doers. It was well known that for the last six years Irish tenants had been completely at the mercy of their landlords, and were cut off from all hope whatever; and they were at that moment also equally at the mercy of that class who had behind them an unjust law. The landlords had proved themselves to be stronger than the House of Commons, and had caused the rejection of the measures which had last year passed the House for the benefit of the tenantry of Ireland. After that, what wonder was it that some men should be driven to despair, and have recourse to violence, to prevent the action of a law which they believed to be harsh and unjust, and to deter landlords from putting it into force? If the right hon. Gentleman desired to see these crimes diminish, and finally disappear from Ireland, he should substitute for the law now existing some broad measure of Land Reform. If he would but do that, and show that the tenant in Ireland might safely lean on some power stronger than landlordism, there would be very little need for any measures of coercion. Irish Members believed that the most effectual way of getting rid of the evils complained of as existing in Ireland would be to get rid of the evils which had caused them. The Prime Minister had come down to the House and made a Motion of great import; but he had not thought it necessary, in putting forward that grave proposition, to deprive private Members of their Parliamentary rights and privileges, to offer any evidence in support of the application which he made. The right hon. Gentleman knew, of course, that such evidence would be required of him neither by his own immediate following nor by the Opposition, who were only afraid that the Motion would not be passed soon enough. But surely the Irish Members had a right to know on what grounds of evidence the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman rested; and although they were but a small minority in the House of Commons, they were still the majority of the Representatives of Ireland. They might be but a forlorn hope, yet they considered it their duty to resist the present attempt to strike down the liberties of their country by every means in their power; and if they omitted to perform that duty, they would be false to their country, themselves, to that House, and the Constitution. They were told by the hon. Member for Glamorganshire (Mr. Hussey Vivian) that the minority should submit itself to the majority in that House; but he would say no more in answer to that advice than that it had already been disposed of by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). The hon. Member, however, had also said that if the Prime Minister had the time which he asked for placed at his disposal he should take care that it was not wasted. He (Mr. Leamy) had certainly no wish to see the time of the House wasted. It had never been wasted by him, for he had seldom taken the opportunity of addressing hon. Members; however, the suggestion of the hon. Member for Glamorganshire was nothing less than an inducement held out to the Prime Minister to attempt to stifle and silence the utterances of Irish Members in debate. However much hon. Members might think it desirable to confer upon the Prime Minister the power which he sought Irish Members were, on the contrary, of opinion that such a course would be one of the most fatal that the House could follow. No Prime Minister would dare to demand such power as was then asked for, were the liberties of the English people in question. Notwithstanding the majority at the disposal of the Premier, and notwithstanding his Tory allies, Irish Members owed it to the people of Ireland who sent them to Parliament, to the people of England, and to the House itself, to defend the liberty they possessed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Byrne.*)

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I am not able to agree to that Motion; and I feel it quite necessary to state, in a few sentences, the reasons which compel me to oppose it. We came down to the House with the impression that the Motion which I had given Notice of my intention to move was one that might very well be debated and disposed of in a reasonable time. But, at the same time, we had no intention to endeavour to use any strong measure of appeal to the majority for the purpose of limiting the discretion of those who might think otherwise. Consequently, our intention was this—if the debate had proceeded in the usual manner, and if, between 12 and 1 o'clock, a Motion for adjournment had been made—although we might have objected to that Motion, we should not have objected to it with the purpose of pursuing our objection through all the occasions on which it might be repeated. Now, however, I am bound to say, so far as the Government can advise the House, we feel compelled to advise the House to decline to accept this Motion, and to decline to accept any subsequent Motion. The reason is to be found in the manner in which the latter moiety of the evening has been spent. It has, in the first instance, been spent in a contest with the Chair; and, in the second place, in Motions for adjournment, commenced not at the usual hour, but at 10 o'clock, apparently with the view of either casting discredit upon the proceedings of the House, and weakening its authority, or, at any rate, of causing such a consumption of time as to make practical progress with Business impossible. I do not wish to put any extravagant or exaggerated interpretation on anything that has taken place; but it appears to us that this Motion is a distinct challenge to the House; and it is for the House to determine for itself whether, in this House, as in every well-organized and well-regulated Assembly, the majority is to prevail, and, I will say, not an unfair majority; not a Party majority; but one which, if it combined Parties, only did so because it is by such a combination that the general sense of the House, and what I may venture to call the moral unanimity of the House, is expressed. For that reason, and as this question has been raised in a manner most unequivocal and entirely beyond the risk of its being misunderstood, by this series of Motions for adjournment, which commenced at 10 o'clock, and which were cleverly intermitted for the space of half-an-hour, when the clock touched upon midnight, we conceive the question is raised whether the House is to retain and act upon its capacity of transacting Public Business; and if the House deems it to be its duty not to allow that capacity to be impaired and nullified, it is to be done by declining to accede to the Motion now made, and to any subsequent Motion for adjournment.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, the Government having decided upon the course which has been announced by the Prime Minister, I rise to say that it will receive the support of hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House. I do not now discuss—what at the proper time may be discussed—the course which the Government has taken hitherto. We consider only the position of affairs at the present time; and, looking to the fact that at the beginning of the evening the Prime Minister put before us, in strong language, the appeal which he made on the ground of the urgency of the situation, that we should take the course of giving precedence to these measures before other Business was proceeded with—taking the case upon that ground alone, and considering the peculiar circumstances in which we stand, I think the Government have a right to the decision of the House upon the present question. We have been prepared, and are still prepared, as soon as it comes to the vote, to support them in the Motion they make; and, in the meantime, we are also prepared to support them in their resistance to any proposal for the adjournment of the debate.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, with reference to the reprimand administered to Irish Members by the Prime Minister, in which he was supported by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, he was compelled, on the part of those who sat near him, to say that whatever might be thought of their conduct by any section of the House they would take the course which they conceived to be consistent with their duty. He rose, however, to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland what course it was intended to pursue with reference to the Bill for the protection of life and property in Ireland, and when hon. Members might expect the resumption of the debate thereon?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the debate would be resumed when the present Motion had been disposed of.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he understood that the present and all subsequent Motions for adjournment would be resisted. But if the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman were debated, what prospect was there that the debate would be adjourned at a reasonable hour? Surely hon. Members were not, in consequence of time having been rightly or wrongly used, to sit all night debating the question of precedence to be given to the Coercion Bills introduced by Her Majesty's Government. Such a penalty would be in the nature of vindictive damages against Irish Members, and he was quite certain that such was not in the intention of the right hon. Gentleman.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, as the hon. Member wished to know what was the exact purport of the advice tendered by the Head of the Government to the House, he could state to him in a very few words that it was to continue the debate on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman until it was finally disposed of.

MR. DILLON said, after the remarks just made, he felt justified in stating that the Government had no excuse whatever for thrusting through that House a Motion of the first importance to Irish Members on the ground that they were but a small minority. With regard to the incident which had occurred, he had only taken part in one division, along with other hon. Members, who took no part in the affair beyond dividing by way of protest. Certainly, nothing he had done was sufficient to justify the Government in declaring they would now force through the House at a single Sitting one of the most serious Motions ever submitted to Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said that the Irish Members were a small minority to override the majority in that House; nevertheless, they were the majority of the Irish Representatives, and would convince the Government that they had at their back the majority of the Irish people. They would resist any attempt to force the Motion of the Prime Minister through the House. ["Oh, oh!"] He would withdraw that expression, and say sheer force. That, he believed, formed part of the plan which had been laid down by the Government. The designs of a Government often leaked out in the public Press; and hon. Members had not been blind to the revelations which had appeared in the public Press, or to a rumour which had been going round London during last week, that the Government had been preparing a scheme to spring upon the Irish Members if they resisted the coercion measure. He believed the Government, however small that resistance might be, intended to snatch at it as an excuse to put an end to the discussion, and force that measure through Parliament in as rapid a way as possible. If ever there was a case in which a minority was justified in resisting to the very utmost, that was a case. They had seen minorities smaller than that of the Irish Members resist just as large a majority as that which they had ranged against them for seven, eight, or even nine nights on questions of not one-hundredth the importance of the question they were now debating. They had also seen a minority of Englishmen so resisting without the excuse the Irish Members had, that they represented a majority of their own people. All he could say was that, small as they were, they were large enough to give a resistance to the proposed measure, which would prove that they were, at all events, in earnest in the declaration that had been made to-day.

Mr. DALY, as one of the Irish Members, rose to enter his protest against this proposal; and, observing that the Prime Minister had said he acted on principle, expressed his belief that the right hon. Gentleman was actuated by the knowledge of his power. But there would be a wide difference between the recognition of his power and the recognition of what he deemed the justice of his proposals. The right hon. Gentleman might have got in his head an idea that he would punish the contumacy of the Irish Members; but it would not add much to the dignity of the British Parliament if the Premier came down to that House, backed by a large majority and by the old enemies of the Irish Party on that side of the House, and by that tyrannous coalition sought to crush the exertions of the Irish Representatives to obtain justice for the Irish people. With regard to other matters to which the Premier had alluded, he should have been glad if the contest with the Chair had not arisen, for he did not approve of trespassing on the patience and indulgence of the House; but he did claim that the House should give the Irish Members fair play on a question of such vital importance to the Constitutional liberties and to the lives and property of Ireland as this was. The Premier was taking undignified notice of what had occurred; but he (Mr. Daly) thanked God that a report of these proceedings would permeate outside the House, and that the judgment of men outside would approve of the action of those who sought to delay a proceeding by which any man in Ireland might, on the slightest pretext, be taken without leave or licence away from his family and immured for 18 months, and at the end of that time be released, without any explanation being given him, except by the whisperings of some secret spy, that a suspicion of him had been engendered in the minds of the Irish Executive. Now, what would be the effect of this hurry? It was the duty of the Government to consider the grievances from which Ireland suffered. He, and men like him, were not acting on a mere formula of Business; they were arguing on behalf of a people who, by the acts of the progenitors of the Government and their supporters, were condemned to a single industry—for a people who had been under English rule for centuries, who, for 800 years, had been bound to England, and whose wants England had systematically disregarded. Were the Government treating Ireland in a fair and impartial manner, or in a dignified manner, as an English Cabinet, when, by their overwhelming strength, they compelled the Irish Members to accept division after division that evening? For himself—and he knew that Members below the Gangway would commend it—he should feel it his duty on behalf of his country, and on behalf of himself as an individual, to protest by every means of action in his power against the course of attack indicated by the Premier—a course which he did not hesitate to declare impolitic and undignified. There would go forth to Ireland that not only was coercion to be imposed, but that an unfair advantage was being taken of the House; but he would withstand that to the last gasp of breath, because he felt it to be an exercise of tyrannical and numerical supremacy. A fortnight would not elapse before whatever good feeling existing in Ireland towards England would have disappeared in consequence of what had occurred that evening. He claimed for himself that he had been very careful not to trespass on the prerogatives of the Chair, and had always regarded the rules of debate, because he did not believe that in an Assembly so large as that it would be possible to continue the Business of the country unless order and the rights of minorities were recognized; but he would tell the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister that he was raising up a fatal bulwark against order, and a desperate hostility to the Rules of the House when, under the guise of the

Leader of the House, he was endeavouring by means of the unholy combination with Gentlemen on that—the Opposition—side of the House, and by means of numerical authority, to break down the Irish resistance. He would protest against that unfair advantage by every action and deed in his power.

MR. SEXTON, referring to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon, said, the Party which the right hon. Gentleman led had only one article in its Irish policy; that article was force. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had declared some time ago that force was no remedy; but Members on the Opposition side above the Gangway believed that that was the only remedy. Therefore, he was not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) had tendered his support to the Government. He had listened to the right hon. Gentleman's speech not without surprise and sorrow—sorrow, that a man of his eminence should be looking forward to the use of coercion in Ireland. He entirely failed to perceive the connection between those divisions and the course resolved upon by the Government. The Irish Members felt that it was a most critical moment in the history of the Irish people. When a measure of immeasurable importance was pending they were deprived of the services of one of their Colleagues, and they would, by the only Constitutional means open to them, offer specific and Constitutional resistance to the course being taken. In the course of the debate that evening it had been stated that important particulars bearing on the question before the House had been circulated, and that hon. Members had not been able to devote such attention to those particulars as to enable them to fully expose the reality of the basis upon which the proposals for coercion rested. He thought that was a legitimate illustration of the course the Irish Members felt it their duty to pursue. They now found themselves face to face with a remarkable and unparaleled state of affairs. The question was, Whether, from day to day, from moment to moment, the House should continuously discuss the proposal to place every Irishman for 18 months at the mercy of the Lord Lieutenant, and of every officer and humblest servant of the Executive in Ireland? The right hon. Gentleman announced, in language sufficiently specific—which was put beyond a shadow of doubt by the curt speech of the Home Secretary—that a policy, bearing a remarkable affinity to that policy of force, was to be applied to the Irish Members that evening. They thought that the policy announced from the Treasury Bench was worthy of the policy proposed for Ireland. The Irish Members protested against the adoption of that policy as a wrong to the country they represented and as a shame to Liberalism; but it was, perhaps, suitable that a similar policy should be adopted in that Assembly. The challenge thrown down to them by the Government they would sorrowfully, but with resolute hearts, accept. He never in the course of his life felt more certain of the propriety of any action he had taken than he did of the patriotism and propriety of the action he should now take. For his part, as far as physical endurance would enable him, he would oppose most resolute and determined resistance to the attempt which had been made, and which had been described as an unholy combination, to break down and silence Irish Members in order that, at a moment of agony and suffering in Ireland, they might be placed in the hands of one man. It was a situation of a degree of gravity which could not be overstated; and whatever might be the issue of these important proceedings upon which the House was about to enter, whatever might be the issue of the question before them, and whatever might be the issue personally to themselves, they had the consolation of feeling that the proceedings of that House would come under the scrutiny of the world. From his heart he should welcome the scrutiny of the world; with all his heart he invited that scrutiny; and when he spoke of that, he did not mean merely the scrutiny of England and Scotland—although he believed there were in England and Scotland many men who would uphold the case of the Irish Members—but he referred to the scrutiny of the civilized world—of all who were the friends of liberty. The hon. Member declared that the remedy for Ireland should be in the nature of a salve rather than of a scourge; and, having referred to those Members who were content to sit in the House silent renegades when their own people were in agony, he said the principles of a wise Assembly should be first to apply a cure to an evil, and then, when the law had been vindicated by its justice and self-evident propriety, if it did not suffice it would be time to propose another course. He accepted with sorrow, but with a resolute heart, the challenge which had been thrown down, and awaited the result with confidence

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, the Motion before the House stood in a different position to the former Resolutions upon which votes had been taken. It appeared to him that his hon. Friends opposite had played most completely into the hands of the Government, and he would draw a lesson from what had occurred to-night—a lesson of which they were told, long ago, by one who was formerly the Leader of the Irish Party (Mr. Isaac Butt)—namely, that a policy of exasperation would eventually bring punishment on the whole of the Irish Representatives. But the fact that this policy had been adopted so unwisely —and especially, to-night, so clumsily and injudiciously carried on—was no reason why the Government should stifle discussion on this, which was one of the most momentous questions which had ever been brought before the House. The proposal of the Government was to postpone all the Business of the House in order to give precedence to two Bills. He wished, therefore, to ask Mr. Speaker a question of a different character to that put by the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon)—a question which appeared to him to be exceedingly pertinent. One of the Bills to which the Motion referred had been introduced to the notice of the House in a speech by the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but what was the position of the second Bill—the Arms Bill? The House knew no more about any Arms Bill than they did about, say, a Bill for the establishment of a silver currency. How could the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government deal in the manner proposed with the various stages of a Bill of which they had no knowledge whatever? If it were true that the Motion of the Prime Minister was applicable to the Bill which had been explained by the Chief Secretary, and which was on the Table of the House, that did not necessarily carry another Bill; or, if it did, why should it not carry all the measures which the Government wished to introduce to the House? There were several Bills mentioned in the Queen's Speech, and why should not precedence be given to all of them, and to all others the Government might introduce during the rest of the Session? The House would, of course, resent such a proposal. For his own part, as a Member of the House, he was unable to form an opinion as to the Arms Bill until he heard its provisions explained in the usual way; but up to the present it had not been explained. Not one word had been offered in regard to it by the responsible Government who were about to introduce it; and he therefore wished to ask Mr. Speaker, whether, if the Motion of the Government were carried, it would be possible for it to apply to the second Bill of the precise character of which the House knew nothing? Then, if Mr. Speaker would be kind enough to instruct the House on this point—which he thought was a definite one, and one not hitherto raised—he would say further, with regard to the Motion itself, that it had not been discussed at all, except incidentally in some remarks which had fallen from the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). The general remarks to which he had listened in the course of the discussion were directed against the Coercion Bill, and decidedly not directed to the question whether the Government Business was to take precedence of all private Members' Business. The right hon. Gentleman who had made the proposal had not given them any references to former conduct of the House on this matter. After some hours' debate here they were, with no opportunity of referring to authorities, and having had no authorities placed before them, asked to make a precedent which should bind the House of Commons for all time. Did hon. Members know what it was to make a precedent in this Assembly; and were they, because some hon. Members opposite had wasted two or three hours in the making and discussion of injudicious Motions, to take revenge, not merely upon those hon. Members, but upon Constitutional Government and the freedom of debate in that House? They had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman in making his proposal to-night; and, to-morrow, if an adjournment were granted, they might be able to throw some light on this grave Resolution. No lover of freedom and truth could refuse them this opportunity; and to say that they should not have it because two Motions had been made that ought not to have been made, appeared to him to be opposed to all the ordinary principles of fair play such as had ever regulated the Business of the House of Commons. Undoubtedly he should vote with hon. Gentlemen opposite, because they had declared that they desired to continue the debate on this grave subject; but, if they were to begin to-morrow to practice upon the Forms of the House, to introduce irrelevant matter, and, whether designedly or not, to bring ridicule upon the proceedings of the House of Commons, he should vote against them. At present, however, he could not refuse to give them an opportunity of considering this most grave proposal. Before he sat down he would again ask Mr. Speaker, whether, if the Motion were carried by a majority in the House to-night, it could possibly apply to that Bill of which they knew nothing whatever—namely, the Arms Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: In reply to the question put to me by the hon. Member, I may observe that the Bill for the Better Protection of Life and Property in Ireland and the Peace Preservation Bill stand very much upon the same footing. Neither the one nor the other has been actually introduced; neither the one nor the other is formally before the House. All that has happened with regard to the first Bill is this, that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland has asked leave to introduce it; but it is not yet formally before the House, as no leave has yet been granted.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: The right hon. Gentleman has not yet asked leave to introduce the Peace Preservation Bill, nor has he explained it. He has explained the first Bill and asked leave to introduce it.

MR. CALLAN said, it was material to bear in mind, in considering the question, that the first Bill had been fully explained to the House, but that the second one had not yet come before them in any shape or form. He agreed with the hon. Member who had just spoken as to the clumsiness of the two last Motions for adjournment. He regretted them exceedingly, and also the absence of the Leader of the Party that sat on that side of the House; but trusted that, in the absence of that Leader, hon. Members would not allow feelings of hostility to grow in their minds against the Irish Party, and would not persist in the course initiated by the Prime Minister. There were two Members of the House—belonging to totally different sections—who were regarded in certain quarters with feelings of animosity; and, undoubtedly, they produced a more irritating effect upon the House than any other hon. Members. He (Mr. Callan) had had the honour of sitting in that House for 12 years, and he must say, as an Irishman, that during that period one of those two hon. Members had on several occasions irritated him beyond measure. He remembered the one to whom he referred coming lumbering down with elephantine grace, and making remarks offensive to both the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland—to the Bishops and priests, and every section of the Irish community—and the objectionable character of those observations was their chief recommendation. He remembered the irritating influence of this Member during the discussions on the subject of the Transvaal. But, to turn to the other hon. Member to whom he had alluded, he knew that, unfortunately, the hon. Gentleman, who had temporarily retired from the House, did occasionally exercise an irritating influence on hon. Members who sat opposite. He must say that both the Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) and the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) exercised an irritating influence on the House. He merely mentioned these things for the purpose of urging on his hon. Friends to excuse the impetuosity and heat of the Home Secretary, and to allow him to irritate them to any extreme to night; and he would appeal to the Prime Minister, who really seemed to enjoy the situation, to allow an early adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: I must recall the hon. Member's attention to the Question before the House. His observations have no relevancy to it.

MR. CALLAN would advise the House not to go on with the discussion on the Main Question, but to continue the debate until they disposed of everything standing in the way of the consideration of an important Amendment placed on the Paper, not for the purpose of causing delay, but for the purpose of raising substantial, *bonâ fide* discussion. When they reached this point, say in an hour's time, then let them, in good temper, adjourn the debate until Thursday, when all Parties would approach the subject in a more fitting humour.

Mr. FINIGAN rose to support the Motion for adjournment, and he did so because he did not think the issues contained in the original Motion of the Prime Minister had been fully laid before the House. The Speaker had just told the House that neither the Preservation of Person and Property Bill nor the Peace Preservation Bill had yet been placed before them. Leave had been simply asked to introduce the first of the two, but that leave had not yet been granted. Considering, therefore, that the measures were not before the House, hon. Members could not, by any possible means, judge whether or not they were necessary to meet the existing state of things in Ireland. They were, however, asked to—and, moreover, by a very extraordinary peculiarity of ruling, they were condemned to—hold their tongues with regard to the speech made last night by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, though they were painfully aware what the effect of that speech had been upon the House. They were also aware that the Prime Minister had taken advantage—palpably and outspokenly—of what was contained in that speech to press on the Motion which he had on the Paper to-night. If he could see his way—which, he was sorry to say, he could not—to argue this question without infringing the Rules laid down by the House, and the rulings of Mr. Speaker this very day, he should only be too happy to offer to the House certain definite and well-defined reasons showing that if the Government wished to put the ordinary law into execution in Ireland they could dispense with all these various measures of coercion, and could save their good name for time to come. But to ask him blindfoldly to accept a Motion curtailing his personal privileges, and curtailing hon. Members' rights of debate, and, at the same time, to ask the House to allow measures of coercion to be brought in—measures which the Government had not had the justice to foreshadow—was to ask them to do something against that principle of liberty so often preached within and without the House by the Government and their supporters. If it would not be out of Order, he would refer to a small extract sent to him this morning by the Transvaal Committee. ["Order, order!"] He simply wished to refer to it as something analagous to the matter under debate. The extract was from a speech delivered in Mid Lothian on November 25th, 1879, by the right hon. Gentleman the present Prime Minister, and from it it appeared that the right hon. Gentleman had laid down as a principle of justice that it was unfair to force on the people of the Transvaal a law which had not received the approval of 6,500 people out of 8,000 entitled to have their voices heard. In this question before the House it was not a matter of 6,500 people opposed to 1,500, but it was a matter of 600,000 tenants, with their wives and families, opposed to 10,000 landlords, most of whom had acted unjustly. ["No, no!"] Well, he must say, so far as the county with which he had the honour to be connected was concerned, most of the landlords were bad landlords, though it was out of no personal malice that they had acted wrongly, but on account of the law. It was the law which enabled them to act unjustly, and to bring disgrace and discredit on the country. He was pleading on behalf of the unfortunate Irish tenants, their wives and children, against a class of men who had acted unjustly towards them, and who had, in the bitter past, created that feeling of hostility which, unfortunately, prevailed in England to-day against Ireland, and which also prevailed in Ireland against England. If Her Majesty's Government would only consent to allow the debate to be adjourned until the whole subject could be considered on a fair basis, he thought that not only the Government, but both sides of the House, would be conceding something which would reflect credit upon them, and which would tend to diminish that feeling of hostility which was already too strong in England and Ireland. If the ordinary law, which the Chief Secretary for Ireland alleged to be disobeyed and set at defiance, were maintained, there could neither be the slightest logic, reason, or statesmanship in asking Parliament to give to the Lord Lieutenant, or to any other person in Ireland, an arbitrary power either through malice, suspicion, or any other evil influence, of having the liberties of Her Majesty's Irish subjects made subservient to the malicious ill-will of particular individuals. He sincerely trusted that the House would consent to the adjournment of the debate; but if the Irish Members were to be told that by the unholy alliance which had been entered into between the two sides of the House, by inaugurating a system of physical endurance an attempt was to be made to try to wear down the House —if that was to be the ultimatum offered to the Irish Members, then they could only, as they had done before—and, if necessary, they could do it again—accept that ultimatum with great sorrow, but with full determination to continue in those paths of liberty marked out by some of the greatest statesmen who had ever preceded the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister in the Leadership of the Liberal Party. They had no reason to look to English opinion for any justification of their conduct. If they wanted anything beyond their own consciousness, they would find it in Ireland, and in feeling, as he did, that they were standing up in the House of Commons for the rights and liberties of Irishmen, and for the rights of a downtrodden nation. If the ultimatum was put forth, as he believed it to be, in the naked form of physical force against the minority, then, as far as he was concerned, as one of the minority, he accepted the challenge, and would fight the battle out to the bitter end.

MR. HEALY congratulated the Government on having introduced into the House of Commons the principle of combination and "Boycotting" which they regarded as so reprehensible in Ireland. The supporters of Her Majesty's Government were sufficiently numerous to be able to leave the House for rest and return the next morning in clean shirts to find those whom they had left behind, and who had been up all night, presenting a very sorry and dishevelled appearance. He also congratulated hon. Members opposite on the fact that their spirits were not now so heated as they were a short time ago. He attributed it to the circumstance that some of the most excitable Members on that side of the House had long since gone home. At the same time, he did not think that the time selected by the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister for introducing the principle of combination was a very auspicious one. The right hon. Gentleman had chosen an early day in the new year, and had at length given to the Irish Members a fair taste of what they might expect under his enlightened Liberal Government. The right hon. Gentleman was to be congratulated on having initiated his measure of coercion so soon. He hoped the Tory Party would feel gratified when they remembered that it was a minority of less than 50 that was treated in this manner. The day might come when, finding themselves diminished to a minority of 50, they might appeal in vain for the support of a Radical majority. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were manifesting signs of impatience. He certainly did not think it came well from them. They would, no doubt, all of them gladly go home; but some of them had a duty to discharge before doing so. Approaching the question in a more serious spirit, perhaps he might be permitted to express his regret that some names which in former days were considered honoured names in Ireland—such as the names of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), and of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government—had given in their adhesion to this policy of coercion. Instead of remaining honoured names in Ireland, they were now becoming names of reproach. [*Laughter.*] No doubt, the laughter of hon. Gentlemen opposite must have a most agreeable sound in the ears of the Prime Minister and his right hon. Colleague. He was sure that those right hon. Gentlemen must feel very grateful at the way in which their obsequious followers had received that statement. He proposed now to discuss briefly the speech which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) made in introducing the Resolution now before the House. [*Cries of* "Question!"] If he was not in Order, the Speaker would point it out. In answer to the objection which was made by the hon. Member for the county of Carlow (Mr. Gray), that the proposal of the Government should be introduced at the several stages of the Bills to which the Resolution applied, the right hon. Gentleman said that such a course would be objectionable and absurd. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "That he had given Notice of the Resolution on the first day of the Session. It was, therefore, taken upon general grounds, and it was wholly free from anything like an intermixture of polemical or controversial matter. It implied no accusation and no implication against anyone."

The right hon. Gentleman added that—

> "In his opinion the reasons for the Motion, which appeared to him to be strong enough to warrant the Government in requiring it at the commencement of the Session, had derived a great accession of strength in consequence of the slow progress that had since been made in the Business of the year."

The position of the Irish Members had also derived a considerable accession of strength, because at the present moment they were being treated to some of the agencies and engines which they were so familiar with in Ireland. Indeed, he understood that the present day was never to come to an end; that it was to be left out of the calendar altogether, and that they would find themselves still at Tuesday when they had arrived at about Friday. It was impossible to overrate the gravity of the proposal made by the Government. There they were, in consequence of the Government not having understood the grounds upon which they made their proposals—there they were at that unearthly hour of the morning, and there they were likely to remain until Sunday next week. The right hon. Gentleman said that as soon as the Government convinced Parliament that the demand for extraordinary powers ought to be conceded, it became the duty of Her Majesty's Ministers to take all proper means for submitting their proposals with due despatch. He (Mr. Healy) presumed that this was a sample of due despatch. So far all the powers which the right hon. Gentleman had taken were powers for keeping hon. Members out of their beds in a most extraordinary manner indeed. The right hon. Gentleman said he would admit, for the sake of argument, the allegation that the proposal of the Government was altogether bad. The House would see that the right hon. Gentleman was ready to admit that at the beginning of the Sitting. He said—

> "I take the first objection—namely, that the proposal is altogether bad; that there is no warrant for it; and that there is no terror existing in Ireland, and very little agrarian crime. For the purpose of the present argument I grant every one of those allegations, and from the point of view of those who make them it is not less necessary that the judgment of Parliament should be taken on this subject without unnecessary delay."

Now, he (Mr. Healy) did not think the final judgment of the House would be arrived at any sooner in consequence of the proposals now submitted by the right hon. Gentleman. He was sure that whatever opposition he was able to give to this proceeding—and as a new Member he was not able to offer much, owing to a want of acquaintance with the Forms and Rules of the House—it would be made 10 times greater than it would have been by the course which the right hon. Gentleman had taken. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Ireland should be cleared from the reproach of having a proposal of this kind hanging over her."

He (Mr. Healy) thought the House should also be cleared from having threats of this kind hanging over them. Holding a revolver at the heads of the Irish Members, the right hon. Gentleman said—"Pass my Motion, or down you go." The right hon. Gentleman went on to say further—

> "If it be true that the Government have, with insufficient consideration, pledged their responsibility to a plan of action so exceptional, well, the sooner the day arrives when they are to be detected and exposed by the force of argument, and when the judgment of the House is to be used against them, the better for those who are the objectors to the plan we now propose."

But was this a time for enforcing arguments against the proposal, when, as they must observe, Mr. Speaker himself was overcome by the lateness of the hour? [*Cries of* "Order!"] He apologized for having made that remark, and would at once withdraw it. The Prime Minister said—

> "When I look at the crop of Amendments which has been sown by the busy hands of Gentlemen who sit within a narrow precinct of this House, it exhibits a wonderful fertility and a very large family of children, of whom, however, I am not forward in claiming the honour of the parentage."

There was very little chance of the Amendments referred to by the right hon. Gentleman being discussed that night. Indeed, he was afraid that if they were brought forward now they would receive very scant discussion, and that was one reason why either the House or the debate should be adjourned. The Government said the right hon. Gentleman came boldly before the House and the country with the proposal that their measures should be proceeded with with all possible despatch. He considered the pleading of the right hon. Gentleman for despatch as an admission that it was impossible for Her Majesty's Government to bring in a Land Bill, with all the intricacies and details which would be involved in it, until they had first dealt with the condition of Ireland. But what would the result be? Why, that every Member of the House would be so extremely tired and fagged out when the Land Bill was brought in that, instead of being in their places to discuss the measure, they would in all probability be in bed, endeavouring to sleep off the effects of their previous revels. The right hon. Gentleman said—and this was an extraordinary part of his statement—that he did not grudge a reasonable amount of time for the discussion of his proposal. But why was this to be done at the expense of the time and Business of private Members, whose opportunities for bringing questions before the House were already extremely limited? Probably, ere long, Her Majesty's Government might propose to erect a gallows in the Lobby, in order that they might carry out in perfection their new system of coercion. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Hon. Members opposite objected, and manifested symptoms of surprise; but he made the statement in all seriousness of spirit and sadness of heart. The right hon. Gentleman based his proposal upon a matter of urgency. He (Mr. Healy) was prepared to show that the question was by no means so urgent as the right hon. Gentleman supposed. It was quite true that there had been in Ireland a considerable number of outrages. But there had also been a considerable number of outrages in England—10 times as many as in Ireland. But, in the case of England, it was not proposed, in consequence of these outrages, to place the liberties of every Englishman in the hands of an individual. Englishmen were fully agreed, no matter what outrages occurred in this country, that, as far as they themselves were concerned, they would not entrust their liberties to anyone. The House of Commons would soon be obliged to hide their diminished heads if anyone was bold enough to submit a proposal to take away the freedom, rights, and liberties of the English nation. Yet this was the proposal now laid before Parliament in regard to Ireland, and the liberties of the Irish people were to be taken away, not for 18 months, as was suggested, but for a period more nearly approaching 22 months. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland alleged that, exclusive of threatening letters, there had been 1,253 agrarian outrages. Now, on the question of threatening letters, perhaps he might be allowed to point out—[*Cries of* "Question!"]—he believed that he was speaking to the Question. He wished to show that the alleged urgency of the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was simply a fictitious urgency; and on this question of threatening letters, he hoped the House would give him its indulgence for a few moments, while he informed them of a very remarkable occurrence which had taken place. It had been alleged that most of the threatening letters were "bogus" productions. He would give the House a specimen of their "bogusness," if he might be allowed to use such an expression, on Christmas eve in Dublin. [*Cries of* "Question!"] He was confining himself to the Question. On Christmas eve, a threatening letter was sent to the colonel of every regiment in Dublin; and the question was, who sent them?——

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is not speaking to the Question before the House.

MR. HEALY said, he would not further occupy the time of hon. Members. He regretted that he was unable to approach these subjects without incurring the displeasure of Mr. Speaker. This he must attribute to his ignorance of the Rules of the House. The hon. Member for Glasgow had been allowed, however, in the course of the debate to show the extreme childishness of some of the charges which had been put before the House, and, in one instance, pointed to a remarkable instance of the crime of cutting a telegraph wire——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon Member is not regarding the observations which I made some time ago.

Mr. HEALY said, he disclaimed any intention of disputing the ruling of the Chair. He would certainly not continue the subject, as it had been ruled out of Order. He would ask, however, with reference to the Motion of the Prime Minister, how it was that the right hon. Gentleman, in making a proposal of the kind to the House, had not brought forward a single precedent? Did he suppose that Irish Members were going to adopt his proposal without examination? He could not but express the astonishment that he felt on listening to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, that not the slightest suggestion had been made that a similar proposal had been ever before put forward. Her Majesty's Opposition were, in a secondary sense, supposed to be the guardians of the rights and privileges of hon. Members; but it had been a matter of surprise to him that they had not met the proposal of the Prime Minister with some opposition. It amounted to this. If the House proceeded at once to the consideration of the Coercion Bills, which would result from the carrying of the Resolution of the head of the Government, Irish Members would not be able, in the short space of time at their disposal, to digest properly the contents of the large number of Blue Books which had been meted out to them. For his part, he should certainly like to give to those Returns a considerable amount of examination. The Blue Book issued that morning contained 200 pages, and some of the outrages returned therein had occurred in his own district. But the right hon. Gentleman, in effect, said, You shall pass my Motion, and if you are able to go through the Blue Books and get at some of the facts, you are at liberty to do so. If hon. Members were not allowed time to read the Blue Books issued, they might just as well be kept from them altogether. The briefest reference to the Return showed him that it contained very serious charges against the district with which he was connected, the people of which were, in black and white, treated as so many savages. He could assure hon. Members, however, that if they visited it, they would find that the people were by no means of that description. His object was to show that, in the short space of time allowed for the study of the official documents, there would be no means of discovering all the inaccuracies which he believed they contained. Hon. Members opposite would, no doubt, be glad when he sat down; but there were some points to which he desired to call the attention of the House for a few moments longer. It was absolutely necessary that hon. Members should study the Blue Books, or how would they be able to address meetings of their constituents in districts where there was a large number of Irish voters? They would be quite unable to discuss before them the state of Ireland. Again, with regard to the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman, he had intended to persuade some of his hon. Friends, if possible, to propose that it should be referred to a Select Committee. He felt that a suggestion of that kind would be received by the House with all the gravity which the case demanded. This course would afford an opportunity of searching for precedents which would be of great use; but if there existed no precedents, the right hon. Gentleman could not but feel that the strength he would derive from the Committee would enable him to press forward his measures with greater success.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to address himself to the Chair and to the Question before the House. The hon. Member constantly addresses himself to sections of the House, and to individual Members of the House, which is quite disorderly.

Mr. HEALY said, he much regretted having addressed his remarks to hon. Members opposite, who did not seem to make those allowances for the position of Irish Members which they would make were they fully acquainted with the facts. That being the case, Irish Members were reduced to the devices customary under such circumstances.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he thought he should be able to show that Irish Members had good grounds for the course they were taking on that occasion, and that the position taken up by the Prime Minister and his Colleagues was unsafe and untenable. He had not been present in the House when a certain occurrence took place, which had largely conduced to the disagreeable and unhappy state of mind in which the House found itself. As he had been that evening addressing a meeting elsewhere, he was perfectly free from those disturbing influences which had affected the minds of some Members of the House. He found he had himself been somewhat fortunate in being allowed to steer close to the wind without being called to Order from the Chair. He had entered into something like a cursory analysis of the Returns before the House, and he attributed the fact that he had not been called to Order to the forbearance of Mr. Speaker. He disclaimed all desire to say one word of reproach against the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster); but he was anxious to get at the Returns of the right hon. Gentleman. He was desirous of getting to the next stage of this Bill at the very earliest moment possible, and he was not afraid of a comparison of the mendacious totals with the truth-telling details which the Returns would disclose, nor of arguing fairly and openly and frankly this question, Whether or not the Government were going to deprive 5,000,000 Irish people of their liberties on the grounds of these outrages? He was not afraid even of leaving to the common sense and justice of hon. Members whether or not the liberties of 2,000 persons ought to be sacrificed because one wire had been cut, or a pane of glass had been broken, or five yards of wall had been knocked down. He was willing to submit it even to the common sense of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. From what took place at an earlier portion of that evening, so far as he could gather from the attitude of the Premier, he was still unpledged to coercion—and why was that? He put it to the right hon. Gentleman distinctly, whether or not he had had those details before his mind when he agreed to the coercive proposals forced upon him by the Chief Secretary for Ireland? So far as he could judge of the state of mind of the right hon. Gentleman from his demeanour—he did not say anything in reply—he took him to deny that he had those Returns before him. If the right hon. Gentleman had only the mendacious totals, and not the truth-telling details of those Returns, he was still unpledged to coercion; and he (Mr. O'Connor) still entertained the hope that the right hon. Gentleman, when he did look at those Returns, which might have been kept back from his mind, might be able to turn altogether from the policy of coercion to which he was not pledged. Why, then, it might be asked, if he was not afraid of the discussion of those details, was he so anxious? Did he interpose to delay the approach of this discussion? That was a fair question, and he had a reply that was satisfactory, at least to his own mind. The Motion of the right hon. Gentleman raised other questions besides coercive legislation. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman had been altogether incorrectly described and understood when it was merely interpreted as the question whether or not the House should approach these proposals of the Chief Secretary on a certain day. There was a far larger and bigger question involved. It was, Whether every private Member should give his right up to the right hon. Gentleman until this question was disposed of; whether the Business of the country should be postponed; and, further, whether, contrary to all precedent with which he was acquainted, all Private and Public Business should be interrupted and postponed during the will of the House until the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman were carried? These were questions altogether independent and separate from the question of coercion for Ireland. This Motion raised far larger Constitutional questions—larger Constitutional questions in this sense, that they were questions referring to this country as well as to Ireland. The question of coercive legislation for Ireland raised a most important and vital question for Ireland; but the question of the rights of private Members and the postponement of Public Business until certain measures were carried, raised Constitutional questions in which England was quite as much interested as Ireland. If these were other times and other circumstances, he was perfectly sure there would not be that conspiracy of silence on the Front Opposition Bench which now prevailed; he was perfectly sure that many hon. Members on that side of the House, who had distinguished themselves on various occasions, and had distinguished themselves in regard to the rights of private Members and the observance of precedence and the Constitutional rights of the House, would have come forward and spoken against this Motion. He was not at liberty to mention names; but he did not think he was going beyond the bounds of fair reticence, when he said that doubts had been privately expressed to him, and not by Irish

Members, of the Constitutional character and safety for the future of these proceedings. If the House for a moment could be changed into a Palace of Truth, and if the secrets of Conservative and Liberal hearts could be laid bare on this question, there would be found doubts whether the right hon. Gentleman, by his proposal, was not laying down a precedent dangerous for the future of private Members. If hon. Members on the other Benches and right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench would not defend the rights of private Members and the Constitutional precedents of that House, it only remained for Irish Members to do so. So far as he was concerned, he was not anxious to fight any battle whatever for the Conservatives in the House, for they were quite able to fight their own battles; but they, as Members of the minority, were more interested than Conservative Members in preserving the traditions of that House. Conservative traditions and Rules of the House were a protection of the rights of private Members and minorities against the Government; and as they were not only the minority as the Conservatives sometimes were, and the Liberals sometimes were; as they were bound always to be a minority, upon them rested more even than on the Conservatives the duty of preserving the interests of private Members. There were one or two other points to which he would refer, but he would not keep the House many moments. He thought he had shown the House that the course which was proposed by the Government was unprecedented and full of danger for that House. There was a third objection which he had to the course suggested. He did not think they could do anything that would more increase the bitterness of feeling which these coercive proposals had already produced, than the course proposed; he did not think they could take any step more calculated to embitter bitterness, than indecent haste in carrying their proposals. Were they not showing indecent haste to carry these coercive proposals? The right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench had, with great frankness, stated his determination, and that of his Colleagues, to pass this proposal and to keep the House until it was passed. This was an open proclamation, that such was their indecent haste, that they were ready to trample on the rights of private Members in order to push through their own measures. The Government were showing indecent haste in trying to carry their coercive proposals, and in showing that they were acting contrary to the best dictates of Liberal policy. In reference to this point he would say this, there had been unquestionably — he would not go into the lamentable incident that had occurred, and to which he was prevented from referring in detail —a certain amount of time wasted that night. He did not know how long a certain incident occupied, but he believed it occupied two or three hours. Those hours were taken—were stolen—from the time at the disposal of the Government; but had they not got two hours since of discussion? Had they not received a full and fair compensation and requital by the time that had since elapsed? Therefore, if the Treasury Bench meant to pursue this debate, because of the unseemly debate which had robbed them of two hours, their claim had already been made good. He wished to say this, finally. He did not wish to delay the proposal for the discussion of this question; his only reason for opposing it was, that he thought the Government were endeavouring to take an unfair advantage of the Irish Members by means of their mechanical majority. They were using brute force, and he believed that the public opinion of England, to which they were appealing, would decide against them upon this question when the public had time to brood over the question. He believed that if hon. Members would allow themselves to calmly consider this question for even five minutes, free from the heat of discussion, they would see that the dilemma in which they had now placed themselves was one the result of which would bring discredit upon the House, and also, which was more important, upon the Government themselves. No Ministry gained by yielding to passion. Of all persons from whom that Assembly had a right to demand coolness of temper, they should claim it from those to whom they had given the high testimony of power to control the fate of millions of their fellow-men. If those right hon. Gentlemen were carried away by the impulse of passion, they were of an untrustworthy temperament, and the sooner they left the Treasury Bench and gave place to men whose calmness of mind better fitted them for the high duties they had to perform the better. He did not suppose that any words that he might employ would induce the right hon. Gentleman to come to the conclusion that he was not the best and most blessed Minister in the world; but he appealed from him to the cooler temper of the English people, and he believed that ultimately the verdict would be in favour of the hon. Members who had resisted unconstitutional proceedings, protected the rights of private Members and made a fair demand that the discussion of all Constitutional questions should be deferred until a time when tempers were cool and minds were free.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the argument for adjournment that evening had been strengthened by everything that had happened. Like his hon. Colleague, he did not, in the slightest degree, desire to obstruct or to delay by a single moment the approach of the deliberate examination of the case for coercion. He was satisfied that the deliberate examination of the case would prove that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was very ill-advised indeed in bringing in a Motion for the facilitation of coercion, which had been the cause of the differences of opinion so markedly exhibited in the progress of that debate. When he said that he looked forward with pleasure—with such pleasure as an Irish patriot might feel in entering upon the demonstration of the incapacity of Her Majesty's Administration to deal fairly with Irish affairs—when he said he looked forward with pleasure to the approach of the moment when they could grapple with the statistics and the alleged facts produced by the Chief Secretary for Ireland in his capacity as echo of Dublin Castle, he did not by any means consider that his anxiety to grapple with the falsehoods that had been imposed on both sides of the House, and imposed on the Liberal Party quite as much as Conservatives, absolved him from his duty as a private Member to oppose to the utmost of his ability the despotic, and the ruinous, and the hostile proposition of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. In entering on this struggle, which he was told had degenerated into a physical-force struggle on the part of the Government—into a mere question of relays—he did not conceal from himself the certainty that he and his Friends would be unsuccessful in their attempt to defeat the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. He knew that the Irish Party would certainly fail to prevent the passage of the Resolution to which they objected; and it was in no spirit of bravado that he entered into the contest. He had had some experience of such contests. He remembered that on a former occasion, on the question of South African Annexations, when the Irish Party, or a section of it, endeavoured to prevent the discussion of important Business at an inappropriate hour, all their resistance utterly failed in consequence of the overwhelmings majority at the back of the Government of the day; still they deemed it to be their duty to exhaust the lawful Forms of the House in opposition to illegitimate proceedings, even with the certainty that those illegitimate proceeding would triumph in the end. In the discharge of their duty to their constituents, and to their English friends, who were many throughout the length and breadth of this country—they, on the present occasion, intended to follow a similar course, and to exhaust all the Forms of the House—although with the certainty of defeat—in opposition to the Resolution of the Prime Minister. The triumph which had been gained over a few Irish Members in a previous Session ought to be a warning to right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who contemplated a similar triumph now. The Irish Members had been defeated, trampled in the dust, and subsequently condemned and taunted by all the Ministerial organs. Hon. Members who were to-night defending the interests of Ireland were then well beaten; but, if the other thing could have happened, if the minority could have withstood the majority, tens of thousands of lives would have been saved, and millions of money also, and untold disaster to this country would have been prevented. If the Government persisted in refusing the request of the Irish Members, they must succeed in their opposition. The Irish Members had made no preparation for the struggle. Her Majesty's Government had come to a sudden determination, owing to a regrettable incident which had happened, and the Irish Members had not made, and were not going to make, any preparation against the relays, and so forth, of the right hon. Gentleman. But, as surely as the Government would win, within a few hours, so surely would the Irish Members within a few weeks, or within a few months, or years, win the cause of their country, which had lived for centuries, and would survive a Liberal Administration. He (Mr. O'Donnell) had excited the Parliamentary indignation of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government when, some time ago, he appealed to him on various grounds to consent to the postponement of the further consideration of his most important Resolution; and the right hon. Gentleman, in the phrases which he knew so well how to use, and with that skill in the explanation of words, sentences, and events with which all sides of the House were familiar, contrived to base a number of eloquent observations upon his (Mr. O'Donnell's) poor remarks. But what had been the essence of his (Mr. O'Donnell's) contention? It was that which was at the root of the whole Irish appeal for an adjournment of the consideration of the question — namely, a protest against being asked to consent to the destruction of the liberties of Parliament, and of independent Members, and to consent to the muzzling of the constituencies, who could only be heard in the House through their Representatives. The right hon. Gentleman, in his reply, had not condescended to advance a single reason in support of his position except that contained in his fleeting and most illegitimate reference to a pending debate, to which, by all the Rules of the House, he ought not to have alluded. The right hon. Gentleman, clearly, had been guilty of a violation of the Rules and proceedings of the House, and that on a most grave and interesting occasion; but, of course, he had transgressed with such dexterity that the act had almost escaped notice. The Prime Minister was a practised Parliamentary debater, and had managed, as his only argument for his Motion, to make a passing allusion to an inchoate discussion on a still unintroduced Bill which might or might not be favourably received by the House. It was entirely in an illegitimate, irregular, invalid, and disorderly reference of that kind, that the right hon. Gentleman shirked his plain duty of offering a serious and substantial justification for the most impolitic proposition he had laid before the House. The fault the right hon. Gentleman committed in introducing this discussion he repeated in his reply to the first appeal made to him by the Irish Members, and he had now left the House—it was to be hoped to seek the repose to which his age, his dignity, and his many labours so emphatically entitled him—without condescending to give either the Members of his own Party, the Members of the English Opposition, or the Representatives of the Irish Nationality, a single additional reason—beyond that most irregular and invalid reason in which he had cloaked rather than explained his startling proposition—for the course he wished them to adopt. The House was still at a loss to know why the right hon. Gentleman had brought forward his proposal, for he had not only fixed the muzzle of silence upon his obedient followers and entered into an agreement with the Conservatives, but had sought to prevent explanation coming from any side of the House, and had set an example by disdaining to give an explanation himself. It was not at this hour—even if the right hon. Gentleman, or someone authorized to speak on his behalf, were to come forward and give that tardy explanation which had not yet been volunteered—it was not at such an hour as this, when the intermediaries of public opinion, the men who let the constituencies know what was being done in the House, could no longer record the proceedings, that such an explanation ought to be received by a Parliament jealous of its own respect, regardful of its duty to its constituents, mindful of its great traditions, and hopeful for the future. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] He quite agreed with hon. Members who uttered the words "Divide, divide!" that it was quite time to come to a decision. That decision ought to be in favour of the prompt adjournment of the debate. The debate, however, he knew would not be adjourned at present, because the word had been passed round by the responsible head of the Liberal Government to legislate for Ireland in the dark. That was the order that had been given. The House had been asked to pass a gagging Resolution which destroyed the liberties of private Members, and which destroyed the liberties of the constituencies, at an hour when no knowledge—no accurate knowledge—could be given to the public of the reasons and motives of hon. Members, and of the manner in which this grave question had been debated. It was now half past 2 o'clock in the morning. The newspapers would not be able to report any speeches before 9 or 10 o'clock. It was to be charged against Her Majesty's Administration that they were endeavouring to put a gag on Ireland and individual Members, and to pass measures in such a silence, in such an obscurity, in such a condition of non-intelligence and non-publicity, as it was long ago the dream of a Party in this House to legislate in—a Party so admirably and eloquently described in the work of one recently promoted to the Treasury Bench. The author of the work to which he alluded, inspired by the remembrance of the obligations he owed to the hero of that work, ought to have come forward on the present occasion in illustration of his fidelity to the traditions of Charles James Fox. The Government, seemingly, desired to pass their Resolution in the absence of the people—behind the backs of the people in the absence of the representatives of the Press—without giving a chance for full and fair explanation of the reasons by which they were influenced in bringing forward their proposal. Let not the Liberal Party of to-day name themselves among the followers of Fox. In truth, they were the "King's friends," and belonged to the Party of "Jackboots" and his sycophants. [*Cries of* "Question!"] This, unfortunately, was the Question before the House. If Her Majesty's Government wished to make it not the question, all they had to do was to challenge the light of publicity, to show that they were not ashamed to give the explanation, with data, that the situation rendered necessary, and to scorn to pass in the dark a Resolution affecting the liberties of even 100 men, not to speak of the liberties of 5,500,000, or, as a matter of fact, 35,000,000—for the liberties of all Her Majesty's British subjects were affected by the proposal of the Government. Her Majesty's Government, if they wished to make the complaints of hon. Members irrelevant, and to show that in attributing to them the dark design to which he had referred he was irrelevant, had only to consent to an adjournment to whatever hour in the morning they chose, providing it was an hour at which the representatives of the Press could record the proceedings and acquaint the constituencies with what was being done. No doubt, his words fell without effect upon the ears of the majority, prejudiced and determined as they were to follow a certain course marked out for them. The certainty of triumph closed the ears of conscience; but there was no truer saying than that which was to be found in many languages—namely, "It is always the vanquished who win." Days, weeks, years, might pass away; but the wrong done would abide, and would continue to work until it had worked out, if not its remedy, at least its retribution. The Prime Minister, in insisting now upon a vote in the dark on this most important question, was acting, he was sorry to say, in strict conformity with the strategy which, however or by whomsoever suggested, appeared to have governed him in the introduction of the Resolution originally. Why was this Resolution introduced in such hot haste, without giving any Member on any side of the House an opportunity of discussing the amount of seriousness to be attached to the extraordinary totals and wonderful phantasmagoria of figures produced in a debate to which he would not venture to make reference, as it was a pending one, and as he could not take the lordly liberties with the Rules of the House which seemed to be reserved to the self-confidence of the eminent Chief of Her Majesty's Government—an acute debater, who had managed, by one of the rhetorical sleights of hand so easy to him, to make reference to a pending debate without being called to Order for a breach of the Rules of the House? If he (Mr. O'Donnell) was to discuss the question, however abstractedly, he asked the House what could be more unfair—especially considering that the object of the Motion which formed that question was to cripple and stifle, and, if possible, destroy the opportunities of private Members to meet by proper refutation errors and mis-statements that might have been uttered—than to prevent his referring to actual misrepresentations that had been made? He failed to see why, because coercive measures of such grave consequence were under discussion, the English, Scotch, and Irish Members should be forbidden to bring forward most important independent Motions, many of which were calculated to throw light upon the matter which the Government had in hand. The tactics of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary were to force his measures upon the House to the prejudice of all other Business. He presumed that in some strange freak of innocence the right hon. Gentleman had allowed himself to be imposed upon, and had been induced to give the House a horrible account of the state of Ireland. But it was unfair to deprive the Irish Members of every opportunity of dispelling the false statements which had been submitted to the House as to the condition of Ireland. It was only reasonable that Her Majesty's Government should afford an opportunity for contradicting the assertions of the Chief Secretary; instead of which they asked the House to destroy the very foundations of Parliamentary law. It was not the Irish Members alone who were interested in opposing the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. Every hon. Member had the same interest. The right hon. Gentleman had primed, and charged, and prejudiced the House with statements which only required time to refute. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Yes, the right hon. Gentleman had primed, charged, and poisoned the mind of the House to the best of his ability, in the excess, no doubt, of his innocence; and now, when the Irish Members pleaded that an opportunity should be afforded to them for examination and inquiry, the only answer of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government was to introduce, under such sinister circumstances, a gagging Resolution, and then point with triumph to his mechanical majority. He was sorry that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt), who loved to fight at the head of a big battalion, and who was always bravest when he had a crowd at his back, should have taken advantage of having an unusually large crowd behind him to address language to the Irish Members to which they were somewhat unaccustomed. The words which fell from the lips of the right hon. Gentleman, although cheered in that House, would be resented throughout all Ireland, and throughout all freedom-loving communities, as being a demonstration of confidence in mere physical force. It was as open a defiance of a mere minority as was ever committed by any mere representative of force in opposition to the power of right. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary—that Constitutional guardian of law and justice—illustrated his ideas of justice by informing the Irish Party to-night, without the slightest reply to their remonstrances, or any explanation whatever, and with perfect scorn of Irish feeling or Irish ideas, that this debate was to be prolonged until Her Majesty's Government had secured the adoption by their mechanical majority of a measure out-Heroding the records of any legislation that ever disgraced the history of the country, even in the time of a Tudor or a Stuart. The Home Secretary addressed a somewhat similar lecture to the small minority of Irish Members who, some years ago, condemned the policy of the Government in South Africa, and the proposal for the annexation of the Transvaal. The discussions on those matters had hardly died away, when, in his character of stump orator and agitator at large, the right hon. Gentleman was found repeating the arguments and protests of the Irish minority in sonorous warnings and denunciations against the Government of the Earl of Beaconsfield. [*Cries of* "Question!"] This was precisely the Question—the attempt to gag and stifle the voice of the Irish Members by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government, supported in a worthy and becoming spirit by the ex-Member for Oxford, who, however, had been so fortunate, under peculiar influences, as to be preferred by the constituency of Derby. The right hon. Gentleman gave no answer to the appeals of the Irish Members. His only answer was to pass over them with scorn, with flouting, with jeers and sarcasm. It was not, therefore, extraordinary that, with just indignation, the Irish Members should protest against such offensive conduct from a Member whom Her Majesty had entrusted with such important functions. The right hon.

Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland seemed to be anxious to take part in the discussion. [*Laughter.*] [Mr. W. E. FORSTER was sleeping.] The unprovoked laughter which had arisen from all sides of the House was calculated to impress on every mind a conviction that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was shy of discussion and more averse to publicity than might have been expected from the author of the marvellous statements which had been made within the last 24 hours. There sat Her Majesty's Ministry—certainly not extinct volcanoes, for their breasts were still filled with dire designs against public and private liberty—they sat, scorning explanation, wrapped in the stateliness of their own reflections; and it was the unanimous opinion of their followers, judging from their expressions of approval, that they fully shared the opinion of the Home Rule Members that, decidedly, the wisest part the Liberal Administration could play on the present occasion was to be silent, and to trust to brute force for carrying out their evil decrees. Was there no explanation forthcoming from the right hon. Gentleman the echo of Dublin Castle? Was there no explanation forthcoming from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), who already wore the vesture emblematic of the sea of gore through which the Executive might find it necessary to wade?

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to apply himself to the Question before the House.

MR. O'DONNELL fully admitted the justice of the Speaker's call to Order, and apologized for having made any attempt to allude to the extraordinary appearance which Her Majesty's Government presented at that moment. Every argument which the Irish Members advanced against the conduct of Her Majesty's Government gained increased force as the minute-hand revolved, and as hour was added to hour. He confessed that, personally, he felt considerable difficulty, and that he was in no condition to cope with the mass of physical force in reserve, or with the loud conversation of some hon. Members. At the same time, when Her Majesty's Government treated this great subject—this question of the liberties of so many millions of men, and the suppression of the rights and privileges of the Parliamentary Representatives, with such undisguised coolness and indifference, he was inclined to excuse the levity with which some conversationalists seemed to regard the proceedings of the House. Her Majesty's Government proposed to muzzle the Irish Members in the midst of a grave discussion for the purpose of preventing them from examining into the Blue Books for arguments against coercion. He knew that there was no chance of arousing the somnolent vitality of those hon. Members who clustered around Her Majesty's Government at that hour (3 o'clock); but when the Irish Members left that Hall, they would be able to appeal to a wider public opinion and a still greater Commons—that Commons of which that House was the Representative, and which had the right, as well as the power, of correcting, on future occasions, the power of its Representatives, and which had the right to claim at the hands of the Irish Members, as the Representatives of an oppressed minority, a full explanation of the open scorn, of the undisguised menace, of the muzzling and gagging tactics with which the advocates of Irish liberty and Irish Constitutionalism had been met by a Liberal Administration. To that Commons at large they would ultimately appeal, and they would tell them, in full detail, the circumstances of that message of peace which the gagging Resolution of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian had sent to Ireland and to the Irish Members. There, in the House of Commons, their voices fell, without weight, upon a Party convinced of victory; but outside those walls it would be their duty to mould and shape public opinion, and to prepare the people for the triumph of right over power. Her Majesty's Government, by forcing these gagging Resolutions on the House, might imagine that they would meet with but slight opposition indeed. The hand of a child could cast a pebble into the ocean, and the extending ripples might reach for hundreds of yards on every side. But it was no pebble, and the hand of no child, that they saw on the present occasion. The missile which Her Majesty's Government hurled at liberty and Constitutionalism was a gigantic mass, which, falling into the vast expanse of the world's opinion, would produce circles and circles of far extending waves, until the shores of distant continents would feel the wash and flood of that great convulsion.

Mr. DAWSON said, it had been implied in the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman that there had been design in the incident that had come under the notice of the House. As a Member of the Irish Party he entirely denied that imputation, and asserted that whatever had occurred was of an impromptu character. He had no intention of making any appeal to the House; but he wished to clear himself and stand independent in his position, by saying there had been no foregone conclusion, and no attack on the temper of the House, or any clumsy attempt to bring it into contempt. Certainly there were enough of charges against Irish Members without having recourse to innuendo. What they stood upon at that moment was as true as it was before the incident occurred; they were asserting the great principles and immemorial privileges of that House, and of themselves as Members of it. The importance of these was as obvious then as it was before the incident occurred; and he, therefore, thought the House should dismiss that incident from its mind. He said it would be unbecoming in such an Assembly that it should be met in the manner it had been. It should be remembered that when the Rules of the House had been laid down the English nation alone ruled there; but that, since that time, the Representatives of another nation had been introduced *nolens volens*. It must, also, be borne in mind that the English Representation was very powerful; while that of Ireland, when united as one man, amounted to but one-fifth of the whole. The incident, which had been met with prompt and sharp censure, should be forgotten, and was too trifling to justify the course of action now proposed by the Government. That action went beyond the necessities of the case, and he could not but think it should have been reserved for a more worthy occasion. He trusted the House would be relieved of the necessity of prolonging the Sitting upon such trifling grounds.

Mr. GIVAN said, he had hitherto given consistent support to Her Majesty's Government, and desired to do so in the future; but, after listening to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman and other hon. Members, he had come to the conclusion that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to accede to the present demand for the adjournment of the debate. An inroad was about to be made upon the Rules and Constitution of the House which would affect minorities, and a precedent was about to be set which, once established, would not be easily set aside. Although he was not quite sure that Irish Members opposite had a majority of adherents amongst Irish Representatives, he knew that the people of Ireland, from Cape Clear to the Giant's Causeway, had a deep sympathy with the sentiments which those hon. Members advocated, so far as the amelioration of their condition, with reference to the Land Laws, was concerned, and were determined to adhere to many of the principles which they put forward. It had come to this, that in consequence of Her Majesty's Government having, in the first instance, brought in coercive instead of remedial measures, many of those who had stood aloof from the Land League were at that moment joining it. Hon. Members must bear in mind that in dealing with the Irish people they were dealing with an exceedingly sensitive as well as sensible people, and that if agitation was to cease and peace and order be restored, it was necessary not only to do right towards them, but to convince them that right had been done. There was no people on the face of the earth so amenable as the Irish to justice, forbearance, and consideration. He had confidence in the position he had taken with regard to the present discussion, derived from the admission of the right hon. Gentleman the head of the Government, who had observed, in the earlier part of the evening, that but for some circumstance which had taken place on the Benches opposite, he would have been prepared to adjourn the debate. It was quite clear, from references to the Return issued that morning made by hon. Members opposite, that they, at all events, were not satisfied that a sufficient opportunity had been afforded them of fully investigating its correctness. Surely, Gentlemen who represented so much of Irish opinion in that House should have the opportunity which they desired. It was only right and proper that this should be afforded, for the purpose of satisfying the Irish people that there had been full, free, and exhaustive discussion of the measures proposed. As the right hon. Gentleman had made the admission to which he had alluded, he did not think that the unfortunate incident which had occurred on the other side of the House, or that even the waste of time, great or small, ought to be a reason for denying to Irish Members time necessary for the purpose of discussion. He knew there was a great abhorrence to the measures of coercion which the Government were seeking to introduce. Not only did this feeling exist amongst the people generally, but good and loyal persons, who had no reason to be apprehensive of any penal consequences falling upon them, felt insulted that, year after year, coercive measures should be applied to Ireland. Hardly once during 20 years past had she been free from the operation of coercive laws; and, therefore, he also considered it regretable that Ireland should be again the subject of coercive legislation. He was as much opposed as any Member of the House to obstructive tactics for the wanton purpose of delay; but, on the present occasion, he felt there was great weight in the arguments which had been adduced by hon. Members opposite in favour of the Motion now before the House, to which he appealed to Her Majesty's Government to accede.

MR. A. MOORE said, it was to be hoped that some little concession would be made on both sides of the House, in order that some termination of the position might be arrived at. He had been present on former similar occasions, in reference to which he could say that the House was always the loser in the end. They had been discussing that evening the question of depriving the Irish people of certain Constitutional privileges, and the House had been put into a bad temper by an unfortunate incident. Hon. Members opposite had used some hot words, and they had been replied to by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary. He thought it was possible that some arrangement might be made, and suggested that the Motion of the Prime Minister should be allowed to pass. This, he was aware, would be a great concession on the part of Irish Members, after the manner in which they had been treated. At the same time, there could be derived no great benefit from continuing the discussion until Wednesday evening. On the other hand, he appealed to the Government not to proceed with the Coercion Bill until Thursday.

MR. GRAY thought the suggestion of the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) should receive some response from the Government. He, like his hon. Friend, had had some experience of these unpleasant incidents, and he agreed with the hon. Member that whoever might have been the gainer in these contests, the House had been, on the whole, the loser. It really would be an unhappy thing for the Government and for the country if the first stage of that measure was marked by a demonstration of heat and something approaching to ill-temper on both sides of the House. If the Government were going to adopt this step of imposing coercion on Ireland, they should at least do it with calmness and deliberation, and not do it because their tempers were ruffled by an unpleasant incident. He trusted the suggestion of the hon. Member would be considered by the Government, and that they would not pass it over as unworthy of attention. He believed it was a reasonable suggestion, and one which would commend itself to the approval of all Members of the House, and save them from an unpleasant and unprofitable strain which could only result in physical discomfort and mental injury and discredit to the House. A suggestion by which a substantial advance would be made by the Government was worthy of consideration; and it was a very small view of the position for the Government to take that, because one hon. Member had transgressed the Rules of the House and provoked punishment, a matter of primary importance was to be forced through the House in a manner which the Prime Minister had declared it would not have been but for that incident. Therefore, when all the heat of that discussion had passed away, and when the primary facts alone remained on record, they would have this before them—that a Bill suspending the liberties of the Irish people had been forced through one stage at a time of night when no publicity could be obtained for the arguments, not because of urgency or real reason, but because certain Members of the Government were irritated at the conduct of a private

Member of the House. Was that a reasonable attitude? He thought the suggestion of the hon. Member for Clonmel a reasonable one. It was a large concession for Members holding the views he (Mr. Gray) held; but it would relieve the House from a very disagreeable position.

Dr. LYONS, while consistently opposed to any form of unreasoning obstruction in that House, would add his voice in support of the plea made by the hon. Members around him. He did not think the Government was adding to the feeling of dignity and respect with which they ought to be regarded by entering into a contest of this kind, and he must say that he thought that all persons interested in so very important a crisis as that now existing had just grounds for complaint—and such as would be recognized fully when that hour had passed away—that there had not been sufficient time to examine with care the records of alleged crime in Ireland which had been put before the House. As an illustration of the feeling which was growing up in Ireland he would read a letter from a gentleman in Armagh, who was entitled to all credit and respect, and who had large influence in his district. The letter might throw some light on the feeling which was beginning to operate in Ireland. That gentleman, writing from Armagh yesterday (January 24), said—

> "I need not tell you that all here are deeply disappointed with the Government on account of their conduct in reference to the Land Question. They say they made many sacrifices to return the Liberals at the head of the poll in Orange Armagh, and they ask, Is this the return of the Government—insult, mockery, and coercion? A few days after the opening of the Session, I had a letter from one of the highest dignitaries in the Irish Church, a man of moderate views, but a true, warm friend of the Irish people. He said, 'Mr. Gladstone's few words on the Land Question are the saddest message sent to Ireland for years.' If the Government have a Land Bill why do they not introduce it at once, and not sink the people to despair? If a good Land Bill be introduced and passed coercion will be quite unnecessary; but if, after all the education the Government had received on the Land Question, they did not pass a satisfactory measure, the people say it will be an incontrovertible proof of the unwillingness or incompetency of the English House of Commons to legislate for Ireland. Then will arise another agitation more formidable than the present, for all the people, Protestants and Catholics, are fully alive to their interests, and never before were they so united or determined. It is a cruel wrong to the poor people to keep them so long in suspense. Mr. Gladstone should not act the part of a bad father who would give the lash to a poor child crying for bread. Ireland is a suppliant at his knees asking him to redress her wrongs; but his reply is coercion."

The hon. Member added that he thought a very reasonable proposition had been made by the hon. Member for Clonmel, and at that hour he asked the Government to consider with wisdom and prudence the position that was before the House. He did not think it would be to the credit of any Government to say that at an initiatory stage of a measure of such an exceptional kind they would force the House to sit through the night in order to secure the triumph of passing a Resolution which, at all events; stood in this singular position—that, though present in the House and challenged on this subject, still the Government had not produced any precedent for their proposal. He was opposed to obstruction. He had voted against it, and would vote against it on every occasion, for it was unreasoning and unmeaning. There was an inevitable end before them, and it was their duty to face it; but it was perfectly futile to keep up that obstruction. He urged the Government not to enter into this contest, and he would add his voice in earnest support of the plea that had already been made to the Leader of the House.

Mr. LITTON said, he was quite prepared to support the Government in the action they had taken that evening. He could not conceive how a Government, without showing determination to meet the obstruction which was presented to the House by hon. Members on the other side, would deserve the confidence of the House unless they were determined to see the matter through; and he would say this—that if he saw any hesitation on the part of the Government in regard to the contest they had now entered upon, he should never feel called upon again to sit up all night in order to support them. But, while he said that was what the Government ought to do, he presumed the object they had in view was to carry the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, and he apprehended that in carrying that Motion with the consent of the House, they would have attained the first step in the proceedings they deemed it necessary to take. As he understood, a proposal had been made which did not seem to him an unreasonable one. The proposition was, that the Resolution of the Prime Minister should be carried; and, on the other hand, all that hon. Members on the other side would ask in return, would be that the next step of the Coercion Bill should not be taken until Thursday—in other words, that the few hours from 12 till 6, during which the House could sit on Wednesday, should be considered as a time which might be fairly allowed to hon. Members to enable them to prepare for the further consideration which must come on on Thursday. If that were so, and there was any ground in the argument that the hon. Members on the other side had not had time to examine the statistics presented to the House, there would appear to be some reason in conceding to them the six hours of Wednesday, and thereby secure the immediate passing of the Resolution. He did not think there would be any loss of dignity in adopting that course; but, yielding to the better opinion of the Gentlemen who sat on the Treasury Bench, if they saw a loss of dignity—and dignity was something to be considered—by adopting that course, he would support them through the Sitting, no matter to what hour they sat, to meet the opposition of the other side, which he regarded as prejudicial to the case they had put before the House.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, that if a reasonable suggestion had been thrown out on that side of the House which would meet the wishes of the other side of the House, as well as of many Members on that side, the Government would be doing very wrongly if they did not accede to it. There were Members on both sides of the House who were not more enamoured of this measure than the Irish Members. They accepted it as a bitter necessity, taking it for granted that it would not have been introduced by those in whom they had such entire confidence if it had not been absolutely necessary. But the proposal of the hon. Member for Clonmel was not reasonable, well-meant as it might be, and a glance at the Resolution would show that it was impossible for the Government, with all the good-will in the world, to assent to it. The terms of the Resolution were—

> "That the introduction of the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property Bill, and the Peace Preservation Bill, have precedence of all Orders and Notices of Motion, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise decide."

If the Government acceded to the demand made, they would not put those Bills in the position which was the intention of that Motion, and a whole day would be wasted when the whole object of the Government was to save time. He did not wish to say more, especially at that time of the night; but, in his opinion, no blame could be attached to the Government for refusing to accept what was not really a reasonable compromise.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member has put the matter quite clearly, and I must acknowledge that. The proposition, if acceded to, is that the House having passed a Resolution of great importance, should immediately break it. [MR. A. MOORE: I would amend it.] But the impression would go to the country that we were trifling with the whole matter. [An Irish MEMBER: What country?] Our constituents. There seems to be a curious impression in the House that we are going, if this Resolution is passed, immediately to pass the measure I brought in last night. We are only at the first stage of the measure, and this is the first occasion I recollect on which any Government measure has been opposed at the first stage. Although the Irish Members wish to have every opportunity of giving full expression to their views, I hardly think it quite consistent that there should be this display of feeling, when the question is merely how soon we should go on with the debate, as to whether the Bill shall be introduced or not. The statistics from which I quoted yesterday, and the Blue Book which has been circulated to-day, the Irish Members desire to examine; but does anyone doubt that if we pass this Resolution, they will not have abundant time to do so? The real question we have before us is, whether the House—whether the enormous majority of the House—is to decide the mode in which we shall carry on the Business of the House. That is a very important question? If it is not decided in the affirmative, it will be a precedent, and a very bad precedent—namely, that the House is not master of its own proceedings. I am sorry not to be able to accede to the suggestion of my hon. Friends, because I am sure they made it in perfect good faith, and with a wish to arrive at a pleasant ending to this contest. I really cannot take the course suggested, for we should stultify ourselves. We must go on to another division, and I hope it will be the last.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY could not say that he was much surprised at the decision of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the proposed compromise. That proposal had not come from him (Mr. Justin M'Carthy), nor from any hon. Member on that side of the House; it had come from one of the right hon. Gentleman's own friends and supporters, and was, no doubt, offered with the best intention in the interest of free debate and in the interest of the dignity of the House. The Irish Members on his side of the House had made no suggestion, no proposal, and certainly no appeal *ad misericordiam* to Her Majesty's Government or to the right hon. Gentleman. In saying that, he was perfectly aware—and had never been more distinctly aware than at the present moment—how little value in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman attached to any appeal from hon. Gentlemen sharing his (Mr. Justin M'Carthy's) sentiments. In recommending that the debate should be now adjourned in order that a subject worthy of the consideration of Parliament should be calmly discussed, he was offering a disinterested piece of advice, because, as he never by any chance went to bed at so early an hour, he suffered nothing personally by the prolongation of the debate. He, and hon. Gentlemen who acted with him, desired only that they should have a fair discussion of this preliminary measure of coercion proposed by the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary entirely misunderstood the degree of importance the Irish Members attached to this measure. They were opposed to the Government measures of coercion in the first instance, and, more than that, they were opposed to any measure of urgency by which it was sought to thrust that coercion down the throats of the House and of the Irish people. They felt it was their duty as Irishmen, and necessary for their national credit, that they should oppose not alone the Coercion Bills when they were brought forward, but that extraordinary measure of urgency by which the Prime Minister, departing from all precedent and custom of years back, endeavoured, without proper debate or proper discussion, to force his views upon an exhausted House of Commons and the small number of hon. Members who represented the Irish people. The Irish Members were not going, whatever the sacrifice to their personal comfort, to allow the measure of urgency to pass, any more than the measures of coercion themselves, without recording their strong and emphatic protest against it, and without appealing from the House, heated as it was by the many unusual incidents which had occurred, to the English people. He was glad to hear the hon. Member for Monaghan (Mr. Givan) introduce into the discussion considerations he had not yet heard put forward on the other side of the House—namely, considerations for the feeling of the Irish people. The hon. Member had said with truth that, day by day, as these discussions proceeded, the feeling of the Irish people grew more nearly unanimous in favour of the small body of men defending the rights of their countrymen in the House of Commons. The people of the North of Ireland were becoming more and more inclined to despair of any good being done for Ireland by the present Government, and were, therefore, growing more and more inclined to identify themselves with the Land League and its opinions, and to oppose the Government. On this question of urgency the desire of the Irish Members had been to obtain such a fair discussion as would enable them to show the English people what was the nature of the proposition so suddenly pressed upon the House. They had come down to-day, not only with no idea of offering obstruction to the proposal of the Government, but with no expectation of an unusually long debate. As for himself—and he knew he could speak for every Member of his Party—he had been under the impression that there was a tacit understanding that the Premier's proposal would be discussed to-night, and, perhaps, to-morrow, and that then, a division having been taken, they would necessarily come to the question of coercion — a question which, at one time or other, they would have to discuss. He was sure no single Member of his Party had had a thought of obstruction, or even of a prolonged debate, to-night. Unfortunately, he was not present in the House when that incident occurred which seemed to have inflamed so much the passions of hon. Members on the other side of the House. The Home Secretary, he understood, had made some display of resolve which seemed to indicate a determination not to treat with the Irish Members on any terms whatever. He had announced, in a melodramatic style more calculated to impress a gallery audience than the House of Commons, that the Government intended to listen to no appeal to reason, but to go on with their measure of urgency until it was disposed of, regardless of the convenience of the Irish Members. This display of cheap heroism on the part of the right hon. Gentleman had, as was only to be expected, excited some amount of temper amongst the Irish Members. The Home Secretary had only himself to thank for the feeling that had been shown. But he could only repeat that there had been no intention of causing an all-night Sitting, much less of adopting unreasonable and obstructive opposition to this preliminary measure of urgency. Irish Members wished to get the attention of the English public aroused to the fact that they were about to be coerced in order to prevent them from opposing the coercion of their country; and, having discussed that point, they would have been quite ready to go on to the consideration of the graver question—the Coercion Bill itself. It was the more necessary for the Irish Members to insist on this discussion, seeing that important statistics had been newly published that morning. It was part of their case that by an exposure of the manner in which these figures were put together, and of the manner in which the buckram army of outrages had been arrayed by the Chief Secretary, they could so demolish the case he endeavoured to make out as to show there was no necessity whatever for coercion; and, therefore, as a matter of course, no necessity for the vote of urgency that was to lead to coercion. He need not remind the House how the night had been wasted from sober debate; but the facts he had referred to ought to have strengthened the claim of the supporters of the Government to the reasonable compromise that the discussion should be brought to a conclusion to-night, and that the Coercion Bill should be resumed under better auspices and in happier temper on Thursday.

MR. ASHTON DILKE thought it would be a great pity if the opportunity of conciliation, which they now seemed to have some prospect of, were thrown away and wasted. He agreed with the hon. Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson) that the compromise proposed by the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) was an impossibility and an absurdity on the face of it. But there was another alternative that might be acceptable to both sides of the House—namely, that the debate should be adjourned now on the distinct understanding that a decision should be arrived at before the conclusion of the usual Wednesday Sitting. He only threw this out by way of suggestion. If it did not meet with the approval of the House, he would not press it.

MR. FINDLATER was of opinion that the Government ought to consent to the adjournment, and believed that if they did not it would have a bad effect in Ireland, where the people would think there was no justice whatever to be got from Parliament.

MR. A. MOORE said, the hon. Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne (Mr. Ashton Dilke) had described his suggestion as "an absurdity on the face of it;" but he failed to see that the hon. Member had established a claim to a monopoly of intelligence, notwithstanding that he was a "Philosophical Radical." He might allow other people to have a small amount of intelligence. The suggestion he (Mr. A. Moore) had recommended to the favourable consideration of the Government was one they would accept if they wished to be reasonable, and not protract a scene that brought more disgrace on the House than on individual Members of it. They might insert in the Resolution a word or two to render it operative after Wednesday. In this way the discussion of the Coercion Bill would go on on Thursday, and continue day by day.

MR. LABOUCHERE could confirm what had been said by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Justin M'Carthy)—namely, that so far as could be learnt, there had been no intention to obstruct. He had the honour of moving the adjournment of the debate last night, and was, consequently, anxious to know when he was likely to be called upon to address the House. He had questioned hon. Members opposite, who were generally supposed to know a little more than others with regard to these matters, and they had told him that it was possible a division might be taken on the Resolution of the Prime Minister this evening; but that if not, if two or three hon. Members wished to speak to-morrow, the division might be taken at 3 o'clock on that day. They told him that if he wished to speak on the Government Bill, he had better be in the House at 2 o'clock on Wednesday. He had no doubt hon. Gentlemen opposite had meant what they said. What had occurred to-night with regard to the hon. Member for Cavan was a mere accident, and he was sure there was no plan or design at the commencement of the Sitting for bringing about any species of what was called obstruction. It had been intended that the division should be taken at the very latest by 2 o'clock to-morrow, and that being so, there was no use their continuing to sit until 2 o'clock, until 12, or possibly for three or four weeks. He was not speaking for himself—for, so far as he was personally concerned, he was going to bed—but for Members on both sides of the House. The thing could be settled in the simplest possible manner by an adjournment until 12 o'clock, with some sort of understanding—["No, no!"] Hon. Gentlemen might say "No!" but there were 30 or 40 hon. Gentlemen in the House who represented certainly one part of the United Kingdom, and a most important part, and it was most unfair, whenever any sort of understanding with them was suggested, for hon. Members to ridicule the notion as if those 30 or 40 Gentlemen were not their equals, but were a species of lepers not worth having any dealings with. The Government should accept an adjournment; if they did not, the fault would be on their side.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 24; Noes 159: Majority 135.—(Div. List, No. 12.) [4.0 A.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. DILLON, in rising to move "That this House do now adjourn," said, it was very difficult to understand the present action of the Government. He and his Friends came down to the House in the belief that probably two nights would be required for the discussion of the Prime Minister's Motion. That was not an unreasonable belief when regard was had to the importance of the proposition, and he was fully persuaded that had it not been for the unfortunate incident a few hours ago, the Government would have consented to an adjournment. The Irish Members were in no way responsible for the incident, and they only did what they considered to be their duty when one of their number had been suspended from the service of the House. They were refused a second night's discussion; but he was sure that when the Government and their supporters came to consider their position in a cooler moment they would find they had committed a very great mistake. He was equally sure that the cooler and more intelligent portion of the people of England would justify the action of the Irish Party, and would say they had not been guilty of any obstruction in the matter. The Government were alone responsible for the waste of time. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had said very truly that the Irish Members entered upon the debate with a *boná fide* object, and not with the intention of offering any factious obstruction. He had, however, always said he would offer all the opposition the Rules permitted to the Coercive Bills to be introduced by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. As a proof of their *boná fides* upon the present occasion he would tell them that an hon. Gentleman, representing one of the largest constituencies in England, had asked him during the evening if he was quite certain the debate would be adjourned until the morrow, as he wished to support the Irish side of the question. That hon. Gentleman had gone home, intending to come down to-day (Wednesday) to deliver his speech. It must be remembered that the whole Sitting had been occupied by the discussion upon the Motion of the First Lord of the Treasury. For the second time in the history of Parliament an hon. Member of the House had been silenced, and surely two hours was not an unreasonable amount of time to consume in the consideration of so rare, almost unprecedented, and to a large constituency in Ireland, so startling a matter. In his speech in introducing his Motion, the Prime Minister endeavoured to show there was no argument could be used against his proposal for urgency in respect to the Coercive Bills for Ireland, and that the evidence in possession of the Government was such that no time ought to be wasted. They would be able to demolish every bit of evidence the Government could bring forward. A great portion of the evidence had only been submitted to the House this morning, and hon. Members had not had an opportunity of considering it. Besides, the House decided to consider whether the evidence was such as to warrant them in passing such a Motion. It was a remarked fact that the Prime Minister had not cited any precedents for his Motion. It would be generally admitted that the question really affected Ireland; but how many hon. Members from Ireland were prepared to support the policy of the Government? Only one Irish Representative, the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Litton), had stood forward to support the Government in the course they were now pursuing. One solitary Irishman had been induced to support the Government in the attempt to stifle discussion, while 60 Irish Members, at the least, had bitterly opposed the attempt. The Government had been warned by men who did not agree with them (the Home Rulers) that the course they were adopting would only exasperate the Irish people, even those who were in league with the extreme Irish Party. The Government would do well to pause before—by brute force, by the sheer force of English and Scotch Members—they adopted a proceeding which would, in the highest degree, be offensive to the Irish people. It was true he was one of a minority of between 30 and 40 only; but would it not be wise for the House to deliberate before it continued this international struggle—for such a struggle it really was—in which English and Scotch Members were going to crush Irish Members on a question which had reference to Ireland alone? He did not know what the Government expected to gain; but this he did know, that if it afforded pleasure to hon. Gentlemen opposite to sit there for three nights, the public feeling of Ireland would be at the back of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his supporters. It really seemed to him that hon. Gentlemen were entering on a most unreasonable course. The logic of the position was entirely on their (the Irish Members') side, but force on the side of the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not keeping to the Question before the House. He is speaking on other matter quite beside the Question before the House.

MR. DILLON said, there were a great many matters connected with the condition of their country which they considered very urgent, and which they considered it desirous to bring under the attention of the House. But when they endeavoured to bring in a Bill, their arguments fell flatly upon empty Benches. The very fact of summoning Parliament a month earlier than usual was sufficient to prove that Ireland was in a condition requiring remedy. They, of course knew perfectly well what was the condition of their country; and the question now under debate, from their point of view, was whether they were to acknowledge the urgency of coercive measures or the urgency of the remedies which the majority of the Irish Representatives believed in. They considered that their proposals were of more consequence to the welfare of the Irish people than that of the Government; and if the House would listen to them dispassionately, they hoped to be able to convince hon. Gentlemen that if they would carry a measure which would proclaim a truce between the contending factions in Ireland, the necessity for coercion would pass away. The adoption of the Resolution of the Prime Minister might be the very opposite result to that which the right hon. Gentleman was desirous of attaining. He was, no doubt, desirous of expediting the general Business of Parliament; but he (Mr. Dillon) and his hon. Friends believed the adoption of their proposal would tend to that end. They protested against postponing for an indefinite period all the privileges and rights of Members of this House, and they protested against a limitation of their privileges in order that a purely mischievous measure might engage them. The Prime Minister's Motion would place them in an unpleasant position, for it not only declared the urgency of measures of coercion for Ireland, but it practically silenced the

Representatives of Ireland in the House for all useful purposes. They would be reduced to the position of passive resistance to the proposals of the Ministry, if the Motion were passed. They could not initiate any legislation, or introduce any grievances which they had a right to bring under the notice of Her Majesty's Ministers. They protested against being coerced in this way, for then their presence in the House would amount to a perfect sham and delusion.

Colonel The O'GORMAN MAHON seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it was now nine hours since he ventured to move an Amendment to the Motion of the Prime Minister. Nine hours ago, he respectfully submitted to the Government what appeared to him to be cogent reasons why they should pause and consider the position they were now adopting before hurrying the House into a decision which was likely to be, for a time at least, fatal to the rights of minorities in that House. They had already seen, by the proceedings of that evening, how much truth there was in that forecast; and how completely the dominant majority could be used had been shown by the right hon. Gentleman who had introduced the Motion. But the delay which had taken place was not to be imputed to hon. Members who sat on the Home Rule Benches. Anyone who had closely followed the proceedings of that night would bear him out that the delay which had taken place was entirely to be attributed to the want of tact and want of management and knowledge of the Forms of the House which the Ministry had manifested. If they had only taken the opportunity afforded to them at 11 o'clock the night before, they could have assented to the first Motion for adjournment, and then they could have brought on the Motion of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. If the Ministry had seized that opportunity, which he thought it was a mistake to have afforded them, they would by the present time have had a discussion on the very Bill they were so anxious to bring forward. But for six or seven hours the Ministry had manifested the same want of tact and knowledge of the Forms of the House which had contributed so much to their discomfort last Session. He wished to draw the attention of the House to the fact that, though there was a great deal in the objection which he had urged, not a single Member of the Ministry, and not a single supporter of the Ministry, had risen in their places to reply to that objection. He was not a stickler for personal dignity, and he was not affronted that his suggestion had not met with an immediate response. But not only had the Ministry not condescended to reply, but they had by mere force of numbers silenced the Irish Members in the discharge of the duty which they believed their constituents looked to them to discharge in the defence of their liberties. They were prepared to discuss the position point by point, and until they had been able to show that the Government were wrong, and that they were not justified in making the application they now made. They did not shirk the discussion, and he wished at once to refute any suggestion to the effect that he was obstructing. He had a great contempt for obstruction. He looked upon it as the very lowest form of Parliamentary practice. He could never condescend to employ it; but he did believe in steady, firm, and sustained pressure scientifically applied. [*A laugh.*] He did not see that that was a matter to laugh at. He supposed that those who had indulged in the hostile demonstrations which had taken place, regardless of the rights of minorities in this House, and regardless of the rights and privileges of the Irish people, could scarcely object if the Representatives of the people of Ireland declared their intention to keep up, as he had no hesitation of declaring his intention, a steady drag on the Government, until he could induce them to pay that attention to the affairs of his constituents which it was their duty to pay. The Government had refused to answer the objections which the Irish Members had raised. They had determined to silence them by mere force of numbers. They had refused even to accept the proposal which emanated from the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) — a proposal which seemed to him to be all in favour of the Government and all against the Irish Members. But if they came to consider why the Government refused the compromise, they would be able to realize the way in which the dignity of the House was likely to be trailed in the dust by the present Administration. The reason why the Government would not consent to the offer was that they were content to see the House partially occupied by a number of sleeping figures, who bore the semblance of Legislators, but who in reality were only Members on guard, ready to out-number the defenders of Irish liberty, and who were waiting to be relieved by those who had gone home for a certain number of hours, and having agreed with the relays who had gone home, the Government felt they were bound in honour to keep the thing going, unless they could make the Irish Members surrender at discretion. He listened to the proposal of the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) with dismay, and he was glad the Government did not accept it. He was not as able as the majority of hon. Members to stand the strain of a prolonged Sitting; but while he had strength left he would stand at his post, and do what he could to resist what he believed to be unwarrantable tyranny on the part of the majority. The conduct of the Government was calculated to degrade the dignity of the House. The Ministry had been singularly unmindful of the fact that Mr. Speaker had been kept in his chair for no less than 12 hours, and singularly unmindful of the fact that the Officers of the House had been unnecessarily kept from their repose. He and his hon. Friends gained little credit by the events of the present Sitting, but the Government gained still less credit. The Irish Members knew that, whether they succeeded or not, they would be doing that which Englishmen would certainly do if they were in their place. If they submitted, they would only earn the contempt of the English people. They knew that as soon as the coercive measures were passed, a large number of innocent men would be cast into prison; they knew that besides the men who would be cast in prison, a large number would live in fear and trembling; they knew that throughout the length and breadth of the land many a home would be desolated by the enforcement of this coercion. It was their duty to avert such dangers as long as they could, and until they could obtain the assurance that the Government would not enforce their coercive powers until the people of the country had an opportunity of judging of the merits of the case. Until they obtained this assurance, they would maintain the struggle by every Form the House permitted.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he rose for the purpose of drawing attention to the statement of the hon. Member for Tipperary, to the effect that he had heard the proposal of the hon. Member for Clonmel with dismay, and was glad that it had been rejected by Members amongst whom he sat. The hon. Member for Tipperary expressed his disapprobation, and spoke of the hon. Member for Longford as having also disapproved it. When, therefore, it was attempted to fix on the Government the responsibility of having rejected measures to which hon. Members opposite were favourable, those remarks should be recollected. The House had been told that the debate was not to be protracted, and that it was to be concluded on Wednesday. But what was the declaration of the hon. Member who had just sat down? He had stated that the intention was that the debate should be continued until there was an undertaking given by Her Majesty's Government that the Coercion Bill should not proceed, except at such a rate as might be satisfactory to the people of Ireland. That was certainly the impression the words of the hon. Member produced upon his mind. He had listened for many hours to the debate which had taken place, and had moreover heard from many Members outside that the battle of coercion was to be fought on the Motion of the Prime Minister. It was singular that when the meaning of plain words was gathered, and when a distinct impression was derived from the language of hon. Members opposite, it should be immediately repudiated. It had been stated that this Motion would be resisted to the last for the purpose of preventing the question of coercion coming on. It was perfectly idle to say now that assertions of that character had not been made over and over again, for it had been the very point of discussion until a late hour in the morning. It had not been even whispered that the debate would close that day until 3 o'clock was reached, and it was impossible for anyone who had sat out the debate to come to any other conclusion than that this was not intended. The right hon. Gentleman the head of the Government stated, at half-past 12 o'clock, when the Motion for adjournment was moved, that he could not consent to it in consequence of the obvious intention shown throughout the night in dealing with his Motion. The hon. Member for Longford had charged him (Sir William Harcourt) with speaking, earlier in the evening, in an impassioned way; but he had simply replied to an hon. Member in a single sentence that the intention of the Government was that the debate should be continued until the Motion of the Prime Minister was disposed of.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he began to think that the prolongation of the debate was producing its natural effects upon the understandings of hon. Members on both sides of the House. It was becoming difficult to get a clear perception of each other's meaning into the minds of hon. Members. He had never accused the right hon. Gentleman of speaking in a passionate tone; but of a certain haughtiness towards, and the disregard of, a section of the House. As for the suggestion of the hon. Member for Clonmel, he had not regarded it with much favour, as what Irish Members desired was a fair discussion of the question of urgency. They knew very well they could not make this question of urgency the occasion for a prolonged fight against coercion, and that they must get rid of that first line of defence before they came to the Land Question. They had never supposed the Government would be so unreasonable as to refuse that discussion, nor did he think they would have done so if the untoward incident, which they all regretted, had not occurred. It seemed that on account of an act on the part of one hon. Member, the whole Irish Party were to be rebuked and punished.

Mr. M'COAN said, he felt no sympathy whatever with what had been ruled to be disorderly on the part of the hon. Member for Cavan, although he regretted the censure which had been conveyed. He regretted that the character of that incident had been misappreciated by the Prime Minister, who had done the other Members of the Irish Party the injustice of supposing that it expressed the feeling of the whole Party, and, in consequence, manifested towards them a demeanour which was the reverse of conciliatory. The remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary indicated a similar spirit, couched as they were in an imperious style, which few Irishmen would be disposed tamely to accept. That being the impression which he derived from the language of right hon. Gentlemen, he was now prepared to take his part in the debate, if it lasted until midnight. These were not the only instances of discourtesy of which he had to complain. In answering a Question which he had put to the Chief Secretary for Ireland the other day, the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his opinion that it was impertinent.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Question before the House. I must call upon the hon. Member to confine his observations to that Question.

Mr. M'COAN said, he was endeavouring to explain the grounds on which the debate was being continued by hon. Members on his side of the House, and was proceeding to remark upon an instance of the manner in which Irish Members were met by the Government, and which, he thought, justified them in the course they had adopted——

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I did not mean to convey that the Question of the hon. Member was impertinent; but that if I were to ask the officials the question which he expected me to put, it would be impertinent to them.

Mr. M'COAN said, he gratefully accepted the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman. Some allusion had been made by the Home Secretary to the compromise suggested by the hon. Member for Clonmel. He trusted he was in order in saying that if acceptance were given to that proposal by Her Majesty's Government, Irish Members were willing to accept it on their part. The Motion for adjournment was not intended to obstruct the Motion of the Prime Minister; but they certainly desired to exhaust discussion upon that most important question, which directly interfered with the rights of private Members; and, regarding it as not leading up to the lines of the Coercion Bill, but as bringing coercion upon themselves, they thought it right to resist it by every means in their power. The evident intention of the Government had been to crush the Irish Party by the brute force of the majority, and their expectation was that they would weary them out. Scarcely one direct supporter of the Government had vouchsafed to engage in the debate; but he had been glad to see no less than four Members from the North raise their voices against the measures of the Government, and urge them to adopt the compromise which had been offered. It might be satisfactory to hon. Gentlemen opposite to assure them that Irish Members were quite as fresh as they had been several hours since, and that their education with respect to the Forms of the House would, he hoped, enable them to protract the present entertainment for some hours to come. He thought the Government would have acted with dignity had they accepted the compromise offered shortly after midnight. They had, however, preferred to force on an all-night's Sitting, and if the debate was reported in the papers, he ventured to think the verdict of public opinion outside would be with the Irish Members. [*A laugh.*] Learned Professors might laugh——

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS rose to Order. Did the hon. Member allude to him? He had not laughed; but was, on the contrary, ashamed of that discreditable exhibition.

Mr. CALLAN rose to Order. He wished to know whether the words "discreditable exhibition" could be applied to an individual Member?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the words were applied to any hon. Member, they would be out of Order; but I did not understand them to be applied in that sense.

Mr. M'COAN said the grounds on which the adjournment was asked for were that the Government had not met Irish Members in a spirit conducive to temperate and useful discussion; and that as the House was not in a temper to proceed with the debate in a useful manner, it was thought right that it should be resumed at a proper time on Wednesday. He had shared the feeling created by the greatly improved manner of the Home Secretary in his later remarks, and had hoped that this new and better tone indicated an intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to allow the House to adjourn. But as there now seemed to be no chance of that, there was nothing left to the Irish Members but to carry on the debate far into the day. He endorsed the remarks of the hon. Member for Longford, that while the intentions of the Irish Party were to resist the Motion of the Prime Minister, they had no hope of being able to protract the discussion on that Motion beyond Wednesday afternoon. It was the fault of the Government that the debate would now be protracted into the afternoon; and when they met again it was hardly to be expected that they would be in a more conciliatory frame of mind than at present. Moreover, when the Coercion Bill was reached, the Government would find that the temper of Irish Members had been hardened by their experience of that evening, and, within the lines of courtesy, he would tell the Government that they might expect as firm a fight upon that measure as was ever offered to a Treasury Bench. Although they did not represent the whole of the country, it had been admitted that evening that the North of Ireland was coming over to their side, and they would soon have the whole of the Irish people at their back. That being so, they felt new life and fresh acquisition of courage as the fight went on; and he trusted they would be able to satisfy the House that, although they were but a small number of Members and were so sat upon by the Olympian Deities on the Treasury Bench, they would stand to their guns on the Motion before the House, and also in their subsequent opposition to the Coercion Bills. They had now a cohesion of strength which, probably, no Irish Party ever possessed before; but he thought it due to individual Members of the Party to remind the House that they were conducting the fight that evening under all the disadvantage entailed by the absence of their Leader.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY rose to Order. He wished to ask whether the cohesion of the Irish Party was relevant to the Question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have vainly endeavoured to explain to the hon. Member that the Question before the House is the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, and that upon that Question a Motion for adjournment has been moved. The hon. Member is bound to confine himself to that Question.

Mr. M'COAN said, he regretted to have again been ruled out of Order; but trusted that this would be attributed to his want of Parliamentary experience. He was merely pointing out that the absence of their Leader——

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE rose to Order. The hon. Member was again touching on the very subject upon which he had been called to Order.

Mr. O'DONNELL rose to Order. He desired to observe that the hon. Member who appealed to the Chair should allow the hon. Member to conclude his sentence without interference.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must again appeal to the hon. Member to confine himself to the Question before the House. The hon. Member has a habit of wandering into matters which are not relevant to the Question before the House.

Mr. M'COAN said, it was entirely owing to his inexperience of the Rules of the House that he had strayed from the Question. If the adjournment were accepted by the Government he thought much would be gained, and for that reason he should support the Motion of the hon. Member for Tipperary.

Mr. DALY said, the farther the debate proceeded the more misconceptions arose. He had been greatly surprised to hear from the Home Secretary that the impression left on his mind was that the Irish Members intended, by their resistance to the Motion of the Prime Minister, to fight out upon that question the battle of coercion. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had stated that the real Question before the House was as to how its Business could be carried on, whether by the majority or not; and he had pointed out at that time that his Motion was nothing more than for leave to bring in a Bill which it was not usual to oppose. But he (Mr. Daly) replied that it was a perfectly legitimate position for the Irish Members to occupy, to delay as much as possible the measures proposed to be introduced until they had individually investigated the grounds of their introduction. He did not impute to the right hon. Gentleman any tendency to exaggeration in the statement of the facts which he had laid before the House; but he had reason to believe that many things which he had deposed to as facts could be fairly and entirely controverted. Another reason for the prolongation of the debate was that allusion had been made to the compromise offered by the hon. Member for Clonmel. For his own part, he needed only as much time as would enable him to test the accuracy of the figures upon which the Bills of the Chief Secretary for Ireland were based. Then there had been the proposal of the hon. Member for Newcastle, put forward with a good intention and with the desire of giving fair play to the minority as well as to the majority; as well as the appeal of the hon. Member for Northampton, who showed by his remarks, and by statements made to him, that there could be no possible dream of obstruction, in the proper sense of the term, in the minds of hon. Members for Ireland. He complained that all these proposals had been rejected, together with that of the hon. Member for Monaghan; and it was clear from this that the intention of the Government was to put Irish Members into a corner, and to "Boycott" them in order to prevent them discussing the question fully. But they had a right to look to the interests behind them, without regarding the personal sacrifices they were called upon to make. He could not acquit Her Majesty's Government of a combination with the other side of the House to assert an unfair advantage over the Irish Members, although he entirely acquitted his Colleagues of the charge of obstruction. He believed he had disproved that charge, and had shown that they were opposing the Motion of the Prime Minister on the grounds of law and order. It was unfair for the Government, at that hour in the morning, when their protests against that Motion would not reach the ear of the general public through the Press, to endeavour to crush the utterances of hon. Members on this side of the House. Her Majesty's Government might prolong the discussion as long as they thought fit; but the question was one of such vital importance, that it would be the duty of every Irish Member to drop in the House from physical exhaustion rather than yield to such a Motion as that of the Prime Minister. He knew when men had considered the importance of the issues involved, and the relative position of Parties in that House, that a sound and healthy declaration of public opinion would pronounce that the Irish Party were right in giving a most determined opposition to a Motion which cut deliberately at the Constitutional rights of their countrymen.

Mr. SPEAKER having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Whereupon Mr. PLAYFAIR, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

[5.55 A.M.]

MR. BARRY said, he was sorry the Home Secretary was not in his place. Accustomed as they were from time to time to remarkable utterances from that right. hon. Gentleman, he was startled to hear him declare that it was understood from what had been said by the Home Rule Members, that it was the intention of that Party to offer the Motion every possible opposition; in fact, to initiate the struggle upon the Coercion Bill at this early stage. He (Mr. Barry) altogether repudiated that. He had no idea, until half-past 1 that morning, that the Government were about to take this extraordinary action. At the earliest moment his hon. Friend the Member for Longford explained that there was not the slightest intention to offer factious opposition to the Motion of the Prime Minister; but that it was the intention to debate the question fairly, and then to take a division somewhere between 12 and 2 o'clock. But nothing approaching a desire to obstruct had been intended by the Home Rule Party. In supporting the Motion for adjournment, he expressed his regret that a question of such importance, such magnitude, as was involved in the Resolution proposed by the Prime Minister, should be discusssed under such exciting conditions. It was impossible to discuss it in a calm and deliberate manner. The proceedings—the descreditable proceedings—in which they were engaged, were very much against the wishes, the desires, and hopes of the Irish Party; and these proceedings were sprung upon them in the most unexpected manner; and in the present position of affairs it was impossible that a question involving the Constitutional liberties of the Irish people could be properly considered. But, apart from that, the wording of the Resolution, it was proposed to give the introduction and successive stages of the two Government Bills precedence over all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion. Now, it was admitted that in the present condition of Ireland there was, in several districts, great danger of famine and dire distress. Seeing that there were reports of hundreds of people on the verge of starvation, and almost attacking the Poor Law Guardians for relief, it would be a most improper, a most dangerous proposal that an Irish Member should not have the means of bringing forward a Motion in reference to the condition of the country. Suppose he wished to draw attention to the sufferings of the people in the district around Kanturk, he would be precluded from doing so if such a Resolution as this of the Prime Minister's were passed. It had been said that the Irish Representatives were desirous of shirking a discussion on the direct issue of coercion. To that statement he gave a distinct contradiction. They were anxious, and it was perfectly natural they should be anxious, to reach the Government proposals for coercion, for they knew that so long as they were engaged in the discussion of side-issues there was the fear of their being misunderstood outside, and thought to be unnecessarily obstructing the proceedings in the House. He was quite aware that feeling did exist very widely in the country, and within the last few days he had had convincing proof of it himself. This was one reason why they wished to reach the direct question of coercion at the earliest possible moment. But that was no reason why they should admit the claim of urgency, eloquently, but briefly, set forth by the Premier. By doing that they would, to a large extent, be admitting the case—the trumped-up case—of the Government. They—the Irish Members—had had no time to examine the details upon which the Government rested their case, and which details were only placed in the hands of Members yesterday morning. For himself, he had but taken a cursory glance at the Blue Book. He had a feeling, almost a conviction, that the Government case was remarkably weak; but when he took a hasty glance through that Blue Book, he was absolutely startled to find the case for the Government so superficial, so flimsy. Now, if they did not earnestly combat the plea of urgency, they would be acknowledging that the amount of disorder, of anarchy, was so excessive as to justify an action almost unprecedented in the House—that of placing all other Business aside. He contended that the case of the Government was reared on an unsound basis, that their evidence was drawn from vitiated and tainted sources; and in order that the Irish Party might make their convictions clear to the House, and to give time for the examination of the evidence, it was no unwarrantable thing to occupy the time of the House for two Sittings. In Ireland the proceedings of the House with regard to coercion were watched from day to day with feverish anxiety, and Irish Representatives felt they had a duty to discharge; so, when it appeared to other hon. Members that the time of the House was uselessly occupied, let them bear in mind the circumstances in which Irish Members were placed, and he thought a little reflection would go a long way towards moderating that excessive zeal on behalf of the Government which had been displayed on both sides of the House. The very latest Returns on the Table of the House——

Mr. DODDS rose to Order. The House was not now discussing the Returns on the Table.

The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Lyon Playfair), motioned to the hon. Member to proceed.

Mr. BARRY, continuing, said, he desired to show the reasons which actuated Irish Members in wishing for an adjournment. The latest Returns showed that agrarian crimes reported by the police—such as they were—were diminishing at a very rapid and satisfactory rate; and so the basis upon which the Government founded their proposal for coercion was gradually melting from under their feet. These agrarian outrages, small and trivial as they were, were becoming day by day less and less. This was the first fortnightly Return, and the second Return would be due in about a week. After the first Return had shown this remarkable diminution in crimes reported by the police——

An hon. Member rose to Order, and asked whether the Returns of Agrarian Crimes had the slightest relation to the Question before the House?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): If the hon. Member is only using the Return as an illustration, he would be in Order; but not if he discusses it.

Mr. BARRY resumed. He had no intention of entering into details, or of making a discursive argument, but simply was urging an argument against the plea of urgency set up. It would be only fair to the Irish people, it was an act only to be expected from any Government, that as the evidence gathered during the months of October, November and December seemed to justify them, from their own point of view, in bringing in a coercive measure, so they should allow that the evidence of January and February might upset that opinion and relieve them from that painful position in which they were placed at this moment. He was anxious that the Government should have time to re-consider their position; and he asked would it not be a fair, statesmanlike, and sensible course to wait for the next Return and see whether they were justified in obtaining this coercive measure, or whether they might not introduce into it important modifications? In the present temper of the House they could only enter upon a discreditable physical struggle. There could be no reasoning or logical force on either side. The whole matter had a foregone conclusion; the majority would insist on walking through the Lobbies, and the small minority would, as long as they were able, do the same. But was it compatible with the dignity of a Legislative Assembly and the Government of a great Empire to enter on such a course? Was it in keeping with the character of the House? How did the struggle arise? Not out of premeditation. It arose out of an unhappy incident regretted by nearly every Member in the House. That incident turned a deliberate, tranquil debate into a scene of storm and passion, and now they found themselves face to face with this unpleasant, discreditable crux. As soon as they had passed away from these unpleasant surroundings, and had had time for calm reflection, they would come to the conclusion, to use a vulgar phrase, "that the game was not worth the candle." He was aware that persistence could only end in defeat for those with whom he acted; but he also knew that no credit could accrue to either side, and he urged, in the most emphatic manner, that time for sleep and reflection should be allowed to enable both Parties to arrive at a wise conclusion. He had had some hope that the Radical Members would rally to the side of the Irish Party; but incidents of this character were calculated to mislead public opinion farther and farther from sympathy with Ireland. In supporting the Motion for adjournment, he had still some hope it might be accepted.

MR. O'SULLIVAN held that it was not unbecoming to afford a matter of so much importance a two days' debate, and there was no reason for forcing on a conclusion within one day. There were other reasons in favour of an adjournment. The Returns had only been in the hands of Members since yesterday morning, and it was quite impossible to examine them in the time given. In the second place, the Leader of the Irish Party was absent, and it was well known he had an important Notice upon the Paper. The present Motion was no ordinary question of the first or second reading of a Bill, nor, indeed, was the Bill in contemplation an ordinary measure. Its object was to do away with the liberties of every man in Ireland for the next 18 months. He, as an Irish Member, asked for a Bill to settle this unfortunate dispute, this bitter struggle between landlord and tenant which had lasted for 100 years; he asked for a Land Bill which would satisfy the people of Ireland, and he would guarantee there would be no need for a Coercion Bill. But, instead of this, they were offered that which had been offered to their forefathers for the past 80 years—a measure of coercion. There were strong reasons for opposing this, for Irishmen knew what the people had suffered under such in times past, how men were imprisoned under it upon suspicion and treated worse than burglars and pickpockets. They knew the power was not merely in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant or of the Chief Secretary; but that there was not a police-officer or police-constable——

An hon. MEMBER rose to Order, and asked was it in Order to discuss the Coercion Bill?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member would not be in Order in discussing that Bill, but I do not understand he is going to do that.

MR. O'SULLIVAN explained he had no intention of doing so; he merely wished to show how the people had been injured during the trial of such a Bill before. He knew the injustice and persecution the people suffered when they were imprisoned on the authority of a police-officer——

An hon. MEMBER again rose to Order.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, he was speaking to the Motion of the Prime Minister.

An hon. MEMBER submitted that this was out of Order. The hon. Member for Limerick had distinctly stated that he was addressing the House on the Motion of the Prime Minister, and he submitted that that was entirely out of Order. The Question before the House was the adjournment of the House, and the speech the hon. Member was now making, according to his own showing, was upon the Prime Minister's Motion, and not applicable to the Motion for adjournment.

MR. CALLAN, on the point of Order, directed the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Question before the House was the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, upon which Motion a Motion of adjournment had been moved, and, therefore, under the circumstances, the hon. Gentleman was perfectly in Order.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member would not be in Order if he were to discuss the details of the Coercion Bill on a Motion for the adjournment of the House. It is the custom to allow a certain latitude to hon. Members in these discussions; but I must ask him not to exceed that latitude.

MR. O'SULLIVAN proceeded, and remarked that he had often seen the Benches nearly empty during discussions in which the interest of Ireland was concerned; but he saw them pretty well filled now when the subject was not the interest of Ireland, but the restriction of the liberties of the Irish people. This was a debate too important to finish in a few hours, and he was sure the Prime Minister would not have objected to an adjournment at the usual hour—half-past 12—but for the unfortunate incident that occurred in the earlier part of the night, and over which two hours were spent; and he now would suggest that an adjournment be agreed upon, that the debate be resumed at 12 that day, with the understanding that the division be taken before 6 o'clock.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, the first reason he would bring forward in support of the Motion for adjournment was, that these were not the circumstances, this was not the time, and this was not the audience best calculated to pass an impartial opinion on the Irish Question. When the question of adjournment was raised, the conduct of the supporters of the Government was being brought before the notice of the Irish nation, and Her Majesty's Government were responsible for the exhibition which was now taking place in spite of the judicial protection the Chair was extending to Irish speakers. If any similar proposal with regard to England or Scotland were introduced by he cared not what Prime Minister, English and Scotch Members would take the steps Irish Members were taking, and would carry out those steps with as much more resolution as English and Scotch Members had numbers beyond those of Ireland. If by any Prime Minister an attempt were made against the liberties of the English people, and while the measure was still pending, and before Members had an opportunity of replying to a fiery phillipic delivered by a responsible Minister—if a measure for hurrying on such a project was brought forward under such circumstances, then hundreds of English and Scotch Members would, in case of necessity, resort to all the Forms of the House to prevent the progress of such a measure. It was no use blinking facts, or shutting one's eyes to the realities of the case. An English Minister, even at this time of the 19th century, when civilization had made such progress, and when there was such objection to violence, by such an act, would create such a violent insurrection that, within one fiery fortnight, would lay the established Government in ruins. The people of England were beginning to realize the crime against the Constitution inflicted by this project, and it was even driving the loyal Members of the North of Ireland into the ranks of the extreme Party of Irish Members. The Irish nation were observing closely this act of an English Ministry; and, far beyond the limits of Ireland, there was another Irish nation that was taking note of the same circumstances. [*Laughter.*]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I think the hon. Gentleman is now travelling beyond the Question before the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL continued. At the moment when addressing the Chair was not the time for other Members to indulge in derisive laughter. If Irish Members were excitable and likely to lose their temper, certainly hon. Members on the other side, by the studied course of ostentatious insult they were pursuing——

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE rose to Order. Was the hon. Member in Order in using those words?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member would not be in Order in asserting that any hon. Member was bringing an ostentatious insult against another hon. Member.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he was happy to withdraw the expression, and to adopt the kindly interpretation which the Deputy Speaker had put upon the conduct of the interrupting Members. He was observing that the Irish nation was closely observing the conduct of the Government. Were the latter anxious to impress the conviction upon them that they must despair of being dealt fairly with in Ireland; and, under the circumstances, were the Irish nation likely to grow in confidence with the government and legislation for Ireland by the English Parliament? One of the Ulster Members, in the course of the present discussion, explicitly informed the Government that the feeling was likely to grow, and be increased, that there was no justice to be had, and that the British Legislature was incapable of legislating fairly for Ireland. Let the Government take this warning from the lips of one of its own supporters, who had no affection for the Home Rule constituencies, and who was far removed from the teaching of the Land League. The course pursued by Her Majesty's Government was, undoubtedly, not the course which Her Majesty's Government would pursue with regard to England. That was a fact that might be stated beyond contradiction. The effect might not be felt to-morrow; but it was to be hoped that Her Majesty's Government did not wish their legislation to pass away with no hope for the future.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE rose to Order, and submitted whether or not the hon. Gentleman was not going altogether beyond that legitimate latitude to which allusion was just made?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I did not observe anything in the remarks of the hon. Member that called for my interposition.

MR. O'DONNELL, resuming, remarked upon the interruptions made for the purpose of destroying the continuity of his observations. In the discharge of his duty to his constituents—and he represented the English and Scotch constituencies quite as much as those of Ireland—he urged the Government not to suppress the rights of private Members, who were supposed to be independent Members. Hon. Members who interfered with his defence of the liberties and rights of all subjects of the Crown were mistaken if they supposed he would be deterred——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is now travelling out of the Motion before the House.

MR. O'DONNELL continued. The only possible ground for the Government plea of urgency was that there existed a state of affairs in Ireland which necessitated the prompt application of coercive measures. But how did the House know this state of affairs existed? The Government pointed to statistics, but, at the same time, would not allow hon. Members the time to study these statistics. On that ground he asked for an adjournment of the discussion on this urgency Motion, until an opportunity had been given to examine these statistics, which were said to justify the Government proposals. Imagine a Minister proposing to introduce a Coercion Bill for England, and, while making his demand, pointing with outstretched finger to the cover of a Blue Book, and forbidding the House to open it to see whether it corresponded with the alarming description given by the Government. Such a course, which would not be attempted in relation to England, was now being pursued in reference to Ireland. And why? Because the Minister relied on his majority, and publicly avowed that the opinion of the Irish Members was of no consequence to his policy. There was a time when the Liberal Government proposed to govern Ireland according to Irish ideas; but they now would not even allow government according to English ideas, for they forbade acquaintance with those statistics upon which their policy was based. Did not the Government think that the very statement of this dilemma would tell outside the House, if it did not inside? The Government must be aware that their demand for urgency, this hot haste for coercion, with a practical prohibition of the examination of the grounds for it, was condemned by Members of their own Party, whom the bonds of Party discipline forbade to give open expression to their feelings. In private conversation, numbers of Liberals condemned the action of the Government, and justified their support of this extraordinary measure by saying—"We must stick to our Leaders, right or wrong." Ireland was on the verge of 18 months of despotism; but did the Government fancy that the facts of their present policy, of their suppression of the freedom of debate to the utmost extent of their ability, would be forgotten by the Irish people in twice 18 months; and what afterwards would be the relations between England and Ireland? Behind this demand for urgency lay the whole future of the amity or the enmity of the English and Irish races—one or the other. If Her Majesty's Government ostentatiously treated Ireland as they dared not treat England, would 18 months, or 12 times 18 months, remove from the Irish people, whom it was to be presumed the Government wished to turn into loyal subjects if they were not such now, the deep impression that such treatment must produce in the Irish mind? He was glad to hear the Home Secretary had lately addressed the House in a somewhat less provocative manner; but the venom he had introduced into the debate had not so entirely evaporated as to justify his acquittal on the strength of his tardy repentance. With the exception of that of the Home Secretary, there had been no Ministerial statement. The Chief Secretary did rise, some time ago, but only to repudiate, oppose, and utterly reject a number of suggestions for a compromise coming from his own side of the House; and it was evident that the Government had no regard for their own supporters, and intended to crush the remains of conscience under the heel of Party discipline. The Government had clearly disclosed their determination to despise reason and reject argument, and to rely on physical force. They might triumph, as did their Predecessors of lamented memory; but passing the Motion under such circumstances would deepen the depreciation of the Government credit in Ireland, and would add a further argument to their political opponents, who could point with pride to the fact that though, perhaps, they were not over tender, they never went the length of Her Majesty's present Government. Everything that had happened under Lord Beaconsfield's Government was out-Heroded by the present Motion of the head of the present Ministry. Where were the letters of "Verax" now? Was this not Cæsarism with a vengeance now? Was it not on a level with the attempts of the Government of the Third Napoleon to silence the objections and close the lips of the Representatives of the people? No majority that ever crowded round M. Rouher could exceed the servility that Her Majesty's Government exacted from the Liberal Party. Would it not be better for the Prime Minister at once to pass a short Act prohibiting the appearance of Representatives from Ireland within the walls of Parliament? Their policy was one of separation——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is travelling outside the Question altogether.

MR. O'DONNELL continued. The demand for adjournment would be granted in another case, while it was refused in the case of Ireland; thus separating in treatment the two parts of the Realm that, theoretically, were one. He hoped the adjournment would be agreed to, and the discussion resumed at a period when it could be conducted with more effect, and also with decency.

MR. HEALY said, the most cogent reason for adjournment was that it was 7 in the morning, and hon. Members were sleepy. That was a fact which should carry some force, if no other argument availed. Before the rights of private Members were surrendered under the Motion of the Prime Minister, he would like to hear something from the more experienced Members of the House. The Motion was made by the right hon. Gentleman; but on the opposite Benches the chain of silence remained unbroken. It was touching to see the pleasant manner in which the sturdy Radicals below the Gangway cried "Hear, hear!" to the Government plea of urgency, whether right or wrong.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE rose to Order. Was this attack at all relevant to the Question before the House?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): It does not strike me that the hon. Member has gone beyond the licence of debate.

MR. HEALY thought the number of snubs the noble Lord had received from the Chair would have induced him to allow a new Member some consideration.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST rose to Order. Was it in Order for an hon. Member to speak of another hon. Member as having received "snubs" from the Chair?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I consider the expression arose from the hon. Member's inexperience. Certainly, I had no intention of implying that my noble Friend was not justified in directing my attention to points of Order.

MR. HEALY withdrew the expression; but, really, these interruptions made him stray from Order. Hon. Members had one face for the hustings, and another for the Treasury Bench; and their Janus-like attitude had attracted considerable attention. He could only promise them that when again they went before their constituents their conduct would be reviewed——

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE rose to Order, and asked whether the observations which the hon. Member was addressing to the House could, under any circumstances, be in Order?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is certainly out of Order, and travelling outside the Question.

MR. HEALY resumed. In struggles of this kind, time after time, it had been the custom for the majority to give way and end the wrangle; but it appeared that the right hon. Gentleman had so tied the hands of his Colleagues on the Government Bench that no compromise could be entertained, and therefore they must go on. The Irish Members had been referred to as a minority endeavouring to put down a majority. But the majority were at home in bed, or only made known the fact of their being awake by their interruptions.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE again rose to Order, and wished to know whether observations upon individual Members being awake could be considered in Order on the Motion before the House?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): Such an expression I do not think was out of Order; but the hon. Gentleman must not be surprised at the impatience of the House when some of his remarks seemed to be made simply for speaking against time.

MR. HEALY said, he would address himself to the question. The recent proceedings of the Government had not gained them much credit in Ireland, and all idea of hope in the Government would be at an end after the proceedings of that night. The Members for Ulster had spoken of the feelings of their constituents, and how they were utterly at a loss to understand the action of the Government. Where were the Members who usually supported the Government on the other side?——

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS rose to Order, and submitted to the Chair whether the observations the hon. Member was making had anything to do with the question? He would only add that the House would support the ruling of the Chair.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I have already pointed out to the hon. Member that he is out of Order in travelling aside from the Motion before the House, and I must caution him not to do so again.

MR. HEALY said, he would not incur a rebuke again. Complaint had been already made that the Government did not allow time for the very important Papers which had been issued. That complaint was certainly to the point; and certainly it was quite impossible to go into this subject without a careful study of the statistics—not if they were kept up all night, and obliged to go on with the Coercion Bill next day. Another argument was that, unfortunately, they were there in a foreign capital, at a great distance from their own country, and at a time when their speeches would never reach publicity among their constituents. He denied that there was a justification for the plea of urgency, and he should resist all such proposals. There were suffering people in Ireland almost starving; they asked for bread, and they received the stone—coercion. Instead of taking away the rights of private Members for their proposal, let the Government bring forward a measure for relief, and it should have his support. Some men had faith in the noble two in the Cabinet among the Liberal section; but even these would now lose faith in the Cabinet——

MR. A. H. BROWN rose to Order. Were not these observations distinctly against the ruling twice or three times laid down from the Chair—were they to the question of adjournment?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The observations were for the purpose of showing that the hon. Member and his Friends would have consented to a Motion of this kind had another measure been brought forward. He must not enlarge upon this. Another measure must not be brought into the discussion; but, as an allusion, it was not out of Order.

MR. HEALY said, although they might step outside the point of Order, they had to appeal to the House on behalf of their people. It was their only resource. If the House, time after time, was going to shut them up, and would not consent to an adjournment, he would rather, if they were to be shut up, be turned out of the House——

MR. W. CARTWRIGHT was sorry to interrupt the course of the debate; but he must maintain that the remarks made just now were not in Order, and were indecorous.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is again travelling outside the Question.

MR. HEALY: I will not speak any more, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LEAMY said, it was impossible to have a fair discussion now. It appeared from the declaration of the Home Secretary that there was an intention to push on the debate to a conclusion that Sitting; and so it became no longer a question of argument, but a trial how long some 40 men could hold out against hundreds. Of course, they would be beaten; but would the victory be accompanied with any honour? There seemed to be an impression that the Irish Party were endeavouring to obstruct the course of Public Business. But nothing was further from their minds, which were occupied with something far more serious. Their objection now was that the hour was an unreasonable one for the House to enter, in a proper spirit, upon one of the most dangerous Motions ever submitted to it. There had been no evidence of urgency. The Leader of the House had swiftly come down, and said—"This must be passed," like a dictation. In fighting this question, Irish Members were supporting the rights of private Members; and time would vindicate the course they were taking. Their constituents would feel that their Representatives were doing that duty for which they were sent to Parliament. The challenge the Home Secretary threw down he must have known the Irish Members would take up. And what could the Government gain? Did they add dignity to the proceedings of the House; did they add prestige to their cause; or did they advance the Motion one step? One good result had followed. It had brought the Ulster Members to the Irish side, and it had shown the English and Irish people that a great Liberal Government could attempt to strike down the liberties of the Irish people.

MR. CALLAN regretted the discreditable proceedings of the night, and he asked what advantage could be derived from a recurrence of such scenes? He begged he might not be interrupted by cries from the other side from officers on full-pay, who would be better employed on other duty. What, he asked, had been the benefit of the all-night Sitting some four years ago on the affairs of the Transvaal? Irish Members then presumed to interfere, and their opposition was put down in much the same way it was proposed to crush them now. But was the result a happy one? What loss had England suffered in blood and treasure in South Africa since that debate?

An hon. MEMBER rose to Order, and asked if this had anything to do with the Question before the House?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I think it is only alluded to by way of illustration; the hon. Member would not be in Order to discuss the annexation of the Transvaal.

MR. CALLAN said, he only wished to show what evil results had followed an all-night Sitting. Again, last Session, when a discussion was raised on the Constabulary Vote, offers of compromise were rejected, and the Sitting was prolonged through the night, and at 11 o'clock in the morning the Government had not advanced an iota beyond where they were at the same hour the night before. But he was not surprised that the Chief Secretary objected to an adjournment. He would have had light thrown on these reported cases of agrarian crimes; he would have had to furnish a copy of that infamous Lansdowne lease.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): It is clearly out of Order to discuss leases, or other questions of land tenure in Ireland.

MR. CALLAN resumed, and went on to urge that even, at that late hour, the Government might accept the suggestion made earlier in the Sitting, to agree to the Resolution now, with the understanding that the debate on the Coercion Bill should be resumed on Thursday.

MR. GRAY shared with other hon. Members the regret that had been expressed at the unfortunate result of the incident that had brought about this all-night Sitting. He did not know whether matters had gone so far that it was useless to make an appeal to the noble Marquess to put an end to the unpleasant position of affairs; but as he (the Marquess of Hartington) had not been present through the whole Sitting, perhaps he would be in a calmer mood, and with a mind open to consider a fair and reasonable arrangement to terminate this unhappy dispute. It was conceded on all sides that, so far as the Irish Members were concerned, there really was no intention to unduly prolong, much less to obstruct, the debate on the Motion of the Prime Minister. It was a matter of common conversation in the Lobbies that a division would be called early on Wednesday afternoon; and it was also stated by the Prime Minister that, but for the unhappy, untoward, unforeseen incident early in the evening, the Government would have raised no objection to a postponement on the understanding that it should be terminated some time on Wednesday afternoon. That was the position of affairs when the hon. Member for Cavan incurred the censure of the Chair, and, unfortunately, was suspended. This led to a somewhat acrimonious discussion. But the question for consideration now was of such supreme importance that it ought not to be complicated with issues of a comparatively trivial nature. The Government was too strong to permit themselves to be irritated by an incident of this kind, and to punish Irish Members, and, through them, Ireland, because an irritating incident diverted the ordinary course of debate. It could not be doubted that if the Government persisted they must succeed; but what would follow? Was the House forthwith to proceed with the two Bills of the Chief Secretary? The Prime Minister had declared, in explicit terms, that the Government desired a full and free discussion. He would put it to the noble Marquess, would it agree with that declaration to push on the Coercion Bill forthwith without allowing an interval of rest?

MR. FINIGAN said, he must again impress upon the Government the fact that the ordinary powers of the law were sufficient to enable them to deal effectually with alleged crime and outrage in Ireland. He was proceeding to argue that coercive measures would produce a distrust of the ordinary law, when——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I have to point out to the hon. Member that he is out of Order in not confining himself to the Question before the House.

MR. FINIGAN went on to complain that no opportunity was given to the Irish Members to examine the statistics contained in the Blue Books before they were asked to consent to the abridgment of the liberties of debate, and to sacrifice the privileges of private Members. In conclusion, he earnestly appealed to the Government to come to some reasonable compromise.

MR. NELSON said, he entertained the hope that no hon. Member would believe for a moment that he rose merely to waste time. ["Oh, oh!"] It might have that appearance; but he really rose in the hope of throwing oil on the troubled waters. For the last 30 years he had stood in the battle-field in Ireland in a part that bore not the least hot aspect; and he could say that if they were merely going to pile up outrages——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): It is difficult for me to see that the hon. Member is speaking to the Question before the House.

MR. NELSON said, he really did not desire to traverse the Rules of the House. He did not believe that anything was gained by it, and he did not believe that any man practising it added either to his influence as a public man, or to the dignity of the House. He wished, however, to appeal to the noble Marquess, who now represented the Government in the House, to strive after some means of extricating the House from the unfortunate dilemma into which it had fallen. Could he not see some mode of solving that difficulty by which they might at once preserve the dignity of the House and the liberties of the subject. The contest in which they were now engaged was one of mere physical endurance, and they might as well be arrayed against each other in the field of mortal combat as to be carrying on the present conflict in the spirit which was now aroused. It was not a good spirit. [*Interruption.*] The way to prolong a man's speech was to go on interrupting him. He believed he was expected to waste time; but he could not do it. [*Laughter.*] If it was a mere matter of wasting time, he could take his turn with any hon. Member; but he was in earnest, and he should lose his self-respect if he were in any other spirit.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is entering into general questions altogether outside the Question.

MR. NELSON said, he should be glad to be told what was inside the question; but whoever occupied the Chair he (Mr. Nelson) submitted to like a lamb. Someone had said that he would honour the Crown, if he saw it even on a thorn bush. He had the same respect for the Chair. ["Question!"] He was only endeavouring to learn the Forms of the House. [*Laughter.*] It was far easier laughing than speaking. Business could not be conducted unless there were some mode of limiting Party tactics. As one accustomed to move in other walks, he might have appealed to the Christian feeling of the occupants of the Treasury Bench; but he had left that outside altogether. He supplicated, implored, entreated, beseeched, whichever word the noble Marquess liked best, to relieve them from this dilemma. One qualification for the Leader of a great Party was imperturbability of look, and he wished he could catch the slightest shade of feeling on the countenance of the noble Marquess. He trusted to the feeling of the noble

Marquess, although he could not catch any idiosyncracy. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and laughter.*]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Gentleman has repeated the same remarks about the noble Marquess several times, and the House is impatient, and wishes him to come to the point of the adjournment of the House.

THE O'DONOGHUE observed, that the Motion of the Prime Minister practically asked them to prepare the way for the abolition of trial by jury in Ireland, and to say to the traversers who had been tried at Dublin that, although they might be acquitted by their countrymen, they would, nevertheless, be imprisoned at the arbitrary pleasure of the Government. He believed that the Government had no confidence in their own promised Land Bill, and were looking forward to the howl of indignation with which it would be received in Parliament. He believed that their Land Bill would be a worthless measure. He thought the territorial magnates in the other House need not be much alarmed about the Land Bill which the Government were to introduce. ["Order!"]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) reminded the hon. Member that he was travelling beyond the Question before the House.

THE O'DONOGHUE continued, contending that the only Bill which would be carried would be a Coercion Bill, for which the Prime Minister's proposal was meant to pave the way; and the consequence of carrying that Bill would be that for 18 months they would not be able to agitate against the worthless Land Bill of the Government. He asked the Government to give time for consideration.

MR. MOLLOY supported the Motion. He had noticed of late a strong anti-Irish feeling growing up in England, which he could not but deplore. He regretted that the honest and sincere overtures of the Irish Members had been refused by the Government, although they would have tended to lessen delay. It appeared to be a question of dignity—and poor dignity it was to his mind—that the Government should not recede one inch from the position they had taken up. He had been sitting for 17½ hours in the House, and he asked seriously what good had the expenditure of all that time done to either of the contending parties.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 21; Noes 125: Majority 104.—(Div. List, No. 13.) [9 A.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. SEXTON, in moving that the debate be adjourned, said, he thought it had been evident for several hours past that the spirit of the House was jaded, and that it was ill-fitted for the Business before it. He should address no supplication to the Government. The Irish Members were willing to be judged by the merits of their case. He commented on the fact that the Ulster Members, formerly so docile, had risen frequently in the debate, and warned the Government that their conduct in attempting to crush the Irish Members, under the circumstances, would cause intense dissatisfaction in Ulster, which boasted of its loyalty. This was a great point gained by that Irish Party, with which the Ulster Members did not act. The Irish Members represented the only people affected by the action of the Government, and they were certain of the approval of the Irish people. The people who were at the back of the Government were not concerned in the Motion before the House, and the Irish Members would continue to present an unbroken front to the Government so long as they persevered in their present unwise course. As to the melancholy incident which had led to the expulsion of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), the Irish Members could not have anticipated it, and they then found themselves placed suddenly in a position of great difficulty. The launching of that thunderbolt naturally disturbed their minds, and that of itself would have justified their action. But there was something more than that. It was only that morning that evidence had been placed before them which enabled them to form a correct opinion of the subject before the House. The Government seemed to become irritated by the protest which the Irish Members made against the expulsion of one of their number, and they refused the ordinary courtesy of an adjournment of the debate. That was an attempt to punish the Irish Members, who resented it, and would continue to resent it. No doubt, the Government thought that they would prejudice the Irish Members in the eyes of the British public; but he believed even in that matter they would fail. It was plain from the appearance of the Benches last night, when the incident with regard to the hon. Member for Cavan took place, that an attempt was about to be made to entrap the Irish Members. [" Order ! "] He had a perfect right to say that preparations were made in that direction. That was shown by the numerous attendance of the supporters of the Government at the time last evening when it was decided to resort to force. He protested against that House being made a Chamber merely for the registration of the wishes of the Cabinet, to the extinguishing of the rights of private Members. What was it that urgency was asked for? For a Coercion Bill for Ireland. The repulsive feature about the whole business was that the Government sought urgency for their Bill in the face of the last Returns, which showed that there was a remarkable diminution of crime in Ireland. Murder was a blank, manslaughter was a blank, levying contributions was a blank.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL rose to Order. Was the hon. Member in Order in referring to the speech of the Chief Secretary?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is in Order in using the Returns as an illustration of his argument; but he would not be in Order in entering at any length into details.

MR. SEXTON said, the Returns showed that crime had almost disappeared in Ireland. Was the Government, then, anxious to hurry on coercion in the fear that if they waited a few days longer all excuse for their Bill would have vanished? Was the explanation of the urgency asked for to be found in the fact that Members of the Government were afraid that the landlords should be cheated out of their revenge on the Land League? Let that be as it might, there was no need, so far as the state of Ireland was concerned, for urgency, and the Irish Members were thoroughly justified in the course they were taking.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

MR. O'KELLY said, the Motion of the Prime Minister, though harmless as to diction, would let loose deadly forces on Irish homes. It was not attempted to give urgency to the Land Bill.

MR. GORST: I rise to Order. Is the hon. Member entitled, on the Question now before the House, to discuss the Land Bill?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The Land Bill is not the Question before the House, and the hon. Member is therefore irregular.

MR. O'KELLY denied that he had any intention of discussing the Land Bill. Why had urgency been asked for coercion? Not on account of any startling crime, not because of an increase of exceptional crime; on the contrary, exceptional crime had almost disappeared. What had become of their boasted liberties when the crime was attempted of depriving the Representatives of 5,000,000 of people of their liberties by the English legislature? And that was not all. This proposal to coerce Ireland would be felt, not only by 5,000,000 of people in Ireland, but by 2,000,000 in England, and 5,000,000 across the Atlantic—a power that one day would make itself felt in that House. But so long as the Irish Members had the physical power they would resist the proposal of the Government to the very end, and teach Englishmen what was meant by liberty. They were not there to obey the will of any Minister, but to rule the Realm. If he thought that in coming into that House he had to sacrifice his individuality, he would consider a seat in the House of Commons no honour, and he would not hold it half an hour. Who was it that proposed this Motion? The man who had shed eloquent tears over the Bulgarians, who had been put into power by the people, who would be nothing but for the people, and probably he would be handed back to his original nothingness by the people. No doubt, the Tories would be very well satisfied to see the Prime Minister sent back again to his retirement. Parliament was being degraded, and he was opposed to that degradation of Parliament. By the postponement of the debate they would secure time for deliberation. When the heat of passion was cooled even Tories and Radicals might see that they were forging chains for England.

Mr. DILLON said, the object of the Government was to put him and his Friends into an invidious position with respect to the people of Ireland. It would be made to appear as if Irish Members were standing between their country and remedial measures. He declined to go into that question, if for no other reason, for one which had never been alluded to up to the time of the Motion for adjournment—that the Motion would put Irish Members in an unfair position with their constituencies. But his argument was that coercive measures might very well be adjourned from Mondays to Thursdays and Thursdays to Mondays, or even from Mondays to Mondays. English Members might stay away on those days, and leave a quiet time for the Irish Members and the Chief Secretary to settle terms between themselves. It must be remembered that there were the Englishman's view and the Irishman's view of the question before the House, because the former had nothing to fear from the passing of the proposed measures of coercion, while he and other Irish Representatives had good reason to regard them with apprehension, as those measures when passed would leave them at the mercy of landed magistrates, who would speedily use their new powers to send him and other Representatives of Ireland to the treadmill, and not a single English Member would weep over his sad fate. But he did not want to go to the treadmill. He would refer hon. Members to a work by an Irish magistrate—much respected in England, but not respected in Ireland—namely, Mr. Bence Jones, who proposed that Irish Members and agitators should be sent to the treadmill. Those Bills would hand them over, not only to the tender mercies of the Chief Secretary, who, he was sure, would treat them with reasonable kindness, but to those of such men as Mr. Bence Jones.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Gentleman is now travelling beyond the Question before the House.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked if it was not in Order for a Member to refer to the Motion for adjournment and also to the original Motion?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): Of course, a fair latitude will be allowed; but hon. Members must confine their observations as strictly as possible to the Motion for adjournment. At this moment that is the simple question before the House.

Mr. DILLON said, he was proving that the question on which they asked the debate to be adjourned was one of great magnitude. Was he not in Order in endeavouring to prove that the Motion for urgency tended to abridge the liberties of Irish Members and of the Irish people?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I rise to Order. ["Order, order!"] Before the Deputy Speaker answers the question, I wish to say that Mr. Speaker, before he left the Chair, laid it down that the discussion should be confined within the narrowest possible limits.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is certainly travelling beyond proper limits. He is now discussing a measure which at a subsequent period is to be brought under the consideration of the House.

Mr. DILLON said, he would at once bow to the ruling of the Chair. He would remind the House that that was the first time everything had been postponed to the passing of coercive measures. No such precedent would have been made in dealing with any other people or class than the Irish people. Yet they were told that a fraction of a night ought to be sufficient to decide such a matter. He thought that even four or five Sittings were required for the consideration of a question of that magnitude. It was a smaller question, it would appear, in the eyes of Englishmen than Hares and Rabbits, or an Employers' Liability Bill. Irishmen could scarcely be expected to take that view. Things were going on in Ireland which required the absolute freedom of Irish Representatives; instead of that freedom, they were to be gagged, and the freedom of the Press and the liberty of the subject were to be put down in Ireland. A more extraordinary proceeding than that of the Ministry had never been taken in the memory of man. But he trusted that, though this country was now inflamed against them, a cooler judgment would hereafter be taken, and men would recognize the injustice with which Ireland was being treated. The waste of time was owing entirely to the Government, for it would have been altogether prevented if the Government had, in the first week of the Session, introduced remedial measures. In all probability, however, after two or three weeks' profitless wrangling, the Ministry, who now refused any kind of compromise, would come forward and volunteer what they now so stubbornly and so unreasonably declined.

MR. LEAMY said, Irish Members had been charged with stopping the progress of Land Reform. But he had received commands from his constituents to fight to the last against coercive measures, come what might to Land Reform. He thought that, considering the many hours the House had been sitting, one of the Ministers might have stood up from the Treasury Bench and given reasons in support of the urgency of the Motion before the House. The moment the Bills were passed the exceptional powers would be exercised not by the Chief Secretary, but by the magistracy, who would substitute the statements of the informer for the verdict of the jury, and thus the liberties of hundreds of thousands of innocent people would be sacrificed. If the Ministers had consented to the adjournment of the debate the division would have been taken at the next Sitting. But he and his Party had been challenged, and they had accepted the challenge.

MR. GRAY said, that when the unhappy incident of the previous evening occurred, he believed it was generally understood that the debate would be adjourned and a division taken on Wednesday afternoon. ["No, no!"] If that was correct, the Members of the Irish Party were in this position—that owing to an untoward and regrettable incident the debate was to be forced on to the point of exhaustion. If the Prime Minister had not expressed his determination to press matters on, he would not on that ground alone make the appeal which he was about to make. But he wanted to know what the next step would be? Would the right hon. Gentleman, by prolonging that discussion, be fulfilling his pledge to give opportunity for the fullest discussion of those Bills? Was not the course followed by the Government a mere resort to physical force, and a punishment inflicted on Irish Members for an unforeseen and unfortunate incident? Was that giving ample freedom of discussion? A suggestion had been made by the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore), but was not accepted. He would suggest that, instead of proceeding then, the first and other stages of the Bill should be considered on and after Thursday afternoon. They would then have had the physical rest which they required, and an opportunity of studying the voluminous Returns which had been issued. If that proposal was not adopted, he would ask—Would the right hon. Gentleman, supposing they passed the Resolution, give them any interval of rest, instead of urging on his Bills without delay? If delay was granted he would not continue the discussion; otherwise he would continue it to the end. He had confidence in the love of fair play of the Prime Minister.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR supported the proposition of his hon. Friend. If the right hon. Gentleman could see his way in the course of an hour, when the House would have reached the usual time for the beginning of Wednesday's Sitting, to agree to the Motion, which came originally from the hon. Member for Clonmel, and had been supported by some of the right hon. Gentleman's own followers, a great amount of time would be saved. The Prime Minister had, in the first instance, expressed his desire that the debate should be ended on Wednesday's Sitting. Would they not be meeting that desire if the debate was concluded that morning or even afternoon? There was no desire on the part of Irish Members to postpone the time when they should meet the Chief Secretary on the merits of his case. They would then convince every right-minded man that the case of the right hon. Gentleman was a sham. It would, indeed, be a calamity if, when the time came for considering the question, the patience of the House should be so exhausted that they would not fairly consider the case, which was irresistibly strong, of the Irish Members. But the Chief Secretary had the deepest interest in the prolongation of the present debate. But he thought even the right hon. Gentleman's conscience ought to be touched. The Chief Secretary appeared to wish to inflame the minds of hon. Members against the Irish Representatives. It was a misapprehension, likely to prejudice the Irish cause, that they wished to prolong the present debate. They wished to concentrate their strength on the merits. Their present course was forced upon them by the Treasury Bench, who had changed their ground, and substituted physical force for cool argument. Before sitting down he wished to renew earnestly a suggestion that had already been made—namely, that they should at once divide on the Motion for adjournment—the rights of the Irish Members having been sufficiently vindicated—and then resume the discussion of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor). That Amendment having been got rid of, they might come to a decision that day on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, and thus leave Thursday free for the further consideration of the measures of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. DAWSON explained that it was a complete mistake to suppose that the unfortunate incident which had occurred on the previous night was the result of a plan. He assured the House that it was impromptu, and, therefore, should not have provoked vindictive conduct on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers. He maintained that it was unfair to say that the Irish Members stood between their country and remedial measures. They would, however, put everything between their country and coercion which they possibly could. The Chief Secretary was endeavouring to impose a law against which the country would rise *en masse.* When the people of England and the Press of Europe came to consider the extraordinary proceedings of this House, he thought they would see in it no warranty for such a proceeding as the prolongation of the debate. The Irish Members had made propositions which, if the Government were not vindictive, they would accept. He contended the Irish Party in the debate of the past night had acted in a just, fair, moderate, and becoming manner; and that means, unfair and tyrannical, had been adopted and pursued by the Government. Let it never be supposed that he came there to interrupt the proceedings of the great English nation; but only to claim for his own country some share of that free atmosphere in which the great institutions of England had flourished.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY urged that the Government should accede to the suggestions made by the hon. Member for Carlow County (Mr. Gray). In his (Mr. O'Shaughnessy's) opinion, the conduct of the Government in not consenting to an adjournment of the debate an hour or two after 12.30 was imprudent and injudicious. In refusing to do that the Government had shown themselves less just than their Conservative Predecessors.

Mr. BYRNE accused the Government of endeavouring to force their measures through the House with indecent haste, and vindicated the rights of a minority to full and free discussion.

Question put, and *negatived.*

[11.55 a.m.]

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed.

Mr. PARNELL: Sir, I think, after the discussion we have had upon the Question you have just put from the Chair, that it will generally be agreed that we might now take a division; and I would propose to my hon. Friends that if the Government would agree to postpone their Motions with reference to the Irish Bills until Thursday—["No, no!]—that this debate might now be brought to a conclusion with a division on the Question just put from the Chair. I do not wish to allude in any way to the proceedings of last night, for I was not able to be in my place, and am not a competent judge of what took place; but I may say that I regret that anything should have occurred to interrupt the calm judgment of the House in regard to the case which we hoped to lay before you in connection with the coercive measures. I am much influenced by the consideration that the temper of the great majority of Members should have been aroused and diverted from the calm consideration of this question. I have now to propose that the Government should postpone—["No, no!" *and cries of* "Order!"]—that they should not take either of the two coercive measures until Thursday; and we, on our side, will go to a division at once on the question just put from the Chair.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, if I rightly understand the words which have fallen from the hon. Member, they are these—that he and his hon. Friends are willing to proceed at once to a division upon the Main Question, provided we are willing to postpone until to-morrow the resumption of the adjourned debate upon the Motion of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland. These words are, I apprehend, not applicable to the present situation of affairs. I take it for granted that the hon. Gentleman, after the objections which have been somewhat persistently made to my Motion, would take a division upon that Motion. Whether he takes it immediately or whether he does not—we will assume that he takes it immediately, because that course might be for the general convenience—but whether he takes it immediately or not, we have now arrived at such a period of time that after that division shall have been taken the Tuesday's Sitting will have been prolonged into hours ordinarily assigned to the Sitting of Wednesday, and the Wednesday's Sitting will *ipso facto* have disappeared. I apprehend that there is no doubt whatever about these circumstances. Well, I may say that under no condition would the Government have thought it right, quite irrespectively of any wish from any quarter of the House, to ask the House, thoroughly exhausted, to brace itself for the discussion of such a question as that proposed by my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland. But that consideration does not now arise. The Wednesday's Sitting, I may say, has disappeared. It is non-existent. If my Resolution be confirmed by the majority of the House, the effect of it will be that the adjourned debate on the Motion of my right hon. Friend will, in regular course, be resumed to-morrow (Thursday); and, consequently, the point which the hon. Member for the City of Cork desires to reach will be reached by the force of circumstances. As far as I am concerned, I am bound to say that it would not be possible for us, after what has occurred, to enter into any arrangement on the subject. The arrangement made for us by the inevitable lapse of time, of course, we accept, and, indeed, we have no choice about accepting it. We are, therefore, quite prepared to proceed to the division, either at once, or after whatever further discussion any hon. Gentleman may be disposed to think necessary, if there are hon. Gentlemen who are still unsatisfied on that subject. With regard to the debate which has taken place, it is not necessary for me to refer to it at any length; but the declaration made by me about 1 o'clock this morning has been referred to, and it is, perhaps, necessary that I should repeat that declaration in the terms in which I gave it. That declaration referred to the view which we took, and which we believed that the House would take, of the Motion of my right hon. Friend, and to the subsequent stages of his Bill. I disclaimed all intention to put down the liberties of speech by means either of this Resolution or of any other Resolution. I said, on the contrary, that we felt the rights of Members and the gravity of the subject entitled hon. Gentlemen to a perfectly free discussion, without any restraint upon that freedom, but discussion always within the limits of reason and of usage. These, I believe, were the terms I employed, and I need not say that I do not in any manner recede from those terms. Some hon. Gentlemen have been pleased to say that the inconvenient circumstances which have occurred, and the suffering which has been endured by those on whom none of us would wish to inflict suffering, were due to the fault of the Government or to the Treasury Bench. I believe it is always allowable to say that in the discussions of this House. I believe it to be one of the inalienable privileges of Members of this House, whenever they think that anything inconvenient occurs, to say that it is entirely the fault of the Government. Far be it from me to attempt to put the slightest restriction on that inalienable privilege. I think it comforts hon. Gentlemen. I would not, therefore, interfere in any respect with that privilege, and I desire to give it the freest course. It does us no harm. A great variety of speakers have frankly admitted that the debates and divisions which took place between 10 o'clock and 12 o'clock last night—and which certainly had an important influence upon the views of the Government, and, I think, a majority of the House—were debates and divisions which grew out of the suspension of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). It is admitted that they were debates and divisions intended to bring in question the decision which had been come to by the House. Anything more fatal to the general procedure of this House, and to the freedom of the Legislative Body, than the adoption, after the decision of the House, of measures intended in any manner to question, or weaken, or undermine that decision, I cannot conceive. I am warned by the clock that there is no occasion for me to detain the House any longer, and I do not wish to enter into any controversial matter. One thing only I have to say—the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Stafford Northcote), on the part of his Friends, rose last night and frankly supported the proposition that I had made; but I wish to say—it is no more than justice I should say—that for this proposition and for the course taken in declining to allow, so far as we could decline to allow, the Sitting to be broken for the purpose of resuming the debate on a future day, Her Majesty's Government have been exclusively and wholly responsible. In taking that course upon our responsibility, and recommending it to the House, we neither desire, nor will we allow, any portion of the responsibility to devolve upon any other person. Our conduct, of course, is for the House to judge. The House has judged it by the votes which have been taken; and I think, so far as we know, nothing now remains except that we should proceed to a division upon the question.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I think, Sir, it is of very great importance to the character and honour of this House that we should, on such an occasion as the present, have a clear understanding of the position in which we are placed, and of the course which we are asked to take. I am not now even perfectly certain that I understand what the nature of the proposition is that has been made, and the remarks of the Prime Minister. The right hon Gentleman has very truly and properly said that the Government are responsible for the course which they have taken in asking the House to remain throughout the night, in order not to break the Sitting till the Resolution had been passed; and I took it for granted that they would continue the Sitting until their object should be attained; but I also wish to say that the Members on this side of the House who, acting as the Opposition, have supported the Government in this matter, have claims to be considered in the course they have taken. The Prime Minister spoke just now of the House being thoroughly exhausted; but I believe I may say, on behalf of those who sit on the Opposition Benches, that they are perfectly prepared to continue the debate and support the Government as long as it may be right that they should do so. We have, undoubtedly, made considerable sacrifices, and in this I am speaking for some who are not now present, but who have gone through all the hours of the night in the House, as well as for those who are now here; and I say that we are prepared to support the Government in doing what they may think necessary under the circumstances. Now, are we, after what has taken place, to lose the fruits of what we have done? If I understood the language of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) aright, it seemed to point to something in the nature of a compromise. If that be so, I feel sure that the feeling of the great majority of independent Members would be against anything of the kind. But we also understood the language of the Prime Minister to be such as I think he ought to have held—namely, he gave us to understand that he could not be a party to any compromise. I understood the Prime Minister to state that it was necessary that, in his judgment, the House should come to a decision upon the question which has been submitted to it, without any stipulation as to any other matter. With regard to the subsequent conduct of Business, that is, of course, a matter which rests with the Government to propose. It is within their exclusive competence to say whether or not the adjourned debate on the Chief Secretary for Ireland's Motion shall be resumed to-morrow. If they proposed that course, of course, no one would have a right to challenge it; but I think we ought clearly now to decide upon the course we are to take with regard to the Motion now submitted to give precedence to those measures before any stipulations are entertained as to the future. Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House cannot say that they have been thoroughly satisfied with the course which the Government has pursued with regard to this great subject. I am taking a wide view; but, looking not only to what has taken place in Parliament, but to what has taken place before its assembling, we have not been satisfied with the course which the Government has taken in this matter; but we have thought that, so great was the importance of supporting the Executive Government in making proper provision for the interests of the public in this matter, that we have abstained, as far as possible, from criticizing what we considered to be their defects, because we considered that the important duty now is to support them in carrying that which they have proposed, and to urge upon them the duties which rest upon them, both of carrying their measures as rapidly as possible, and acting upon them as efficiently as possible when they have been carried. If there were any doubt in the minds of hon. Gentlemen who sit on the Opposition side that the Government were hardly in earnest in the prosecution of their measure, that there was an indication to tamper with the opportunity to be placed within their power and compromise with hon. Gentlemen who are opposing their measure, we then would deem it our duty to call attention to the conduct of the Government, and to express in some decided manner our substantial disapproval. But we are willing to believe that the conduct of the Government will be of a different character, and to conclude, from the manner in which they have taken up the matter, that they intend to act with promptitude, and that they will persevere earnestly and to the end with their proposals. With reference, however, to the particular question before us, the course to be taken in regard to the Bills for the introduction of which leave has been asked by the Government, if it is their intention, after they get this order of precedence, not to proceed with the adjourned debate till to-morrow, at least let us have the understanding that when it is resumed it will be concluded at to-morrow's Sitting. We have now spent several weeks in the discussion of this question, for practically, in the debates on the Address, we have been discussing the question of whether legislation of this sort should be undertaken by the House.

MR. PARNELL: I rise to Order. I wish to know whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) is in Order in discussing on the present Motion the question how long the debate on the Motion for leave to bring in the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill, which is not now before the House, may last?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): If the right hon. Gentleman was discussing the merits of a Bill which is not now before us, of course he would not be in Order; but, as I understand, the right hon. Baronet was only referring to the conditions upon which he and his supporters would vote upon the Resolution which is before us. In that he is quite in Order.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: All I would say, and all I am anxious for, is that it should be understood that the Government ought to proceed with the greatest rapidity when it asks the House to give up the time of private Members, and to make considerable sacrifices, in order to give precedence to this measure, which we are assured is one of urgency. It is for that reason that we are willing to give it precedence, and we have a perfect right to ask for an assurance that the precedence which we give shall be used for the purposes for which it was given. We have heard something from the Prime Minister about discussion without stint or restraint, and that language has been repeated with a qualification. It is not for the purpose of having discussion without stint and without limit that we agree to give up the privileges of independent Members. We gladly and readily consent to the course proposed by the Government, with the clear understanding that they are to make the best possible use of the time so given to them. It is a matter entirely in their discretion whether they proceed with the Chief Secretary's Bill to-day or to-morrow. They are the managers of the Business of this House, and I think it would be right and proper for us to say that we leave it to them on their own responsibility; but I do say that if they resolve to proceed to-morrow we must hold them responsible for proceeding with all due celerity and despatch. There is only one other word I wish to say, and that is, that I entirely affirm and support what has been said by the Prime Minister as to the incident of last night. If it is understood for a moment that the suspension of a Member for disregarding the authority of the Chair is to give an excuse for suspending the Business of the House and for raising debates upon the question, the pretension put forward is one that is wholly inadmissible. Nothing could be more distinct and clear than the course taken by the Speaker with regard to the hon. Member whose conduct is in question; and no excuse was given, in consequence of that transaction, for entering into a debate on the subject. The Rule is that the Motion is to be put without debate, and to allow debate upon it afterwards would be a manifest evasion of the Rule; and I hope we shall learn, from the proceedings of last night, that it will be necessary for the Government to act with firmness and vigour in this matter. If they do so, so long as there is no disposition shown to evade responsibility, they will receive the support of the Opposition; but if they do not, it will be necessary to call the attention of the House to their mode of conducting Public Business.

Mr. WHITBREAD said, he thought it would be better for the House to keep to the simple question before it, and not proceed to make bargains or agreements as to what should be done if this or that course should be taken. He had followed with satisfaction the words in which the Prime Minister had very properly declined to make any bargain which would have the effect of limiting the discussion upon the Bills which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland was about to introduce. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister was also perfectly right in declining to enter into a bargain with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the discussion upon those Bills should be limited to one Sitting. What the Prime Minister had said was that the debate on the Government Irish Bills was to be without stint and without limit, except such as reason and usage dictated. That qualification, in his opinion, expressed the feeling of the great majority of the House. They had no wish to stifle or limit free and fair discussion; but the House knew that the great majority of the Members would enforce their decisions, and there were ample means at the command of the House if they wished to do that. He was sure, however, that the great majority which supported the Government would always be forbearing and most unwilling prematurely to enforce its will upon any hon. Member of the House. With that view, he deprecated coming beforehand to any bargains with the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

Mr. GORST said, that, inasmuch as an appeal had been made to the Government by the Leader of the Opposition, some Member of the Government, and not the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread), should have replied to it. He (Mr. Gorst) altogether differed from the hon. Member for Bedford in his opinion that the independent Members of that House had not a right to ask from the Government a distinct understanding as to the use which was to be made by them of the power with which they were now asking the House to intrust them. Where the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition had failed, he (Mr. Gorst), of course, could not hope to succeed. But he must say that, on an occasion when Her Majesty's Government had received such loyal and generous support from their political opponents, it would have been a mere act of courtesy for one of them to have risen to reply to the right hon. Gentleman. The time, however, had now arrived when independent Members on that side of the House should state the position which they had taken up during the present Session, and give notice to the Government as to the extent to which they could rely upon their support. He did not think that the Government could complain of the conduct of the independent Members on that side of the House during the present Session. In giving a tacit consent to the policy of Her Majesty's Government they had hitherto practically altogether effaced themselves. They had taken no part in the discussions that had occurred, and had contented themselves with giving silent votes in favour of the Government on an occasion which the Government said was one of great national emergency. He, however, should like the Friends of the Government to know that their support was given solely on the faith of the words used by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that this was a time of great national emergency, and that every day at the present moment was one of the utmost importance. Therefore, they had a right to demand that all due progress should be made with the measures before the House. But while the Government were making use of these expressions, independent Members had to sit by and see day after day lost for practical purposes. Thus that very day (Wednesday) had been lost as far as the Public and Private Business of that House was concerned, and all because the Government refused to accept the proposal which was made to them in the middle of the night to put off the discussion on their Irish Bills until Thursday—a proposal which they now found themselves compelled to accept. He, therefore, thought he had a right to complain of that, on the part of independent Members of the House; for had the Government acted with proper temper and discretion, that day might have been made use of, whereas now it was entirely thrown away. The course which the Government was adopting was one which was creating a feeling of considerable annoyance throughout the country. While there was no wish to prevent Irish Members from fairly discussing the subject of these Bills, the country looked to the Government to conduct their Business with due celerity.

MR. J. COWEN said, that when he left the House last night the discussion was proceeding in the quiet humdrum style that was not uncommon to that Chamber. He was assured by the hon. Gentlemen who were chiefly interested in the discussion that it would be prolonged until after midnight and then adjourned—with the sanction, it was expected, of the Government. Under that belief he left, and only learnt that the House had been occupied in such disorderly proceedings after 10 o'clock that morning. He had no stomach for such long controversies. They unduly tested men's strength and patience, and produced no good result. Such struggles were appeals, not to reason or good sense, but to physical force. They were better fitted for lads in a playground than for grave and stately legislators. During the few years he had been in the House there had been frequent trials of that description of endurance which the House had been exhibiting overnight; but he had systematically avoided them. He had never once moved the adjournment of a debate or the adjournment of the House, nor had he on any occasion attempted to talk against time. Procedure of that kind was foreign to his conception of what was either dignified or profitable. The Assembly of which they were Members was the oldest and noblest Legislative Body in the world. He was jealous of its reputation and its influence; and, as far as he was able, he discountenanced all such struggles for physical supremacy, come from whatever quarter they might—Conservatives, Liberals, or Home Rulers. There were abundant ways of arriving at a legitimate conclusion on a disputed point without resorting to such extreme and reprehensible tactics. He had had it in his mind to present some arguments against the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister; and he expected—had the Business followed its usual course—that he would have had an opportunity of doing so at that day's Sitting. But both the strength and temper of the House were greatly strained, if not exhausted; and he feared it was in no humour to listen to a statement of objections conceived in a different spirit from much of the speaking that had taken place. He would like, however, even at the disadvantage under which he spoke, to place before hon. Members the objections he had to the course the Ministers proposed to pursue. He did that not as a partizan of either side. He spoke as an independent Radical. There were few left of that class or creed of politicians; but, for such few as did exist, he wished to lodge a disapproval of the course the Government were taking. He objected to the Resolution of the Premier for two reasons. First, because it was an interference with the few and fast-diminishing privileges of private Members. Second, because it was an attempt to put at a disadvantage the Irish Members, while the liberties of their country were being forcibly confiscated. It was customary for hon. and right hon. Gentlemen, when they found themselves securely seated on the Treasury Bench, to treat with indifference — sometimes almost with derision—the rights of non-official Members that they had, when in Opposition, themselves lustily and loudly enough clamoured for. They were assured, with a lofty air of superiority, that their fears were superstitious. He had no wish to institute invidious comparisons between the two classes. Both official and non-official Members had their places and their uses. Officials from their position became masters of facts that were not available to those who stood outside the Ministerial barrier. They got of technical knowledge plenty; but its superabundance not unfrequently blunted their perception of great principles. Immersed in routine, they were apt to lose the faculty of following the forces that underlay and regulated national movements. They became not unfrequently stereotyped administrators. Statesmen, as he understood, ought to be both philosophical and practical. They should be comprehensive enough to grasp great principles, and close enough to be able to apply those principles. Independent Members, if they were deficient in their knowledge of detail, were unencumbered by official restraints; and they could bring to the discussion of Constitutional questions an unfettered freshness that men in Office were not always able to command. A private station was not only a post of freedom, but it was often, also, a post of honour. Many—indeed most—of the noblest enactments that graced the Statute Book of this country had been initiated by independent Members. They had advocated reforms during years of reproach and ridicule; and when popular opinion had been educated by them up to the acceptance of their doctrines, they were embraced, often without acknowledgment, by the official Leaders of the Party. The history of Parliament was crowded with the records of men who had stood steadily and strictly on principle; who did not seek the emoluments, and did not care for the glitter and gold lace of Office—men who had kept the lamp of freedom burning, when its more pretentious friends were sunning themselves amidst the seductive and somnolent pleasures of official life. He had no desire to applaud unduly the efforts of independent Members; but, while there was so strong a disposition to disparage them, their claims for consideration had a fair right to be stated. The Resolution before the House, taken by itself, was objectionable enough; but it was still more objectionable when taken in connection with other and covert assaults on the rights of non-official Members. Liberties of discussion were seldom taken away all at once. They were usually abstracted steadily and systematically. The time which years of precedent had accorded to non-official Members was being gradually entrenched upon. He asked the House to bear with him while he recited some facts that were pertinent to the point at issue. In the first Session of last Parliament, the Prime Minister of that time moved, eight or nine days before the House rose, that all the time should be placed at the disposal of the Government. No objection, of course, was made to the proposition. The year after, however, the request was made two or three days earlier. In 1876 it was made two or three days earlier than in 1875; and in 1877 it was earlier than in 1876. Every year the time at the disposal of independent Members was gradually curtailed, and the time at the disposal of the Executive was steadily increased. The difference between the time absorbed by the Government at the close of the first Session of the present Parliament and that absorbed at the close of the first Session of last Parliament was more than three weeks. Hon. Members would, therefore, see that, unconsciously to a large extent, and imperceptibly, the powers of the Executive were increased, and the opportunities at the command of private Members were decreased. Last Session, also, continued a month longer than usual. It extended in all over 15 weeks. Hon. Members might have overlooked the circumstance; but it was a fact that for eight weeks out of last Session—more than half the time—the Government had almost complete control of the time of the House. It was quite true that last Session was an exceptional one. He had no wish to undervalue the weight of that consideration. But when an exception was allowed to pass without protest it became a precedent. Precedents were accustomed to increase, and an accumulation of them constituted law. What was fact to-day became doctrine to-morrow. This Session had begun a month earlier than usual. The Government complained that during the time little progress had been made with Public Business. That was quite true; but the inference they wished them to draw from that fact was not quite fair. The discussion on the Address had occupied 11 days. That was, undoubtedly, a long time; but it was quite a mistake to suppose the Government had been the sole sufferers, if anyone had suffered by the discussion. Out of those 11 days, six had been taken from private Members. The Government had sacrificed only five of the days assigned to them by the Rules of the House. If anyone should complain, therefore, of the length of time occupied in discussing the Address, the ordinary Members of the House had greater grounds of complaint than the Executive. If the Resolution of the Prime Minister was carried—or now, as the matter stood, whether it was carried or not—the day had been monopolized by Ministerial Business. He knew he was not at liberty to refer in detail to Bills that were coming before the House. A number of hon. Members had been called to Order, and he had no desire that the Speaker should have occasion to interfere with him; but he believed he would be quite right in stating, in a few sentences, the object of the first Order for that day (Wednesday). It was a Bill in charge of his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary (Mr. P. J. Smyth). It was a moderate and temperate concession to the universal demand of the Irish people for increased powers of local government. As the law stands, no project of public interest—whether promoted by a company or by a municipality — could be considered in that House without going through both a costly and cumbrous ordeal. The promoters and opponents of such measures had to present their case to Parliament. Local agents, it might be in distant Kerry, Donegal, Galway, or Mayo, had to instruct their London agents; the London agents had to instruct barristers; and the barristers argued the question before a Committee of that House. It was often an appeal from knowledge to ignorance. What his hon. Friend proposed to do was to permit these preliminary inquiries to take place in Ireland, and to be subject, of course, to the approval of Parliament. It was a reasonable proposal, and not one in any sense of a Party character. There was no man in the House better able or more entitled to speak on behalf of the Irish people than his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary. He had given the best years of his life to the service of his country. Yet the Resolution of the Government would prevent the consideration of that Bill for the present year. It had been three times before Parliament in previous Sessions; and now, on the fourth time, it was to be rejected, and rejected too, for a Coercion Bill. What did the Government think would be the impression produced when these facts were known, and that statement was told in Ireland? He asked permission to illustrate the point he was pressing upon their consideration by reference to circumstances that took place in 1866. In that year, Mr. Lowe (now Viscount Sherbrooke) made a speech, in which he described the working men who were proposed to be enfranchised by the Reform Bill then before Parliament as venal, ignorant, drunken, disorderly, and lawless. Shortly after that speech was delivered, a meeting of trade unionists was held. A distinguished Member of the present Ministry attended that gathering, recited the fact that Mr. Lowe had spoken in the way he had described, and told them that, in consequence of that speech, the measure of Reform had been defeated, and its enactment for a time delayed. He urged the trade unionists to take these words, get them printed upon cards, and stuck up in every trades union office, in every workmen's club room, and every factory and shop throughout the country. The artizans, whose rights had been denied by Parliament, when they saw the bitter and harsh things that had been said about them, would be stimulated to renewed agitation in order to secure their enfranchisement. This counsel was given, as he had stated, and was acted upon with a result they were all familiar with. Now, he would have hon. Gentlemen near him ask themselves what would be the effect of the Government action that day? To-morrow, in every workshop in the country where Irish labourers were employed and artizans engaged—throughout the whole of Ireland, from Cork to Carrickfergus, and from Dublin to Galway, they would know that the remedial measure proposed by his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary had been thrown on one side, and a Coercion Bill accepted in its place. When the hard words that had been spoken—words akin to those that had been applied to the unenfranchised workmen of England years ago—were read in conjunction with the doings of Ministers, the relations between the two peoples would certainly not be sweetened. Nothing could be more calculated to wound and irritate a sensitive and suffering people than the terms in which they had been addressed, and the ostentatious preference that was made by the

Ministry for repressive, rather than for remedial measures. He would illustrate, however, by reference to another point, the injurious effect that the absorption of all the time of the House by the Executive had upon the course of public affairs. Previous to and at the General Election there were no questions insisted more strongly upon than those relating to foreign affairs. The strongest plank in the Ministerial platform at the Election was their foreign policy. ["Question!"] He was not going to discuss polemical matters. What he wished to say, and what he believed it was competent for him to say, was that the position of affairs abroad was such as to excite apprehension, if not alarm. ["Order, order!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I think the hon. Gentleman is now travelling quite outside the Question before the House. He is not warranted by the terms of the Motion before the House in entering into a discussion of foreign policy.

Mr. J. COWEN said, he had no wish whatever to deviate, even in appearance, from the order that the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair laid down; and, while he deferred to his ruling without hesitation, he believed he was entitled to explain that the point he meant to put before the House was, that the action the Ministry were then taking would prevent hon. Members raising any debate on any procedure that they might take on foreign affairs. In his (Mr. Cowen's) judgment, the Government had largely stimulated the elements of danger and mischief in the East. Direct incentives and indirect promises had been given to some of the parties to the Eastern controversy; and, by absorbing the whole time of the House, the Ministry practically forbade anyone attempting to contest the wisdom, the justice, or the necessity for the course they had pursued, or were intending to pursue. When he recollected the indignant way in which the late Government were denounced for concealing information and refusing facilities for discussion, he could not fail to make a contrast between the practices of the Party in power and their professions when out of power. No accusation was pressed more strongly against the late Government than that of declining opportunities for discussion. Yet the present Ministry gave little chance for debate last Session, and this Session there had been none so far; and if this Resolution was carried there would be none for a prolonged period. He would like to ask what hon. Members on that side of the House would have said if the Conservatives had been in Office, and the Liberal Party had been on the opposite Benches? Would not such a proposal as was now before them have been denounced with indignant eloquence as the natural outcome of tyrannical Tory rule? It required no stretch of imagination to conceive—if such a Resolution had been submitted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote)—what perplexing and embarrassing Questions would have been asked from the Front Opposition Bench below the Gangway. They could also easily picture to themselves the inconvenient Resolutions that would have been moved at Question time and on other occasions. When opposition or Obstruction to the Ministry had been carried to such a length as it could be legitimately carried by aspirants for seats on the Treasury Bench, then it might be relegated to the less careful direction of some unfortunate and much-abused Home Ruler. He could well conceive how his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan might have been utilized in such a case. He would have pulled the chestnuts out of the fire, but others would have eaten them. The hands would be the hands of Esau, but the voice would be the voice of Jacob. How his hon. Friends—the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) and the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands)—would have declaimed about the rights of independent Members. Now they sat there mute and motionless. They had not a word to say in support of that unfortunate independent Member, whose interests they were so jealous of, and whose rights they fought for so lustily last Session. A similar course, pursued by a different Party, met with very different treatment at their hands. What was legitimate and fair when men on their own side were in Office was illegitimate and unfair from their opponents. He owned he did not appreciate the justice or fair play of such a course. The attitude of hon. Gentlemen, he feared, only too clearly warranted the accusation that

"To place and power all public spirit tends,
In place and power all public spirit ends;
Like hardy plants, that love the air and sky,
When out 'twill thrive, but taken in 'twill
die."

He had no wish to detain the House when it was weary; but he desired to say, before sitting down, a few words on the position that the Irish Members would be placed in by this Resolution. Whatever was the reason—however good, or however unsound the cause—the fact remained that the Government were about to suspend the liberties of the Irish people. They were going to deprive them of the first, the commonest, but the most sacred right conferred by the Constitution. They were going to vest in a feeble and vacillating Executive, in a frightened and vindictive magistracy, powers such as were enjoyed by no despot in Christendom. Not content with that, they were going to curtail the limits of legislative resistance that the Irish Representatives could offer to this odious policy. He would ask hon. Gentlemen if that was either fair or generous treatment? The Irish Members in that House were in a minority—a hopeless minority. The English Members overpowered them. Was it wise to stretch that power in the way it was now being stretched? It was excellent to have a giant's strength, but tyrannous to use it like a giant. Hon. Members should put themselves in the position of Irishmen, and ask how they would feel and think and act if they were so placed. There was a line from an old book whose contents they professed to reverence, which said that Christians should do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. Were they acting in that way towards their Irish Colleagues? Let them suppose that England had been conquered by France, as Ireland had been by England, and that for 700 years the history of this country under French rule had been a black record of crime, violence, and opposition, as the history of Ireland had been under English rule. Let them suppose that there had been great and prolonged distress, deepening in some districts into famine; and that the people, in their desperation, had been driven to regrettable excesses. Let them suppose, further, that there was a Parliament in Paris which contained some 550 Frenchmen and 100 Englishmen, and that this Parliament of Frenchmen not only proposed to suspend the Constitutional liberty of the English people, but the Parliamentary liberties of the English Representatives. What would they have said, and how would they have acted? He would not libel his countrymen—he would not insult them, by supposing that, under such circumstances, their opposition to such legislation would not have been as dogged and determined as the opposition of the Irishmen was to like legislation for their native land. They were told that hon. Gentlemen who opposed coercion were apologists for or extenuators of crime. That statement, so far as he was concerned, was not only incorrect, it was false. There was no man in that House who respected the law more than he did, or would more rigidly enforce it. If a man shot a landlord he would shoot him. If there was one section of politicians to which law was more precious than to another, it was the class with whom he was associated. Where law terminated tyranny began. No English Radical could look with indifference at disorder or lawlessness. On that point he was entirely at one with the Government. The difference between him and them was the way in which this disorder and these illegal practices were to be put down. He was for punishing the guilty, and the guilty only. The Government, unfortunately, would punish both guilty and innocent alike. ["No, no!"] Hon. Gentlemen said "No, no;" but the fact was beyond dispute that in consequence of a limited number of outrages in Ireland, the Constitutional liberties of the entire people were to be suspended, and that, surely, was punishing the innocent as well as the guilty.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Gentleman is now discussing a question which is upon the Orders of the Day. That is altogether out of Order. The line of argument the hon. Member is pursuing has reference more to the Coercion Bill than to the Resolution before the House. I must request him, therefore, to desist from the course he is pursuing.

MR. J. COWEN said, he bowed, of course, to the decision of the Chair. But when the Resolution before the House was for the purpose of setting aside private Members' Business in order to enable the Government to pass a Coercion Bill, it was fair to infer that some reference should be made to the Bill for whose benefit the regulations of the House were to be altered. He, however, would not pursue the line of argument further; but would conclude by beseeching English Members to view with more consideration the course the Irish Members had pursued under very exceptional circumstances. It was a terribly severe measure to suspend the liberties of their country, and their opposition to such a proposal was not only reasonable, but honourable. It was only too true that the measures of the Government would be passed, and passed with large majorities. They had the power of suspending the Irish Members. They could gag them; they could send them to the Clock Tower or to Newgate. But what would follow? They might stifle the agitation, and what would be the result? Did they imagine that by forcibly suppressing agitation they would annihilate discontent? The agitators might be imprisoned. They might make millions of mutes. But what then? They should beware of the dreary silence, of the gloomy taciturnity that would follow, and that, in its operation and its consequences, would be 10 times more injurious and 20 times more dangerous than legitimate agitation.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I wish, before going further, to notice some remarks my hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) has made, as to my speech of the previous evening, although it is not strictly in accordance with the Rules of the House to do so. I understood my hon. Friend to make a comparison between the remarks I have made with regard to the men who commit these outrages in Ireland, and remarks that have been made in regard to the working men generally in England and the United Kingdom.

MR. J. COWEN said, he had not the slightest idea of making such a reference. What he had referred to was the well-known case of agitation in regard to the extension of the suffrage.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: It is quite true that I have used very strong expressions with regard to those who have committed these outrages. I believe I applied the term "blackguards" to them on the previous evening.

MR. GRAY: And "dissolute ruffians."

MR. J. COWEN: I did not hear the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, and had no knowledge what he said.

MR. GRAY: I rise to a point of Order, upon which, Sir, I wish to ask your ruling. I wish to know, whether the right hon. Gentleman is in Order in proceeding further with any reference to a speech which he states to have been made in a former debate?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): Members usually meet with the indulgence of the House in making a personal explanation; and it is, therefore, due to the right hon. Gentleman when he desires to take that course.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am not going to refer further to that point now; but I am glad I called forth that disavowal from my hon. Friend. If I had not done so, I am perfectly sure how my hon. Friend's remarks would have been understood in the country. I will only say this, in general terms, that any comparison of what any man has said about the working men generally with what I felt it my duty to say about the men who commit these crimes in Ireland would be utterly unfounded. I am not going to follow my hon. Friend in his remarks in regard to the main question, except just to say this—that I wait, for the continuation of the debate on the Bill it has been my duty to bring forward, to hear my hon. Friend prove, or attempt to prove, that the object of the Government is to punish those who are not guilty. Knowing, as he does, what is the meaning of such a charge as that, I say that, unless he is prepared to prove it, he is not doing unto others as he would they should do unto him. My hon. Friend entered into a defence of private Members as distinguished from official Members; and, considering the language he uses regarding the latter, he seems to be full of pity for that unfortunate class of men who come under that description. He also entered into a representation of the manner in which the rights of private Members have been taken from them. Will he allow me to say that I think on that question, that their right to the time of the House is hardly one that ought, with any very considerable insistance, to be brought to bear on this discussion. ["Oh!"] The reason is this, that if the Government are convinced—as they are convinced—and as they would be most culpable if they were not—that it is their absolute and necessary duty to bring forward such a Bill as I did last night, and which, I admit, infringes on the liberty of the subject, then it is our duty, and that of the House which supports us in that feeling, to proceed without delay, to determine whether the Bill should, or should not, be passed. The important measure initiated by the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. P. J. Smyth) is not of that importance, compared with the discussion of such a question, as to allow it to come between it and the decision of the House. I have one remark to make with reference to the hon. Member for Newcastle. He seems to suppose that we are so arranging these proceedings as to avoid discussion of foreign matters.

MR. J. COWEN: All I said was that the inevitable consequence of the action of the Government was to prevent such discussion.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Member has, at any rate, remarked how pleasantly for ourselves the Government have avoided any questions upon which it might be inconvenient to enter. The hon. Member is himself partly guilty of that avoidance. Why did he not, last Friday, when the debate on the Address ended at a comparatively early hour, bring forward the question in which he was particularly interested? The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) has, in the interests of private Members, complained of the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread) following the Leader of the Opposition in the debate; but the hon. Member for Bedford is himself an independent Member, and has surely a right to give expression to his views as such. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition has again asked the Government to make a bargain, and come to an agreement. I trust the right hon. Gentleman does not really make his support dependent upon that agreement. The Government are glad of and welcome his support; but we cannot for a moment accept it, if we did not believe that he gives it because it is in the interests of the country. Therefore I hardly think he is in a position to make a bargain for future arrangements upon the support he now gives us. I understood him to say that he considers, at any rate, that the debate on the Bill I brought forward should be concluded on the night of its resumption. I do not suppose that any hon. Member wishes to delay the discussion on the Bill, or that I am desirous to delay its passing. I have brought it forward as a measure of real urgency, and there is no one in the House that can be so well aware of its necessity as I am. It ought, therefore, to be carried forward with the utmost celerity consistent with the freedom of discussion, limited, as the Prime Minister has said, by "reason and usage." I am not, however, prepared to say, considering the nature of the question, that we can possibly lay down as a matter of certainty, independently of what may be said by Irish Members, that the debate will be concluded in one night, although I shall be surprised if there is any good reason for continuing it for a longer time. Without any compromise, or any arrangement, the Government simply ask the House to come to a conclusion on a most important Motion, which we have brought forward on the strongest possible grounds, in consequence of the urgency of our measures.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY rose to continue the debate——

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Is the hon. Gentleman the Member for Longford, who has already addressed the House, in Order, Sir, in rising to address it again?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member for Longford seconded the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. That is not now the Question before the House. The Motion now before the House is the Original Question, upon which the hon. Gentleman has not spoken.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, it was a satisfaction to know that, whatever Rules the House might adopt for restricting debate, it was not in the power of the Leaders of the House to say off-hand exactly how long a debate should continue, and when hon. Members who chose to speak should lose their right to prolong the discussion. Whoever might be discontented with the result of the present debate, the Irish Members were well pleased and well contented with what it had brought them, as they had obtained what they wanted—an opportunity for considering the remarkable bundle of figures which had been presented by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He felt sure that the powerful speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) would awaken the feeling and conscience of England, and would enable the people of this country to form a just opinion of the question before the House.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he had been referred to by his hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) as one who had formerly, and did not now, stand up for the liberties of private Members. He denied, however, that he was less jealous of those liberties now than he had been before; and he considered that the rights of private Members were in far less danger from the present action of the Government than they would be in if the proceedings of the House were allowed to be set at nought by a handful of Gentlemen who prevented all legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON said, he agreed, to a great extent, in what had been said by his hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) as to the rights of private Members; but there were occasions when private Members best did their duty to the House and to the country by foregoing their claims, and, in his opinion, that was one of those occasions. It was a little hard that private Members should lose their days, and especially if Government failed to use the days after taking them; but he would point out that as they were still on Tuesday's Sitting, they could go on with all the Business set down for Tuesday, and that while they remained upon the same Sitting, the Wednesday 6 o'clock Rule would not apply, so they might still have many hours that day for going on with work.

Mr. A. MOORE submitted that if there had been any Obstruction in the present proceedings it was due to the Government themselves, who declined to accept a reasonable compromise that was suggested to them. By doing so, they had forced the Home Rulers into the action they had taken, with the result that they were now obliged to accept, under compulsion, what they might have adopted on friendly terms—namely, the very Motion which had been made 11 hours and 40 minutes before. A little judgment and temper in managing the affairs of the House would be useful.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said, he claimed to be as independent a Radical as was his hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen), although, if there was any distinction, he hoped he might be excused for saying the hon. Member's orbit was the more erratic; and he was as staunch an upholder of the rights of private Members, but he took a different view of the present situation. The position of independent Members at that moment was one in which they rejoiced that they had got a Government that was committed to measures which Radicals, in and out of the House, had been urging on the attention of the country. He was not altogether ignorant that at the beginning of the Session the Radical section of the House was in great doubt as to the course to pursue on this question of coercion. He was as averse to coercion as any hon. Member, and when the case for the Government was laid before the House he looked with great anxiety to see how hon. Members for Ireland would treat the charges that it was they who had superseded the ordinary law in that country; that it was they who had first curtailed the liberty of the subject there; and it was because they had not manfully grappled with that charge that the Radicals, interested in the personal liberty of Her Majesty's subjects, were compelled reluctantly to come to the conclusion to arm, for a short period, the Government with powers, which, naturally, they had the greatest possible objection to. He trusted that the Land Bill which was to follow would be a messenger of peace to Ireland; that the animosities raised by the discussion of coercion would be forgotten; and that we should soon see in Ireland a condition of things in which disorder would have disappeared and contentment have begun to reign. He was sanguine enough to believe that almost as soon as Parliament should give the Executive the powers demanded, the necessity would diminish for employing them against those ruffians who had been doing such a vile work, and who were honestly repudiated by hon. Members on the Home Rule Benches.

Main Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 251; Noes 33: Majority 218. [1.45 P.M.]

AYES.

Agar-Robartes, hon. T. C.
Allen, H. G.
Anderson, G.
Armitstead, G.
Aylmer, Capt. J. E. F.
Baldwin, E.
Balfour, Sir G.
Balfour, J. B.
Baring, Viscount
Barnes, A.
Bateson, Sir T.
Baxter, rt. hon. W. E.
Beach, W. W. B.
Birkbeck, E.
Birley, H.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Blennerhassett, Sir R.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Bolton, J. C.
Bourke, right hon. R.
Bradlaugh, C.
Brassey, H. A.
Brett, R. B.
Briggs, W. E.
Bright, rt. hon. J.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Bryce, J.
Burnaby, General E. S.
Burt, T.
Cameron, C.
Cameron, D.
Campbell, J. A.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Carbutt, E. H.
Carington, hon. Col. W. H. P.
Cartwright, W. C.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Chaine, J.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Cheetham, J. F.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Chitty, J. W.
Clarke, E.
Clarke, J. C.
Close, M. C.
Cobbold, T. C.
Compton, F.
Corry, J. P.
Cotes, C. C.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowan, J.
Cropper, J.
Cross, J. K.
Crum, A.
Currie, D.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davies, R.
Dawnay, Col. hn. L. P.
Dickson, J.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hn. J. G.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Duckham, T.
Duff, rt. hon. M. E. G.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Adm. hon. F.
Emlyn, Viscount
Evans, T. W.
Ewart, W.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fawcett, rt. hon. H.
Ferguson, R.
Filmer, Sir E.
Firth, J. F. B.
Fitzwilliam, hon. C. W. W.
Fitzwilliam, hn. H. W.
Flower, C.
Forster, Sir C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fowler, H. H.
Fowler, R. N.
Fowler, W.
Fry, L.
Fry, T.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Givan, J.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, H. J.
Glyn, hon. S. C.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gorst, J. E.
Grant, Sir G. M.
Greer, T.
Gregory, G. B.
Grey, A. H. G.
Guest, M. J.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hastings, G. W.
Havelock-Allan, Sir H.
Hay, rt. hon. Admiral Sir J. C. D.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henderson, F.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hildyard, T. B. T.
Hill, T. R.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Holland, S.
Holms, J.
Howard, E. S.
Howard, J.
Illingworth, A.
James, W. H.
James, Sir H.
Jardine, R.
Jenkins, D. J.
Johnson, W. M.
Joicey, Colonel J.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Kingscote, Col. R. N. F.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leake, R.
Leatham, E. A.
Leatham, W. H.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Legh, W. J.
Leigh, hon. G. H. C.
Leighton, S.
Lewisham, Viscount
Litton, E. F.
Lloyd, M.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Mackie, R. B.
Mackintosh, C. F.
Macliver, P. S.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Intyre, Æneas J.
M'Lagan, P.
Magniac, C.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
Mappin, F. T.
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Marjoribanks, E.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Milbank, F. A.
Moreton, Lord
Morgan, rt. hn. G. O.
Morley, A.
Moss, R.
Mulholland, J.
Musgrave, Sir R. C.
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Nicholson, W. N.
Northcote, rt. hn. Sir S. H.
Onslow, D.
Paget, T. T.
Palmer, J. H.
Parker, C. S.
Patrick, R. W. C.
Pease, A.
Pease, J. W.
Peddie, J. D.
Peel, A. W.
Pell, A.
Pennington, F.
Phipps, C. N. P.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Powell, W.
Powell, W. R. H.
Pugh, L. P.
Pulley, J.
Ramsay, J.
Rathbone, W.
Reed, Sir C.
Reid, R. T.
Rendel, S.
Repton, G. W.
Richardson, J. N.
Richardson, T.
Ritchie, C. T.
Roberts, J.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Ross, A. H.
Russell, G. W. E.
Russell, Lord A.
Russell, Sir C.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H.
Schreiber, C.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, M. D.
Seely, C. (Lincoln)
Seely, C. (Nottingham)
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Slagg, J.
Smith, A.
Smith, E.
Stanley, rt. hon. Col.
Stanton, W. J.
Stevenson, J. C.
Summers, W.
Sykes, C.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Taylor, P. A.
Tennant, C.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Tillett, J. H.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, G. O.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Walpole, rt. hon. S.
Walrond, Col. W. H.
Walter, J.
Warton, C. N.
Waterlow, Sir S.
Watney, J.
Waugh, E.
Webster, Dr. J.
Whitbread, S.
Whitley, E.
Wiggin, H.
Williamson, S.
Willis, W.
Wills, W. H.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Wilson, I.
Winn, R.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolff, Sir H. D.
Woodall, W.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS.

Grosvenor, Lord R.
Kensington, Lord

NOES.

Barry, J.
Bellingham, A. H.
Byrne, G. M.
Callan, P.
Corbet, W. J.
Cowen, J.
Daly, J.
Dawson, C.
Dillon, J.
Gray, E. D.
Healy, T. M.
Lalor, R.
Leahy, J.
Leamy, E.
Lyons, R. D.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Coan, J. C.
Marum, E. M.

Metge, R. H.
Moore, A.
Nelson, I.
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Gorman Mahon, Col. The
O'Kelly, J.
O'Shaughnessy, R.
O'Shea, W. H.
O'Sullivan, W. H.
Parnell, C. S.
Sexton, T.
Smyth, P. J.
Synan, E. J.
Thompson, T. C.

TELLERS.
Nolan, Major J. P.
Power, R.

Resolved, That the introduction and the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill and the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise order.

MR. GLADSTONE: I think I shall best discharge my duty by now moving the adjournment of the House. Certainly, so far as the Government is concerned, we could not ask the House to commence a discussion of the Bills which were introduced on Monday, after a Sitting of 22 hours' continuance; and we should object to go into any of the other Business of which Notice has been given by private Members. There are Notices for two Returns upon the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan); and I may say in regard to them that they will be granted without opposition when moved for.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. William Ewart Gladstone.*)

MR. PARNELL asked for information as to the Returns to which the right hon. Gentleman referred?

MR. W. E. FORSTER replied, that the Returns were those relating to the Lord Lieutenant and Magistrates (Ireland) and the Commission of the Peace (Ireland), one of which was now being printed.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at five minutes
after Two o'clock, p.m.
till To-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 27th January, 1881.

ARMY—MAJOR NOLAN, R.A., M.P.

QUESTION.

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether he will inform the House of the number of days' duty done by Major Nolan with his Battery of the Royal Artillery during the last two years; and the amount in pay and allowances he has received during that period?

THE EARL OF MORLEY: In 1879 Major Nolan did 134 days' duties, and in 1880 he did 86 days' duties; making 220 days in all. During the two years he drew 16*s.* a-day, which is the regimental pay of a Major in the Royal Artillery. That made £584 for the whole period. He has drawn no allowances, in consequence, I suppose, of his being probably in quarters.

House adjourned at a quarter past
Five o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 27th January, 1881.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE—Commons, *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Leave*—Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—*Second Night, debate adjourned.*

Ordered—First Reading—Licensing Act Amendment (Justices Disqualification) * [77].

Second Reading — River Floods Prevention [35]; Barristers' Admission (Ireland) [54]; Universities (Scotland) (Voting) * [69].

Committee — Report — Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) * [66]; Judicial Committee * [67].

QUESTIONS.

STATE OF IRELAND—RIOT AT DUNGANNON.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has any objection to place upon the Table of the House copy of the depositions taken before the magistrates in the case of one Simpson, who was charged with firing from his window in Dungannon in August last?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that the inquiry connected with the riot which took place at Dungannon was not yet concluded; and, therefore, he was not in a position to answer that Question.

Mr. BIGGAR remarked that the bill had been ignored.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, it was quite true that the Bill against Mr. Simpson was ignored by the Grand Jury; but other cases arising out of the same riot were still undecided, and he did not think it would be right to give any further answer at present.

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—ADVANCES FOR DRAINAGE WORKS.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What moneys were advanced by the Board of Works to Mr. F. H. Donning for drainage on the lands of Island Duff, parish of Kilmeen, barony of Duhallow, county Cork?

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH: I have been asked to answer this Question by my right hon. Friend; and I beg to say that £800 has been granted to Mr. Donning, of which two instalments of £160 each up to the present have been paid.

CONVICT LABOUR.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to the repeated and urgent representations of the Directors of Convict Prisons as to the pressing necessity for a decision as to the mode in which the convicts shall be employed when the works on which they are now employed are completed; whether, during the present year, the works at Chatham will not be so near completion that many hundreds of the men now in that convict prison will be without employment; whether in a year or two the number required will not be further reduced, and those at Portsmouth also without employment; and, whether, under these circumstances, he would be prepared to co-operate with the Lords of the Admiralty in making arrangements for the employment on dockyard works in Ireland of such convict labour as may from time to time become available from the causes specified?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The matter to which the hon. Member's Question refers is a very important one, and it has been under the careful consideration of the Government. There is no doubt that the necessity for finding employment for these convicts is a very urgent one, and the Home Office is in communication with the Admiralty upon the subject; but no definite conclusion has as yet been arrived at.

In answer to Sir R. Assheton Cross,

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the subject of the formation of harbours of refuge by convict labour was under the consideration of the proper authorities.

THE RECENT SNOW STORM—RAILWAY PASSENGERS—THE LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. COHEN asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that on Tuesday evening, the 18th of January, the London and North Western Railway Company continued to despatch trains from Euston without giving passengers the information, then in the possession of the Railway officials, that the line was completely blocked between Sudbury and Harrow, by reason of an accident to a luggage train, and by snow; and that, in consequence, a very large number of passengers, including many ladies and children, were kept all night at the Willesden Station; and, whether the Board of Trade will take steps with a view of compelling or inducing Railway Companies, in cases of accidents or blocks, to give such information to the public as the Railway officials themselves possess?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, he had received several complaints as to the inconvenience, and, in some cases, danger and exposure to which passengers were, as was alleged, unnecessarily subjected on Tuesday, the 18th instant. He had made inquiries into the case of the London and North Western Railway specified by his hon. Friend, and he was informed by the Railway Company that on the evening and afternoon of that day only one train was despatched from Euston after the block was made known to the officials, without notice to the passengers, and that was sent off by inadvertence. With regard to the subsequent trains that left the station, notice was given to any passengers who went by them that they did so at their own risk. He was also informed by the Railway Company that the passengers detained at Willesden had an offer made them to be taken back to London by special trains for that purpose; but the majority, if not the whole, of the passengers declined to avail themselves of the offer. These statements derived some confirmation from the fact, which would, no doubt, give satisfaction to the hon. and learned Member and the House, that four Directors of the London and North Western Railway Company, and the senior clerk of the Railway Department of the Board of Trade, were in one of the trains that were snowed up all night. As President of the Board of Trade, he (Mr. Chamberlain) had no authority to compel Railway Companies to make special arrangements under such circumstances; but, inasmuch as he thought there was reason to believe that in the case of some of the Companies sufficient care and precaution had not been taken, he had thought it well to prepare a Circular, which would shortly be issued, calling the attention of the Companies to the matter, and urging that instructions should be given to their officials to warn passengers in such circumstances before allowing them to leave the stations.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BOARD FEES.

Mr. PUGH asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it is competent for a School Board to prescribe, under section seventeen of "The Education Act, 1870," a weekly fee, subject to a deduction, on payment quarterly in advance; and, whether the Education Department would see any objection to consenting to a fee, otherwise reasonable, subject to such a deduction?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Yes; it is competent to a school board, with the sanction of the Education Department, to allow a reasonable deduction.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—CLERICAL MAGISTRATES.

Mr. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is correct, as stated in "Thoms' Official Directory," that while 37 Protestant clergymen act as magistrates in the following Irish counties—Antrim (2), Cavan (3), Clare (2), Cork (3), Donegal (5), Down (3), Fermanagh (3), Kerry (1), Kilkenny (1), King's (1), Leitrim (3), Longford (1), Louth (1), Meath (1), Monaghan (3), Tyrone (4)—there is no clergyman of the faith of the great majority of the Irish people a magistrate; if he can state what objection the Lord Chancellor sees to remedying the disparity; and, whether it is true that the appointment of the Rev. R. Kyle, of Coleraine, a Protestant clergyman, to the magistracy was made within the last twelve months? He explained that the latter part of his Question referred to a statement lately made that no such appointment had been made recently.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I believe there are no Roman Catholic clergymen on the Commission of the Peace. I have not inquired into the figures in *Thom's Official Directory* with regard to the clergymen in the different counties mentioned; but I am well aware that the *Directory* is generally accurate in its information. I can only repeat that, as a general rule, no clergyman of any denomination has been appointed in Ireland lately to the Commission of the Peace. Although the holding of the clerical office is not looked upon as a disqualification, it is generally held to exclude, unless the clergyman in question is the possessor of property, or his appointment is considered desirable for other considerations. There are probably a few cases of departure from the general practice. In the case referred to particularly, I am not aware of the exact date of the rev. gentleman's appointment, and the House is aware that it is the Lord Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant of the county, that makes such appointments, and not the Government; but I believe he was appointed before the present Government came into Office. I understand the rev. gentleman possesses considerable property, and holds no clerical preferment at present.

TREATY OF BERLIN—BULGARIA—THE VARNA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that the Bulgarian Government have now admitted their liability to the Varna Railway Company for overdue interest, but that the only offer that has been made is a payment of £80,000 in full discharge of arrears of interest amounting to over £280,000, and an annual payment of £40,000 in lieu of the guarantee of £140,000 per annum; and, whether Her

Majesty's Government have made or will make representation to the Bulgarian Government with the view of protecting the interests of English shareholders, and carrying out the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The Bulgarian Government have urged that the obligations towards the Varna Railway Company laid upon Bulgaria by the Treaty of Berlin are heavier than she can bear, and they have made proposals to the Company for a settlement of their claims, the exact particulars of which have not been officially communicated to Her Majesty's Government, but are believed to be correctly stated in the Question. Her Majesty's Government understand that these proposals have been rejected by the Company; and Her Majesty's agent at Sofia has been instructed to support the Company in their endeavours to obtain the settlement of their claims in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE 23—EUROPEAN PROVINCES OF TURKEY.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of the Government, either alone or in concert with the other Powers signatories of the Treaty of Berlin, to take steps to obtain the fulfilment of the stipulations of Article 23 of that Treaty, by obtaining from the Porte the promulgation in the European Provinces of Turkey of the statute submitted to the revision of the European Commission, of which the noble Lord the Member for Calne was a member; and whether Papers can be laid upon the Table on the subject?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: On the completion of the labours of the Commission Her Majesty's Government asked the Powers to authorize their Ambassadors to discuss the course that should be taken to prevail upon the Porte to put the new statute into force. Some of the Ambassadors have received instructions accordingly; but up to the present time no joint action has been agreed upon. We shall not fail to keep the question steadily in view, and shall endeavour, in concert with the other Powers, to obtain the fulfilment of the 23rd Article of the Treaty.

TURKEY AND GREECE—THE FRONTIER QUESTION.

MR. BRYCE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Ottoman Porte has requested Her Majesty's Government to take part in a Conference at Constantinople for the purpose of settling the question of the Frontier of Greece; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government has acceded to that request; and, whether it is intended that the King of Greece shall be represented at the Conference?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: A proposal of the Turkish Government, that negotiations in regard to the Greek Frontier Question should be instituted at Constantinople between the Porte and the Representatives of the Powers, has been made to Her Majesty's Government, and they are in communication with the other Powers as to the answer which should be given to it.

MINES (COAL) REGULATION ACT, 1872 — THE PEN-Y-GRAIG COLLIERY EXPLOSION.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will direct a prosecution against Moses Rowlands, the acting manager of the Pen-y-Graig Colliery prior to the explosion, under the 60th and 61st clauses of the Mines Regulation Act; and, whether, considering the evidence tendered before the coroner's inquest, and the censure by the jury in respect to the conduct of the manager of the Pen-y-Graig Colliery, he will direct an inquiry into his competency to hold a certificate under the provisions of the Mines Inspection Act?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, the evidence would be carefully considered, and he should then see whether action could be taken upon it.

THE ENDOWED SCHOOLS COMMISSIONERS.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK asked the Vice President of the Council, When the Return moved for last year by Mr. Courtney, with reference to the progress made by the Endowed Schools Commissioners, will be laid upon the Table; whether he can state what number of schemes have been completed during the past year; and, if, having regard to the importance of re-organizing the secondary education throughout the Country, he can state when the Commissioners will have completed their labours?

Mr. MUNDELLA: The Return moved for by my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department will be laid on the Table this evening. The number of schemes completed during the past year—that is, that have received Her Majesty's approval—is 44. The number submitted was 57, as against 45 in 1879 and 52 in 1878. In reply to the important matter raised by the third Question of my hon. Friend, as well as by the Question of my hon. Friend the Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson), I regret to say that, owing to an accident which has befallen the Chief Charity Commissioner, I have been unable to confer with him on the subject. I do not hesitate to say that there is a good deal of anxiety and impatience in the public mind at the slow progress which is being made in the re-organization of the Endowed Schools of the country. So far as I can gather, the delay is due to several causes, one of which, and I think the principal, is owing to the unfortunate change which was made in 1874 in merging the Endowed Schools Commission with the Charity Commission. That change reduced the Commissioners devoted to the Endowed Schools' work to two; and, although these two receive some assistance from other members of the Commission, they, in their turn, have to assist in the general work of the Charity Commission. The work of the Charity Commission itself has very largely increased of late years, and I understand goes on increasing; and the Acts of 1874 require that every scheme shall be finally considered and approved by the Chief Commissioner before it is submitted to the Education Department; so that the work thrown upon him appears to be heavy and increasing. The value of the educational endowments regulated by schemes under the Endowed Schools Act amounts to £294,000 per annum. The value of those in progress and remaining to be dealt with amounts, roughly, to about £340,000 per annum. There are other endowments for education, not being schools, which are within the scope of the Endowed Schools Act, and of the value of which no definite estimate has been formed. Many of the schemes passed during the last 11 years now require revision; and, owing to the absence of supervision and inspection, there is no guarantee for the efficiency of the schools, or that the provisions of the schemes for regulating them are carried into effect. I think it would be invidious, if it were possible, to compare the work of the two Commissions, seeing how differently they have been circumstanced; but it is evident that, at the past rate of progress, much more remains to be done than can be despatched for many years after 1882, when the present Act expires. The subject of future arrangements for completing the work in a reasonable time demands, and will receive, the serious consideration of the Government.

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND)—ADVANCES FOR DRAINAGE WORKS.

Mr. GRAY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that any Irish landlords who obtained advances from the Board of Works for drainage had the work done at per Irish perch while the basis of the estimates on which they obtained the loans was the English perch—a lesser measure; and, whether he will consent to a Return showing the loans applied for by and granted to Irish landlords under the Relief of Distress Acts, and the amount expended in each case up to the end of last year?

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH: I have been asked by my right hon. Friend to answer this Question. The Board of Public Works in Ireland have no knowledge of the fact of any Irish landlords having carried out relief works on loans obtained under the Act of last Session in the manner mentioned. With regard to the Return for which the hon. Member asks, I have to say that a similar one is now being prepared, and will shortly be presented in accordance with the order of the House on the Motion of the hon. Member for Salford.

AFFAIRS OF INDIA—A ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether he is prepared to recommend, either by a Select Committee of this House, or by a Royal Commission, an inquiry into the affairs of India?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, in reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I am of opinion that any general inquiry into the affairs of India, either by a Select Committee of the House or by a Royal Commission, would probably involve an expenditure of money and time, and a disturbance of the Administrative Department of India, which would not be compensated for by any beneficial results which would be likely to be obtained. But I still think, as I thought last Session, that there are some questions of a more limited scope into which an inquiry might be desirable, although, for reasons which I cannot very conveniently enter into now, I have not been able to form as definite an opinion as I hope to be able to form as to the exact object to which the inquiry should be directed. It is not probable that there would be absolute unanimity in the House as to the end or object of such inquiry, and I do not think the House could be expected to agree to it without some preliminary discussion. In the present state of Public Business, it does not appear very likely that an early opportunity will occur; and I am unable at this moment to form any opinion as to the amount of time it would be necessary for the Members of the Government and the House to devote to such a discussion or the inquiry that might result from it; but I can assure the hon. Member and the House that I will not lose sight of the subject, and as soon as the Business of the House is more advanced I hope that either I may be able to make some proposal myself, or that the hon. Member may have an opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the subject.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—CASE OF DENIS MURPHY.

MR. O'SULLIVAN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If it is true that, at the Kilmallock Petty Sessions on Friday last, a farmer named Denis Murphy was returned for trial to the Limerick Assizes for overholding possession of a farm on the property of Mr. C. John Coote, from which farm Murphy was evicted for owing one year's rent and a balance of twelve pounds; if it is true that a majority of the magistrates present refused bail for Murphy's appearance; if it is also true that the magistrate who acted as chairman on that occasion is a tenant to the said Mr. C. John Coote; and, under these circumstances, if the Law Officers of the Crown in Ireland will uphold that decision, especially since Murphy can get bail for his appearance at the Assizes or Sessions for any amount which the authorities may require?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Mr. Speaker, Denis Murphy was committed for trial at Kilmallock Petty Sessions, not for overholding possession, but for forcible entry and detainer in November last of premises of which possession had been obtained by due process of law in June last for non-payment of rent. The Petty Sessions Bench on the occasion consisted of five magistrates; and, by a majority, in the exercise of the discretion with which the law invests them, refused bail. I must assure my hon. Friend that the Law Officers of the Crown in Ireland have no authority to review or interfere with that decision of the magistrates.

MR. BIGGAR said, the hon. and learned Member had overlooked one part of the Question.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, the hon. and learned Member had not answered the Question as to whether the chairman was a tenant of Mr. Coote.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I did not think it necessary to inquire into that circumstance.

INDIA—THE COVENANTED AND UNCOVENANTED SERVICES OF INDIA.

SIR DAVID WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether certain Returns relative to the number and salaries of Europeans employed in the Covenanted and Uncovenanted services of India are now complete, so far as the civil portion is concerned; and, whether he will lay them upon the Table as a separate Paper, without delaying until the military portion is also ready?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON, in reply, said, that the Returns had been received, which the Government would issue without waiting for the military portion.

STATE OF IRELAND—AFFRAY AT CLAREEN, HOLYMOUNT.

Mr. HEALY asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether it is true that at the Ballyglass Petty Sessions last week three women and two men were remanded for a fortnight, bail being refused, on a charge of assaulting the police on the occasion of the late fatal affray between the constabulary and people at Clareen, Holymount; whether the policeman, against whom a verdict of manslaughter was returned in the same case for bayonetting the deceased Quinn, was admitted to bail; and, whether any of the magistrates who refused bail to the three women and two men were landlords or land agents; and, if he approves of their refusing bail on a charge of a minor character to that upon which the policeman was admitted to bail?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): Mr. Speaker, it is the fact that at the Ballyglass Petty Sessions last week three women and two men were charged with assaulting the police in the discharge of their duty while protecting a process-server. The case was adjourned for a fortnight at the request of the defendants, and the magistrates decided on detaining the defendants in custody pending the further investigation of the charge. It is also the fact that at the inquest upon the deceased Quinn, the coroner's jury returned a verdict of manslaughter against a constable, who was subsequently admitted to bail by the Queen's Bench. It is not the fact that the verdict referred to any bayonetting of the deceased; and the medical evidence at the inquest was that the injury causing death, by whomsoever inflicted, must have been inflicted by some blunt instrument. I have not inquired, Sir, whether the members of the Bench were landlords or agents. The charge against the defendants was not, I am sorry to say, at all of a minor character. A process-server named Henderson was proceeding to serve legal processes, protected by a large Constabulary party, under the direction of a magistrate. They were assailed by a crowd of from 300 to 400 persons; a trench of 10 feet or 12 feet was cut across the road and flooded; the earth dug out of the trench was banked up on the road behind the trench, and a large fire lit behind this bank. The Constabulary were attacked with stones and sticks, and several of them were injured. The charge against the defendants is, that they were some of those assailants. I have neither the right nor power to offer any opinion on the exercise by the magistrates of their judicial discretion in reference to this case, which is still depending before them.

Mr. HEALY gave Notice that, in consequence of the hon. and learned Gentleman not having answered that portion of his Question referring to the constitution of the Bench, he would repeat it on Monday.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): That, Sir, is a Question which I cannot undertake to answer.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MAURICE BROOKS asked the Postmaster General, Whether he can communicate the result of the consideration which the House of Commons was informed last Session was then being given to the Petition of the Telegraphists of Dublin for increased pay?

Mr. FAWCETT: One result of the inquiry referred to was the discovery of a considerable redundancy in the telegraph staff in the Dublin Post Office. That redundancy has now been removed, and the Dublin clerks are in exactly the same position as those in other towns. As I have had occasion to say before this Session, a careful inquiry is now being made into the position and prospects of the telegraph clerks in general, with regard to pay and promotion; and any decision that is come to on this subject will, of course, refer to the telegraphists of Dublin.

CITY OF LONDON—THE TEMPLE BAR MEMORIAL.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether it is his intention to take steps to remove an obstruction consisting of a griffin elevated above two statues representing Her Majesty and the Prince of Wales, which has been erected opposite to the New Law Courts in the centre of a public highway?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Sir, the Corporation of London claim, and I believe have always exercised, an exclusive right and jurisdiction over the streets within the City, and the erection of any monuments there, and I have no intention of contesting their claim. I am further precluded from raising any question as to the obstruction caused by the Temple Bar Memorial by the fact that my Predecessor most reluctantly gave facilities for a widening of the road rendered necessary by its erection. In order to prevent much graver inconvenience to the public from the narrowing of the roadway, Mr. Adam felt himself compelled to consent to a re-sale to the City of a strip of land, so as to add to the road to the extent to which it was to be diminished by the Memorial. The necessary effect of this was to reduce the footway in front of a portion of the New Courts of Justice by about five feet. The design for the Memorial was not submitted for the approval of Mr. Adam, nor was he in any way responsible for it. I think everyone must admit, now that the Memorial is completed, that a great mistake has been made; that it is very unfortunately placed; that the reduction of the footway in front of the Courts of Justice will be most inconvenient to the public; and that the Memorial itself is artistically unworthy of the site. I cannot but express my hope that the Corporation of London, which has always shown so much interest in questions of taste and public convenience — for example, as far as Epping Forest is concerned—will defer to the general opinion of the public on the subject. I believe the best course would be to remove the main portion of the Memorial, which has some merits, to a point not far distant, where the road is much wider, and on re-erecting it there not to replace the griffin. I have communicated in this sense unofficially with the authorities of the City. I am unable, however, to say at present whether they will take any action. The matter rests entirely in their hands. I can only say that I shall be glad to co-operate, on behalf of the Office of Works, in removing any difficulties which may exist in regard to such a course.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR would like to ask whether public hostility to the Memorial had not taken the form of malicious injury to certain portions of the Memorial; and whether the First Commissioner of Works would not recommend to the First Lord of the Treasury to bring in a Coercion Bill for that part of London?

MERCANTILE MARINE — LIFEBOAT SERVICES — THE STEAMSHIP "ROCHESTER."

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he has had under his notice the details of an act of gallantry performed in the endeavour to save life by two of the officers and the crew of the steamship "City of Rochester," of Sunderland, on the night of the 19th instant — in lowering a lifeboat and going to the assistance of a Foreign Brigantine ashore on the Maplin Sands —in which endeavour the whole boat's crew narrowly escaped with their lives; and, whether he will consider the advisability of extending to Captain Hardy and his crew some public recognition of their conduct on that occasion?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, that the only information he had received was an extract from the official log which had been sent him by the owner of the *City of Rochester*. It did not appear, however, that there was any actual danger to life. The vessel to which assistance had been rendered was foreign. In those circumstances it was contrary to the practice of the Board of Trade to offer a reward; but it was the usual practice of foreign Governments to give a reward.

STATE OF IRELAND — LAND LEAGUE COURTS AT LIMERICK.

MR. DAWSON asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, What grounds existed for suspecting that the ordinary weekly meeting of the Land League held in Limerick on the 17th instant was of a criminal character, or called for the purpose of violating the Criminal Law, and how the uninvited attendance of the police on that occasion was justified?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Mr. Speaker, the Constabulary had reason to believe that one of the Land League Courts was about to be held on this occasion, and I have already pointed out to the House, in answer to former Questions of hon. Members, the criminal character of such courts. The Constabulary having attended were requested to retire, and were about to do so, when it was resolved, I understand, by the meeting that they should remain.

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether the communications which took place between Her Majesty's Government and Lord Ripon on the subject of the abandonment of Candahar were not of a private and personal character, and therefore in such a form as to prevent the Members of the Council, both of the Secretary of State and of the Viceroy, from placing their opinions upon record before Her Majesty's Government arrived at a decision upon the subject?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, in reply to the hon. Member's Question, I have to state that the opinions of Her Majesty's Government were communicated to the Government of India on the subject of Afghanistan generally, and Candahar in particular, so far as it was possible at the time, in a despatch contained in the Blue Book of May last. Immediately after the defeat of Ayoob Khan by Sir Frederick Roberts, the Viceroy invited an expression of opinion from Her Majesty's Government on the subject of the continued occupation of Candahar in the altered circumstances of the question. These views were communicated to the Viceroy in telegrams, and more at length in a despatch of November 11, which has been included in the Blue Book. My hon. Friend must be aware that that despatch, and every other despatch on this subject, being in the Secret Department, are not necessarily laid before, or submitted to, the Council of India, and that no Member of the Council of India has any right to claim that his opinion on questions considered in that Department should be placed on record. I need not, however, inform the House that I have availed myself, as far as I have been able, of the knowledge and great experience of many Members of the Council for the information and guidance of Her Majesty's Government. As I have already stated, when an answer to the despatch of November is received from the Government of India, I will consider whether it, and any opinion of the Viceroy's Council, can properly be laid on the Table or not. I may, however, add, that I do not wish to make any concealment whatever of the fact, if that is the object of my hon. Friend's Question, that the subject of the retention or relinquishment of Candahar was one of policy which Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that they possessed means of determining for themselves—means equal in value to those which were possessed by the Government of India itself; and also they were of opinion that it was a question of such great importance that, while they were willing to leave the utmost discretion to the Government of India as to the time and mode in which the policy should be carried into effect, they held themselves bound to form their own opinion on the subject, and express it in the clearest manner to the Government of India.

SCIENCE AND ART—SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.

MR. GREY asked the Vice President of the Council, If the privilege of Members of Parliament to enter the South Kensington Museum on Sundays after two in the afternoon, which was enjoyed by them from the year 1857 to the year 1874, and which was abolished in that year, can be restored; and, if not, whether he would state the reason why?

MR. MUNDELLA: I can find no Minute at South Kensington extending the privilege of visiting the Museum on Sunday afternoons to Members of Parliament. I never heard of this privilege myself, and I have spoken to several Members of this House who have sat since 1857, and who never heard of it. I believe that the former Director of the South Kensington Museum issued orders of admission to a limited number of gentlemen, which, as I think, were properly cancelled by our Predecessors. I think the House will agree that if the Museum is to be opened on Sundays, it should be open to the general public; and, if closed, it should be closed altogether.

THE RECENT SNOW STORM—REMOVAL OF SNOW (METROPOLIS).

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he will be good enough to state why he has prohibited the carting of snow into Hyde Park, which refusal of facilities for clearing the streets has entailed a very heavy expenditure upon the local authorities; and, whether there is any objection to clean snow being deposited in the Park?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Sir, the deposit of snow in the London Parks was formerly allowed; but I am informed that experience showed that, in consequence of the great admixture of salt, granite dust, and other deleterious matter, the grass was materially injured, and often did not recover for two years. In consequence of this, in 1876 the deposit was forbidden, and has not since been allowed. I have been unwilling to depart from this decision in respect of the principal Parks. In respect of Westminster and St. James's parishes, from which the pressure has mainly come, there is no real difficulty in carting it into the river. I have also ascertained that they would be permitted to deposit their snow on the vacant ground at the back of Whitehall Place, belonging to the Metropolitan Board and the Office of Woods and Forests. With respect to Marylebone, which is very much more remote from the river, upon being satisfied that they had no place within a reasonable distance where they could deposit their snow, I gave permission to cart it into the least frequented part of Regent's Park upon strict terms; but in view of the opinion of the officers responsible for the condition of the Parks, I could not permit a deposit to be made in Hyde Park or St. James's.

STATE OF IRELAND—OUTRAGES IN COUNTY CORK.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the fact that, in consequence of the recent outrages at Castletown Bere, county Cork, the failure of detection, and the publicly declared suspicion of the people that the police are the perpetrators of these outrages, vigilance committees have now been organized amongst the people themselves, which have nightly to patrol the district; and, if the Government still persists in refusing inquiry into the charges against the local police?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had no information with regard to the statements made by the hon. Member. No Notice was given, nor any time to obtain any information. He might state, however, that he was not inclined to change the opinion he had already expressed, that there was no ground for an inquiry on the subject.

MR. HEALY said, he had given Notice of the Question.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether the reports which have appeared in the papers of the prevalence of "foot-and-mouth disease" in America are correct; and, whether any cases have been detected amongst the stock imported from that country to England?

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked, Whether it was true that the foot-and-mouth disease had extended into Cheshire?

MR. MUNDELLA: I regret to say that foot-and-mouth disease exists in the counties of Durham and Chester. No official information has been received of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States of America; but at different times cargoes of animals affected with this disease have been landed in Great Britain from the United States. In 1879 the disease was detected in six cargoes; in 1880, in 10 cargoes; and during the present month three cargoes of cattle affected with foot-and-mouth disease have been landed, containing no less than 338 affected animals. In one instance the whole cargo of 267 were suffering from the disease in various stages when landed, the disease having broken out very shortly after the departure of the vessel from America. I propose within a few days to lay further Papers on the Table relating to disease among American cattle.

POST OFFICE—TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION—UNDERGROUND WIRES.

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Postmaster General, When it is proposed to substitute underground telegraphic communication with the provinces in place of the existing overground system of wires, which are so apt to get out of order, and which, besides entailing serious expenses for frequent repairs, are dangerous to life in case of their fall through any defect or through stress of weather?

Mr. FAWCETT, in reply, said, there were, at the present time, more than 9,000 miles of underground wire in London and other towns, and the number of miles was constantly being increased. The expense that would be incurred in converting the overground wires from London to the Provinces into underground wires would be so great that the system could not be introduced.

POST OFFICE—POSTAL ORDERS.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Postmaster General, If it is a regulation of the Post Office that a postal order crossed and presented for payment through a banker is not payable until it has been forwarded to the General Post Office, London, and returned to the place where it was presented, unless the banker has made certain arrangements with the Post Office; and, if any such regulation is in force, what reason exists for it, involving, as it does, considerable delay?

Mr. FAWCETT, in reply, said that he had already answered an almost exactly similar Question, put to him by the hon. Members for Dublin and Carlow County on the 20th instant, the reply to which had been fully reported. The sole reason why this rule was adopted was to protect the public against fraud. Since he had answered the question on the 20th instant a large number of banks had entered into the arrangements alluded to, amongst them being the Bank of Ireland.

Mr. GRAY: Perhaps I may be permitted to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Department contemplate in any way limiting the time during which the guarantee of the bank shall run? I believe the principal difficulty with some of the banks—I know with some of the Irish banks—is that the time for the guarantee is unlimited, and that they think would interfere with their business. If the time were limited I think the difficulty would disappear.

Mr. FAWCETT: Perhaps the hon. Member will put the Question on the Paper.

IRELAND—THE STATE TRIALS.

Mr. GREER asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether he will place in the Library for the use of the Members of this House, a Copy of the charge of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, in the information at the suit of the Attorney General for Ireland against Mr. Parnell and others recently tried in Dublin?

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that Question I should like to have an answer to this Question—Whether the attention of the Government has yet been directed to the result of the recent State Trials in Dublin, wherein, by the inability of two jurors to agree with their fellow jurors, a failure of justice has resulted; and, if it is the intention of the Government to afford the defendants an opportunity for a more successful result by instituting a new trial?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. W. M. Johnson): Sir, in answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Carrickfergus, I shall see that a copy of the Charge is placed in the Library for the use of the Members of the House. In reference to the Question of the hon. and learned Member for Meath, I beg leave to say that the Government have no official information at all of what the number of dissentients in the jury was. The only official knowledge the Government has is that the jury did disagree.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN: The Solicitor General for Ireland not having answered the substantial part of my Question as to a new trial, I beg to give Notice that I shall on Monday next—which I hope will be time enough for it—ask this Question—Whether the Irish Executive, having unofficial knowledge of the fact that in the recent State Trials ten jurors were agreed on a verdict of "Not Guilty," intend not to afford the accused the opportunity of a new trial, but intend to punish those gentlemen, or some of them, for the same alleged offences, under the powers of a Coercion Act?

AGRARIAN CRIME (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS.

Mr. DILLON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When the second part of the Returns on the subject of agrarian crime in Ireland would be placed in the hands of hon. Members? The part in their hands at present went down to October 31, 1880. The Returns he wanted, and which were promised, were for Novenber and December, 1880. He failed to see how the debate on the Protection of Person and Property Bill could proceed. ["Order!"] He failed to see how they could proceed satisfactorily with the debate without these Returns.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, before the right hon. Gentleman answered that Question he wished to ask him whether these Returns were seen by him in manuscript or proof before they were presented to the House; whether those Returns had been presented in any way under his supervision; and, if so, whether the details of those Returns were familiar to his mind when he made his speech of last Tuesday night?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that with regard to the Question of the hon. Member for Tipperary, he had already stated to the House that he had ordered the preparation of the particulars for the months of November and December, and, in order that they should be given to the House as soon as possible, he had made the Returns for November and December separate. He hoped the Returns for November would be in the hands of Members in a very short time, and those for December as soon as possible. With regard to the Question of the hon. Member for Galway, he must decline to give any information as to the mode in which he conducted the Business of his Department. He would, however, inform the hon. Member that he was ready to abide by the statement which he had made on Monday.

Mr. CALLAN asked, Whether the right hon. Gentleman would give the residences or the Petty Sessions Districts where the parties charged resided, so that they might identify the accuracy of the charges? In his own county (Louth), which was the smallest in Ireland, there were five cases, and he could not identify or test the accuracy of any single one of them. He knew of one case——["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now speaking upon matters of controversy.

Mr. CALLAN said, he should like to ask the hon. Gentleman, Whether he would facilitate the testing of the accuracy of the charges by giving the residences of the parties charged, or the Petty Sessions Districts in which they resided?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: That is a matter on which I must consult the authorities; but I may just state that it would be exceedingly unlikely that the Member for any county would know the particulars of all the outrages committed within it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [24th January],

> "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

And which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard,"—(*Dr. Lyons,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. LABOUCHERE, who spoke in support of an Amendment which stood on the Paper in his name, to the effect—

> "That no Bill for the Protection of Life and Property in Ireland will be satisfactory which does not include protection to the tenant in cases where it can be shown to the satisfaction of a court of justice that the tenant's rent is excessive, or that he is unable owing to temporary circumstances to pay it,"

said, that since he moved the adjournment of the debate three days ago there had been a certain amount of disturbing element in the consideration of Irish matters. For his own part, he should, in speaking on this important measure, endeavour to keep strictly within the lines laid down by the Prime Minister, and to discuss it within the limits of "reason and usage;" for he was not one of the Members who, as the Leader of the Opposition seemed to consider, objected to those limits as something intolerable. In looking at all measures of importance that came before the House, a Member had to consider them on their direct and immediate merits, and with a view to their ultimate consequences. By ultimate consequences he meant the possibility of a vote involving the fate of the Government. The present Government was a Coalition Government. It had got into power owing to a union of the forces of the Moderate Liberals and of the Advanced Liberals. Last year, on a very important issue, the Moderate Liberals were not true to the association. When the fate of the Government was at issue the Moderate Liberals deserted the Government, and went over to the natural enemies of the Government who sat on the opposite Benches. We Radicals—[*Laughter*]—yes, he knew that it excited the smiles of some hon. Members that anyone should call himself a Radical. He was one, and he believed there were several others in that House. They were so fully convinced that it was most desirable to maintain the present Government in power till many important measures were passed, both for Ireland and England, and they owed so large a debt of gratitude to the Prime Minister for having done more than any other man to put an end to the baneful Government which existed a year ago, that, for his part—and he thought he might speak for many others on that side of the House—although they might not agree to some particular measure proposed by the Prime Minister, yet, if they were told that his tenure of Office was in any way endangered by their voting against such a measure, they would at once subordinate the minor to the major, and give up their own convictions and vote for that measure. But the present was not one of those cases. In this case any Radical Member might give effect to his private convictions, without the slightest chance of endangering the Government by doing so, for, in the course the Government were now pursuing, they had the inestimable advantage of the support of hon. Gentlemen sitting opposite. Everything that was said by the Prime Minister had been received with rapturous cheers. One Gentleman after another on that Bench had got up and rained down blessings on the Prime Minister and the Government. [An hon. MEMBER: When?] If the hon. Gentleman would emancipate him from the Standing Order which did not allow him to refer to previous debates he would tell him. It was possible that the hon. Gentleman himself might not be ready to rain down blessings on the Prime Minister's head; but he was a Member of the Party which was led by the Front Opposition Bench, and the House would not deny that he was strictly accurate in what was, to a certain extent, a figure of speech. Although he (Mr. Labouchere) was a genuine supporter of the Prime Minister, he did not intend to follow the example of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and to rain down blessings on his head that evening. Indeed, he occupied a somewhat singular position. He was returned there as a Radical by a very advanced constituency; and, to his surprise, he positively found himself there almost alone, with his Colleague (Mr. Bradlaugh), as an advocate of Conservatism in the real, though not in the Party, sense of the word. He appeared in the House that evening to defend one of the most ancient, most hallowed, and most time-honoured institutions of this country. He was there to defend the institution which went by the name of Habeas Corpus, and which had existed, according to Hallam, from the first records of English law. For centuries attempts were made by Monarchs to rob us of that inheritance; and for centuries Parliaments, and even the Barons, whose descendants sat somewhere in that House, defended the right of the people to Habeas Corpus. Only once since that right existed had it been suspended in England; and now that the House of Commons was called upon to suspend it in Ireland, he, for one, would unhesitatingly vote against the proposal as not being at all justified by the condition of that country. He fully admitted there might be occasions when it might be necessary to suspend the Habeas Corpus, as when a country was actually in revolt and civil war was imminent; but no one pretended that such a state of things existed at present in Ireland. Every hon. Gentleman would, he thought, admit that all the questions which came before the House respecting Ireland were essentially local questions. To those questions he applied one general rule—namely, the locality ought to be supreme within its limits. Differences of opinion might exist as to the unit of locality; but probably no one would deny that Ireland was a sufficiently large unit to form a locality of its own. He was ready to admit that Englishmen had many virtues, but they were somewhat intolerant; and they were curiously intolerant when any country under their rule ventured to have the same virtues as themselves. There was nothing which they valued so highly as the right of self-government; and yet when Ireland asked for self-government in local matters, they regarded the demand as being something monstrous and intolerable. Let the House suppose for a moment that Ireland were larger than England, and that in a Parliament sitting in Dublin the English Representatives were in a minority. Did anyone mean to say that they would accept the position of Irishmen legislating for them on matters regarding the tenure of land in England? He was certain that they would not; and he was not prepared to admit that English Members had the right to legislate regarding the tenure of land in Ireland, except to register the opinions of the majority of the Irish nation. It was asserted, and pretty well admitted, that the cause of the Chief Secretary bringing in his Bill was the action of the Land League; but he would ask whether the objects of that League were not essentially local? It wished to alter the tenure of land in Ireland. Would it in any way destroy or loosen the Imperial bond which united Ireland to England if fixity of tenure existed in the former country, or if a tenant was called upon to pay rent by Griffith's or any other valuation? The question was essentially local, and he held that the locality was supreme in that matter. They had been told that the Land League did not represent public opinion in Ireland. But how were they to judge of public opinion except by the voice of the majority of the Representatives; and it could not be doubted that the majority of the Members from Ireland agreed in the main with the programme of the Land League. Therefore, they might truly say that the public opinion of the majority of Irishmen was in favour of the Land League. He did not think any Member of the Cabinet would say that if Ireland were left to herself the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant would be the Minister for Ireland. He remembered that the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, in an able speech, said that if Ireland were removed 2,000 miles out to sea, short work would be made of the landlords. [Mr. JOHN BRIGHT dissented.] At all events, the right hon. Gentleman said something like that. It might be said that never were a people more closely united to attain a particular end than the Irish were united at the present moment. He was in the House, sitting beside Mr. Roebuck, when the question of the Irish Church was under discussion. A Gentleman on the opposite side described that Church as an institution which was loved and adored by all Irishmen. Mr. Roebuck said—

> "If I were a Conservative, I should not take that line. I should say that the Irish Church is a garrison; we occupy Ireland by force; and, as long as we do so, it is a mistake to weaken the garrison by giving up the Church."

Well, the Irish landlords were now the English garrison. The speech of the Chief Secretary the other night, though exceedingly able, was very unfair. The right hon. Gentleman began by parading the outrages, with the rhetorical object of prejudicing public opinion. No doubt, he was not taking the accounts from the newspapers; but he had selected the most sensational outrages, and dwelt upon them in the most sensational manner. He went into all the details of "carding." Of course, they all regarded that as an horrible thing; but one outrage of that sort could hardly be brought forward as a charge against a nation. The right hon. Gentleman urged that it was absolutely necessary to pass this measure quickly; but he must remember that there were such things as Standing Orders, and that hon. Gentlemen opposite would be able to delay the Bill for a considerable time. The practical object of the Bill was to put a good many of their constituents in prison; and it was really taking a too Arcadian view of human nature to suppose that hon. Gentlemen opposite would not use, and even misuse, every Standing Order of the House to prevent the passing of such a Bill. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have thought, in pleading urgency, that the Irish Members would act like the "silly dilly dilly ducks" which came to be killed when they were called. It was not at all likely, however, that they were going to do so. Although he should not abet Obstruction, yet he thought that on such an occasion as this Irish Members were perfectly justified in using, and even abusing, every Form of the House in order to prevent the passing of the Bill. As to the Returns of outrages, they had been made up of Reports submitted to the Chief Secretary, who had necessarily been unable to investigate all the cases. The Reports had come from magistrates, most of whom were landowners, and from police constables; and they knew in England how to judge of constables' evidence. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, he believed it was the experience of most London magistrates that they had a certain amount of distrust of policemen's evidence when it was unsupported. The Returns showed the constables and the magistrates had agrarianism on the brain, and that they had put down to that cause what he was convinced the House would see could not be properly put down to it. The first case in the published Returns was that of James Redmond. It appeared that—

> "A portion of the front wall of an old, unoccupied thatched cabin was maliciously thrown down, in consequence of which the roof fell in. The owner of the cabin also holds a rood of land from a man named Rigley, who some time previously offered the injured person a reduction of 10*s*. a-year in his rent if he would give up the land, which he refused."

The landlord, Rigley, was made amenable for this outrage; consequently, it was a case of a landlord outraging a tenant. In another case of agrarian assault, the injured persons were Margaret Lydon, Patrick Whalem, and Bridget Whalem. It appeared that—

> "A dispute arose about the possession of a small plot of ground. John Lydon assaulted the injured persons."

Yet in the very next case John Lydon appeared as the injured person, because he was assaulted at the time of the above dispute by his own wife. This was obviously a little domestic difference between a husband and his spouse, yet it was converted into two separate outrages. Nothing had caused greater indignation in England than the houghing and maiming of animals; but it must be remembered—and it was no honour to Ireland — that it had been for many years a habit in that country to cut and maim cattle. [*Laughter.*] He could understand that laughter; for hon. Members came down to the House with the object of passing a Coercion Bill, and would not even look at the Returns. The Returns showed that every year for a long series of years there had been a number of cases of cuttings and maimings of cattle. Dean Swift complained of the existence of this practice in his time, and jeered his countrymen, asking them whether, like Don Quixote, they looked on a flock of sheep as an army? One case was thus described in the Returns—

> "Ten sheep missing. Supposed to have been maliciously destroyed by being driven over the cliffs into the sea."

Why, somebody might have stolen the sheep, or they might have fallen over the cliffs themselves. Yet this was deliberately inserted in the Returns as a case of killing, cutting, or maiming cattle. Then there was a case of intimidation thus described—

> "A party of men came to Tighe's house at night, and warned him that they would kill him unless he gave up a meadow which he bought."

The next case was one of injury to property, because "the same party, before leaving, broke Tighe's window." That was perfectly ridiculous. Case 147 was put down as an assault on a man named Mockrea, by Joseph and Margaret Connolly. Evidently there might have been a dispute, but it was supposed to be on account of a friend of Mockrea's, who was a process-server, having prosecuted a relative of Connolly in January last; that was to say, 10 months ago. He asked seriously whether there was any exaggeration in his assertion that in compiling these Returns the magistrates and constables must have had agrarianism on the brain? In case 110, Mr. Walsh was fired at on the road when returning from his lodge by four men, but was not injured. Then 111 was the case of the same Mr. Walsh, who, when fired at, immediately dismounted from his horse, and while doing so was struck with a stick and knocked down. Surely those two were one and the same assault. He appealed to the Prime Minister's own sense of fairness, after the sample outrages he had given, to look into them himself, and not be influenced by the mere general statement that there had been a great number of outrages, making up a grand total. They found hundreds or more of those outrages of much the same character; and there appeared to have been a deliberate intention to make the most of every single outrage. Unfortunately for the Chief Secretary's contention — though he would not do him the injustice of supposing that he regretted it—the outrages, to a great extent, ceased after the first Return. They had a Return of the first 14 days of January, and what did he find? Let them remember that Ireland was the country which they were told at the commencement of the Session was in so terribly disturbed a state that not only property, but life, was insecure, and that was the main reason why that coercive policy was adopted. Well, during those 14 days in January there were no murders, no manslaughter, no cutting or maiming; there were four cases of attacking houses, two of firing at the person, one assault endangering life, and one aggravated assault. [An hon. MEMBER: And no convictions.] There were about 5,500,000 inhabitants in Ireland; and it must be remembered that the police unquestionably put down agrarian as outrages all offences which were in any way, however remotely, connected with land. Land was, moreover, the only industry in the country; and he defied them to find 5,500,000 human beings under any other Government in the world who could show in 14 days so good a record as that. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was quite equal to the occasion—he gave up the outrages. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that there were no outrages, so to say, now; but why, he asked, was that? It was an additional argument in his favour, because it showed that a terrible intimidation must exist to hinder those outrages. That was the purest assumption on the right hon. Gentleman's part. They had the fact that there were no outrages, and the right hon. Gentleman said he would tell them why that was the case. "The Irish are, in the first place, frightened of me and my Bill; and, in the second place, they are frightened at the Land League; it is organized now; it would inflict such fearful outrages on any person who dared to dispute its mandates." And how did the right hon. Gentleman prove that? He really did not know. His own impression was that the Land League exercised a great authority in Ireland, and he would admit that in all those great popular movements there were some people who lagged behind. The Land League brought them into the fold by the threat of a social ban called "Boycotting;" or, as the Prime Minister had happily described it, "exclusive trading." They knew the Irish to be a genial and social people, who especially disliked being cut by their friends; and he believed that the fear of being excluded from all intercourse with their friends and being able to take part in a great national movement induced a great many of them to be obedient to the mandates of the Land League. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary regarded exclusive trading as a moral sin. That was the right hon. Gentleman's view, but it was not his. However, the right hon. Gentleman said he did not think that exclusive trading was a crime, and that he would not legislate for it. But as the outrages had ceased, for what was he legislating according to his own argument? Why, he was suspending the Habeas Corpus Act to put an end to that exclusive trading. In 1846 Sir James Graham, in the Government of Sir Robert Peel, brought in a Coercion Bill. One whole day was occupied in discussing whether the Ministers should obtain precedence for the Bill even for one day; and on looking into *Hansard*, he found that Sir George Grey, Lord John Russell, Mr. Cobden, and many other Gentlemen took the line on that question which was taken by the Irish Members in the present case. The Bill was brought forward on the 30th of March; the discussion on the first reading lasted seven days; and among the Obstructives on that occasion appeared the honoured names of John Bright and Richard Cobden. The minority who voted against that Bill on the first reading was

125, who were by no means exclusively Irish Members. The debate on the second reading lasted six nights. They seemed to be giants in those days, for now they were horrified at one night. There voted against the Bill 292 Members. The Government on that occasion found themselves deserted by their Friends, who voted against them in such numbers that the Government had to resign. He would be sorry if that should be the fate of the present Ministry. Sir Robert Peel admitted that in bringing in a Coercion Bill it was necessary to establish that there existed, both as to the frequency of the crimes and, above all, as to the character of the offences committed, a necessity for some extraordinary measures. Now, Returns had been then placed in the hands of Members which gave a totally different aspect to affairs as they at present existed. There was no separation in the Returns for agrarian and other kinds of crime, as Sir Robert Peel thought that would be confusing. They were for the year 1845, and he would compare them with the Returns for 1880. In the former year the number of cases of injury to property was 410, while in the latter it was 506; but, of course, that number included the broken pane of glass. In 1845 the number of cases of firing was 138; in 1880 it was 70. In 1845 the number of cases of attacking houses was 483; in 1880 it was 22. In 1845 the number of cases of firing into houses was 134; in 1880 it was 98. In 1845 the number of cases of sending threatening letters was 1,944; in 1880 it was 1,750. He did not attach much importance to this item, however, because it was absurd to call the sending of threatening letters an outrage. If the sending a threatening letter was an outrage, he had been outraged in his life as much as the entire body of Irish landlords. Yet he had peacefully pursued the even tenour of his way, without calling upon the Prime Minister to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act for his protection. In 1845 the number of cases of incendiarism was 508; in 1880 it was 504. In 1845 the number of cases of assaults endangering life was 777; in 1880 it was 535. It was, however, important to observe that the average of such cases of assaults during the last 10 years was 542; and, therefore, the number in 1880 was actually seven below the average number. In 1845 the homicides and murders were 139; and in 1880, 69; whereas the average of murders and homicides for the previous 10 years was 82, or 13 more than the number in the last year. The right hon. Gentleman had said that this Bill was directed against three classes of the community — against the miscreants, against the blackguards, and against a third class whom he veiled in the obscurity of a foreign language. [An hon. MEMBER: Dissolute ruffians.] The right hon. Gentleman implied that these blackguards and ruffians constituted the leading members of the local Land Leagues. Did the right hon. Gentleman know that a very large number of the most respectable shopkeepers were members of the local Land Leagues; and that in the South and West of Ireland the chairman of most of the local Land Leagues was a priest? They might differ from the priests in matters of faith; but no one had ever asserted that their lives were not pure and honest, and he was surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman say these men were dissolute ruffians and blackguards.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I am sure the hon. Member does not wish to misrepresent me. If he heard or read my speech he would have found I said nothing of the kind.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he had heard that speech and read it, and the remark of the right hon. Gentleman would lead him to give himself the additional pleasure of reading it a second time. He thought the right hon. Gentleman did speak in that sense. But although the right hon. Gentleman implied that the suspension of the Habeas Corpus was only aimed at dissolute ruffians and blackguards, yet later on in his speech he showed that this measure was directed against the leaders of the Land League. Now, he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would not for a moment say that all the leaders of the Land League were dissolute ruffians. He knew that there were men connected with the League who, although they might not agree with them, were as honourable as any man in that House. And what did he hear when the right hon. Gentleman came to that part of his speech in which he frankly told the House what this Bill was? He heard the abominable and hideous doctrine of constructive treason. He found that men were to be cast into prison because of something said at a public meeting which might be twisted as a recommendation to someone else to violate the law. But even that was not enough. The right hon. Gentleman was not satisfied with having this power to use against anyone who spoke according to his convictions in Ireland, but he sought to make it *ex post facto.* In his view, that was a monstrous proposal. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the law would not only deter for the future, but that gentlemen must consider very carefully every word that they had already spoken, and that if such words could be brought within the limits of constructive treason they might find themselves in prison for 18 months. The right hon. Gentleman had called this a Protection Bill—[An hon. MEMBER: A Liberty Bill.]—but he ventured to say that history would give it its true designation of a Coercion Bill. The right hon. Gentleman was very indignant when someone said he was going to punish the innocent with the guilty, and he defied anyone to prove that assertion. He accepted the challenge of the right hon. Gentleman. What was the Habeas Corpus? The Habeas Corpus was a possession, a property. That eminent Conservative—Dr. Samuel Johnson—had said that the one advantage which the inhabitants of this country had, as compared with the inhabitants of other countries, was that we had the Habeas Corpus as a guarantee against arbitrary arrest; and he (Mr. Labouchere) said that when the Government were going to deprive the whole Irish nation of this guarantee they did necessarily punish the innocent with the guilty. Lord Macaulay said James II. wanted to get a repeal of the Habeas Corpus Act, as it was natural a tyrant should. Hallam said that immunity from arbitrary imprisonment was a fundamental and absolute right not conferred by Habeas Corpus, but secured by Magna Charta, if not earlier. The argument in favour of coercion was invariably the same. They were always told it was not aimed against the innocent; that, on the contrary, it was intended to protect the innocent from a few desperate and reckless men. These arguments were used by Sejanus when he proposed in the Roman Senate the law of *Majestas;* and they were also used in the French Assembly when, after the Orsini attempt, it was proposed and carried to give the Emperor power to banish any man without trial. The right hon. Gentleman said that one proof that this Bill was urgently required was that the number of persons under police supervision in Ireland had increased; but the truth was that that number had only increased 10 between November and December. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), in the course of a recent speech, gave some details regarding this question of police supervision and protection. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said he had a friend living quietly on his estate in Ireland in the belief that no single one of his tenants would do him harm. Walking out on one occasion, this gentleman was met by a policeman, who expressed surprise that he had not asked for police protection. On the gentleman saying that he saw no necessity for such protection, the police officer said that while it was probably true that of 200 people on the estate 199 would do him no harm, the two hundredth man might, and, therefore, he ought to ask for police protection. He did not, of course, know whether the policeman was acting as an *agent provocateur;* but he certainly said that in his view the landlord ought to have the protection of at least two constables. The right hon. and learned Gentleman in his speech went on to say that he could not understand any landlord accepting such an escort except as a last resort, because nothing could be much more unpleasant than for a peaceful and law-abiding man to be placed in a position of the kind. An expression of opinion of the kind was somewhat surprising coming from such a quarter; because he had always understood that the great ones of the earth—Monarchs and Princes included—were always fenced round by police protection when they ventured abroad. There being a difficulty in obtaining evidence against persons suspected of crime, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had substituted for such necessity a provision under which any man might go secretly to a magistrate and give information against his fellow-citizens, on which information they might be deprived of liberty. As far as he was personally concerned, he should much prefer that no arrests took place in Ireland rather than that men should be taken into custody on the strength of statements made by secret informers, whom he regarded as the lowest, vilest, and most contemptible of the human race. He would not believe one word they brought to him, and most assuredly he would not act upon it. The right hon. Gentleman said he would take care that no one was illegally arrested. But in whom did he place the power, and from whom did he receive his information? He received it from the camp of the enemy—from landlords, from magistrates (most of whom were landlords), and from police constables, who were under the control of both classes to a very great extent. As an illustration of the bitterness with which the Irish magistracy regarded the Land League, he need only refer to the course taken by the Chief Justice in Ireland. If conduct such as that of Chief Justice May was to be expected from the head of the Irish magistracy, what was to be looked for in the case of some wretched stipendiary. Every hon. Member would remember that Chief Justice May, in open Court, made such references to a case which was pending, but had not come to trial, as caused him later to feel ashamed of what he had said, and to retire from the trial which came to an end in Dublin on Tuesday last. As another reason for supporting the Government, they were told that an effect of passing the Bills would be to procure juries who would convict prisoners brought before them. That might or might not be the case; but, as far as as he was concerned, he was unable to understand how it could be the business of the Executive Government to take care that juries always convicted. His noble Friend the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) had complained that Her Majesty's Government did not follow the unusual and wicked course of packing the jury which had recently heard the State Trials in Dublin—[Lord Randolph Churchill dissented]—but he thought no stronger proof was to be found that Irish jurors might discharge their duties without danger than the fact that no harm had come to the two dissentient jurors who were known to be in favour of convicting the traversers. Furthermore, he had noticed that since the conclusion of the trial that much-maligned man, Mr. Davitt, had upheld the perfect right of those two men to determine on taking any course which they could reconcile with their consciences. Another reason that had been urged in support of the present Bill was that the Land League had established what were called land courts; but, as a matter of fact, these courts were courts of appeal from denunciations made by members of the League, and therefore offered what he could not but regard as a kind of rude justice as between individual members of the League and suspected persons. It could not be denied that this Bill was deliberately brought in, not for the purpose of suppressing outrages, for there were no outrages; not for the purpose of suppressing exclusive dealing, for the right hon. Gentleman had said he would not legislate against exclusive dealing; the whole object was to enable landlords to collect their rents. The view which was held in Ireland—the people of that country being essentially an honest race—was that the tenants had a certain proprietorial right in the soil, but the English law denied that right in every shape; and, further, as in the case of proceedings under the Encumbered Estates Act, enabled, even encouraged, "landgrabbers" to proceed on the principle of rack-renting by advertising properties for sale, and holding out as an inducement to purchasers that such properties were capable of an increased rent. Feeling had changed in reference to this matter in recent times; and he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the opponents of Ministers were acting on precisely the same lines which he followed in reference to the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year. Then the Conservatives denounced Ministers for attacking the sanctity of contract, and now Ministers denounce the Land League for the same thing. It was clear from the Report of the Land Commission, which, owing to the kindness, he could not say indiscretion, of the right hon. Gentleman, was published a day or two back, that in the minds of some Members of the Commission there was an opinion in favour of tenant right; and, therefore, he could not but think that the Land League were justified in asking that there should be a truce, as far as coercion was concerned, until Parliament and the country had been afforded an opportunity of knowing the nature of the proposals in the direction of Land Law Reform which the Government meant to bring forward. Exclusive dealing, or "Boycotting," as it had come to be called, instead of having been, as some persons thought, invented in Ireland, was about as old as the world, and almost universal. In Scotland there was a social ban; and if a man did not agree with his Kirk he was excommunicated. What was that but exclusive dealing? Then, again, there were election cases in this country where if A and B did not vote in accordance with the wishes of a great man they lost his custom; and was not that exclusive dealing? In the management of estates in Ireland there was a species of "Boycotting," as absurd regulations were laid laid down, and tenants who broke them were turned out of their holdings. Well, after all, would this Bill effect a remedy for the grievances which existed? The right hon. Gentleman said it would; but they had had at least a dozen Coercion Bills, and though they made matters quiet for a time they were no real remedy. Other Bills of the sort followed, and the people remained very dissatisfied. In Ireland there was but one of two policies to be pursued—coercion, or satisfaction. They could not halt between those policies. They should consider the geographical and political relation between the two Islands, and give satisfaction to the Irish. He would go further, and say they should give some sort of measure of Home Rule to enable them to manage their own affairs, or they would have to pass Coercion Bill after Coercion Bill for Ireland. No doubt the Chief Secretary would not withdraw his Coercion Bill, and he would be supported in his policy of coercion by the majority of the Liberal Members. But there was one point on which there was not unanimity among those sitting on the Government side of the House, and that was that the Chief Secretary had not accompanied his Bill with some clause giving protection to tenants. There was a strong consensus of opinion among the Radical Members that such a clause should be inserted; and, if so, it would not meet with obstruction from the hon. Gentlemen from Ireland who opposed the Bill generally. There was a class of landlords in Ireland who regarded themselves as, and they were, to a certain extent, a kind of beneficent providence to their tenants, but who were very angry if their rents were not paid. He had talked to a good many of those gentlemen, and very worthy people they seemed to be, and some of them said that they would get rid of their tenants before the Land Bill became law.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: May I ask the hon. Member to name the landlords?

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he would follow the example set by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and decline to mention names. There was another class of landlords who bought their land in the Encumbered Estates Court, and who looked upon the transaction as a monetary speculation; and there could be no doubt that they would consult their own interests, and take advantage of the pressure of the Land League being taken off to evict every tenant from their estates, as they could do so for non-payment of rent, without compensation. The noble Lord asked him to name a landlord. He would not name any landlord with whom he had a private conversation; but he would, as a specimen, give him the name of one landlord. He alluded to Lord Dunally, who owned 21,000 acres in the county of Tipperary, and who wrote a letter which appeared in *The Dublin Daily Express* of the 21st instant. It would be remembered that many landlords had been in the habit of making what they called rules for their estates, which they said were rules in the interest of morality and decency. In that letter Lord Dunally said that at a meeting of the Dublin Land League, it had been said that he always made a daughter who succeeded her parents in the possession of a farm pay him half her fortune. That assertion was, he said, based on the fact, in one case, that of an old couple living on their holding, their daughter being about to be married, offered him £20 to be allowed to live with her parents. He did not in general allow a second family to live on a holding; but in this case he assented; and the £20 was paid. In another case a son wished with his two children to live on his parents' farm, and offered £20 for leave to do so. Lord Dunally assented; but the House would be glad to hear "that he never received the money." Another case was named in which similar leave was given, and a sum of £20 paid for the permission. Now, he challenged any hon. Member to produce any document of the Land League more outrageous, he would say more infamous, than that letter. He was not bringing a general charge against the Irish landlords. No doubt many would fulfil their duty; but here was a case of a landlord with 20,000 acres in Tipperary, and, no doubt, there were many such as he was. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, in the names of the thousands, the millions almost, of Radicals in England who believed in him as a cardinal article of their faith—did he not remember what took place little more than a year ago?—did the Conservatives support him then? No; they said he was an inspired maniac. Did the Whigs support him? No; they intrigued against him. And what happened? The right hon. Gentleman turned his back upon London, upon the Conservatives, and upon the Whigs. He appealed to the nation, and the nation registered the verdict which had placed him in his present position. It was in the name of those men—men who were most anxious to have full justice done to Ireland, who did not believe that it was possible that justice could be done if the Coercion Bill were not accompanied by some sort of security that it would not be abused by the landlords—that he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman and to his noble instincts to give to the occupiers of the soil in Ireland, if he went on with this wretched Coercion Bill, which he was sure the right hon. Gentleman hated as much as any man in the House, that small modicum of justice which would protect them from those who for centuries had not known what mercy was.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON: It is impossible for me, Sir, to express the regret I feel in finding myself compelled to take the course which I intend to do on this occasion. Since I have been in this House, it has been one of my most pleasing duties to take part in promoting every measure which has been introduced for the benefit of the Irish people. There are many hon. Gentlemen from Ireland, new to the House, who may not have personal knowledge of the course I have taken on Irish affairs; but there are others who have, and who can tell them that I habitually acted with such men as the late Mr. Maguire, Sir John Gray, Mr. M'Carthy Downing, and my lamented Friend the late Sir Colman O'Loghlen. I have supported, I believe, every proposal emanating from hon. Gentlemen from Ireland intended for the benefit of their country. I saw lately a list of Irish Bills which had been introduced by Irish Members, only two of which had passed this House. I voted for every one of those measures; and I may add that I myself presented to the Sovereign a Petition praying for the release of the Fenian prisoners. I also supported the Motions made from time to time here for that purpose. No man will doubt then, I hope, my sympathy with the Irish people, and with their just claims, or the sincerity of my feelings, when I say that my position at this moment is one of the deepest sorrow to me. But, painful as it is, I have a solemn duty before me; and, after the fullest consideration of the circumstances, I have no doubt what that duty is—namely, to support the cause of law and order. Not only is that the first duty of a Government, but it is, in my judgment, the best, the surest, and the necessary means for insuring a careful consideration, and the removal of Irish grievances. The House has been treated to a very facetious speech by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere); but he has been more facetious than fair, more humorous than consistent. The hon. Member said he was a Radical, and at the same time a Conservative, because he was here as a Conservative to support the most ancient and most cherished property of a Briton; whilst, on the other hand, as a Radical, he testified his value for that property by protesting against the Motion before the House. But the hon. Gentleman followed up that statement by another. He said if the question before the House were one of throwing out the Government or not, if upon the issue depended the existence of Her Majesty's Government, he would give up those cherished convictions of his, give up what he holds to be the cause of liberty itself, and surrender all, everything, in order to keep Her Majesty's Government in power. What consistency is there in that position? Two such discordant sounds cannot be made to harmonize. It is very easy for an hon. Member to come here and ventilate a principle of theoretical politics, which nobody denies or doubts; but that is no solution of a practical difficulty, not the way to deal practically with a practical and pressing evil. No man on this side of the House, and no hon. Member on the Opposition Benches, I believe, but must contemplate the proposal before the House with regret and pain. I give credit to hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side for cherishing personal liberty as much as we do on this side. We can all imagine the possible dangers which beset society when deprived of those safeguards which the Constitution and our Statute Law have given us. But I have to choose between two policies. I have to choose between an irresponsible authority that subverts the liberty we cherish, and the responsible Government which is amenable to the law as well as to the public opinion of the country. I have, on the one side, a body of persons who, combining together for the accomplishment of a great and noble object, pursue a course which supersedes and defies the law, which deprives society of its legal safeguards, and subjects it to their irresponsible will. I have, on the one side, the League which issues its mandates, and under whose influence, whether intentional or not, loyal and law-abiding subjects have had their rights invaded and trampled down; and, on the other, the responsible, Constitutional Government of the country, charged with the duty of protecting and maintaining those rights. I have, I say, to choose between these two powers; and I do not hesitate to say that I would rather trust myself to the legally constituted authority of Her Majesty's Government, who are answerable not only to the law which they have to uphold, but to public opinion as well, and who can be called to account for every act they do—a Government, moreover, composed of men whose character has been tested by long years of public service. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) referred to some of the cases in the Returns. Those cases show inaccuracies and errors, no doubt; but three or four such instances do not affect the enormous mass reported, against which the hon. Gentleman has not a word to say. I cannot admit, either, the position taken up by some hon. Gentlemen from Ireland. Indeed, it is too great a demand upon our credulity, when they affirm, and ask us to believe, that the outrages and lawless acts in the Returns are either exaggerations, or inventions of the police, or concoctions of the magistracy. Making allowance for exceptional cases of class prejudice, I cannot believe that the magistrates of Ireland are so obtuse or so base as not to investigate honestly the cases that come before them, and that they would wilfully, deliberately, and wickedly suggest and report cases of wrong done for which there was no foundation. Yet this is what we are asked to believe, both of the magistracy and of the police. But it is not, after all, so much the cases of outrage taken by themselves upon which I rely, or even on the Charges of the Irish Judges, as the fact of the enormous influence which the Land League has exercised, and the consequences arising from the manner in which it has exercised that influence. That Association, in its inception, was perfectly lawful. It might have exerted a beneficent influence. It might have enlightened public opinion in England, which required to be enlightened. It would have enormously strengthened the hands of the Government by so doing. Consider of whom the Government is composed. First, there is the Prime Minister, a statesman who has shown more courage as well as capacity in dealing with Irish questions than any other statesman who has preceded him. He is seconded by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; and we know his high sense of justice and what his feelings have always been towards Ireland. We have the Chief Secretary for Ireland, whose sterling character and ability we all know. These right hon. Gentlemen, and others whom I could name, out of the Cabinet as well as in it, are known friends of Ireland and friends of freedom. A Government so composed ought to have had a chance; but no such chance has been given it. They were no sooner called to power than the Land League was set in motion, and, instead of helping and strengthening the Government, it did everything, whether intentionally or not I do not pretend to say, but it did everything calculated to embarrass them, and it succeeded at last in making government in Ireland, by the ordinary course of law, impossible. Had the League taken a different course, had they acted with wisdom and moderation, they would have rendered inestimable service to Ireland. As it is, they have brought Ireland to a condition for which they are answerable, and they have no right to complain if recourse is now had to the only means for restoring the authority of the law, which their own action has set aside. Their whole system, either by themselves, their emissaries, or their branches, has been one of coercion. They have no right, then, to complain of coercion. But what the Government proposes is not coercion. It is protection for the law-abiding citizen against the coercion and tyranny of those who defy and supersede the law, and who have established a system of terrorism which no Government worthy of the name could tolerate. Why was not the murder of Lord Mountmorres denounced at the time by the League? Why was not the murder of poor young Boyd also? The League should have lost no time in condemning these foul deeds, and have warned the people against such acts or any breaches of the law. But what took place? Some of the leaders in their speeches, it is true, made allusion to these murders; but their allusions were worse than if they had kept silence. They told the people that it was unnecessary for them to shoot landlords, because they had the League to vindicate their rights—that, in short, it was inexpedient to commit murder. That was the sum of their denunciations; not a word of reprobation for the moral crime. Had these leaders denounced the murders, as they ought to have done, there would have been no outrages; all England and Scotland, every Liberal in both countries would have been with them, and they would have been a tower of strength to their country. But they were silent, or they spoke, as they should not have spoken, in a way that did not tend to discourage men from acts of violence. At a late period—indeed, a few weeks ago—after matters had come to such a pass that the Government could forbear no longer, we heard some feeble denunciation of what had taken place. I read a manifesto issued by the League, proclaiming the impropriety of the course taken with regard to murder and breaches of the law. The hon. Member for Northampton, perhaps, will take the evidence of this manifesto as proving that there were outrages. If there were none, or none of a serious kind, they would not have been referred to in the manifesto. Pick holes in the Returns as you please; but let hon. Gentlemen answer me this question, What is the origin of the term "Boycotting?" Is it true, or is it not, that Captain Boycott could not get a labourer to take in his harvest, because no one dared serve him save at the peril of his life? That he had to get labourers from a distant country under a military escort? Is that true, or is it not? Take the case of Mr. Bence Jones, a gentleman who invested capital and spent it well in the country. It has been attempted to get up an outcry against him, as I have heard insinuations against poor Lord Mountmorres to neutralize the detestation felt for the deed and the sympathy for his family. Take the case of Mr. Bence Jones's cattle. Is it true or not that his cattle were followed to Dublin, and that a Steamship Company dared not take them on board in order to carry them to Liverpool? If these are facts, what do they show? I put them in place of all the Returns, and far above them, as proving an organized system of terrorism and coercion, under which the commonest rights of the subject were wrested from him with impunity, because the helpless victim of an irresponsible tyranny. Such a condition of things no real friend of Ireland would wish to see prolonged one hour beyond what could be avoided. I know that hon. Gentlemen who are members of the League are patriots; but I regret that they did not take the course followed by Mr. O'Connell. He denounced every man who committed a crime as a traitor to his country and his cause; but Mr. O'Connell was a great man. I say these things with the deepest regret, for some of the hon. Gentlemen who have taken the course they have done are Gentlemen whom I have respected, and with whom I have acted on Irish questions in this House. But can any man seriously suppose that trust can be put in the denials of these outrages, and in the attempt to explain them away? Making due allowance for exaggeration and inaccurate Returns, it is impossible that any man of sense could have read of what has been been going on in Ireland for the last six months without seeing that the law there is, to a great extent, insufficient and inoperative. The hon. Member for Northampton made something like a joke of the argument that this Bill was introduced because, among other things, it was impossible to procure convictions. I agree with him that it is not the duty of the Executive to see that convictions take place in the Courts of Law; but it is the duty of the Executive to see that justice is administered, and if the ordinary law fails to meet the demands of justice it should amend or add to that law even by a measure of special or exceptional stringency. Trades unions were referred to as an analogous case; but when some of the members of these unions were led into excesses, what did we do? We passed the Criminal Law Amendment Act to meet the case, and that put an end to the excesses. Nothing more was necessary, because men, knowing that they had the protection of the law, were not afraid to come forward as witnesses, and juries were not afraid to convict. Can hon. Members from Ireland lay their hands on their hearts and say that this is the case in Ireland? I do not charge the Irish people with being addicted to crime, and I agree with the hon. Member for Northampton in the eulogium he passed upon them; but there have been agrarian outrages, cruel assassinations, maiming of cattle, barbarous acts against landlords and tenants, and not a man has come forward, or dared to come forward, in order to bring the offenders to justice. I have here a Return of last year's crime, and I find that of 2,590 agrarian offences, only 83 were brought to justice. What do these figures show? Strike off some hundreds if you like; but you have remaining an enormous bulk, and out of the whole number only 83 are brought to justice. Is a man to be murdered, and, although the murderer is known, no man dare come forward against him? Is a man to have his house broken into, and be beaten with sticks, and have his furniture smashed to pieces, his hay scattered over the fields, or burnt, and his cattle maimed, while such is the state of terror in those parts that there is not a person who could, with safety to himself, come forward and give evidence? The hon. Member for Northampton spoke very lightly of what, using the Prime Minister's phrase, he termed "exclusive dealing." You may call it by what name you please; but to refuse to deal with a man, to refuse to supply him with the necessaries of life, to refuse to serve him, or allow others to do so, to shun him even in the Temple of Worship, to refuse to sit beside him, and to treat him as a "leper," is a condition of things utterly intolerable, and, to my mind, one of the very worst forms of human wickedness. It is asked, how will a Coercion Bill meet such evils as these? The Coercion Bill will make men feel that they can go to bed without having loaded revolvers or pistols beside them, and without the fear that their house will be broken into by an armed band. The people addicted to these practices will know that they must give them up, or leave the country. People will know that there is redress at law for injury done. Witnesses will not be afraid to come forward, nor juries to convict. A labourer or a tradesman will know that he may serve whom he pleases, and that no one will be able to prevent him. Terror will cease, and men will be able to pursue their lawful avocations in peace. The wrong-doer only will be in dread. He will dread to incur the risk of breaking the law. The hon. Member for Northampton referred to the present land tenure in Ireland. We have, somehow, not been successful in dealing with this question. For upwards of 40 years there have been attempts to deal with it. It has always been my opinion that the introduction of the English system of land tenure into Ireland was a mistake. It was opposed to the social habits and traditions of the people; and those who possess the land have not succeeded in reconciling them to it. I go to the whole extent with the hon. Member for Northampton on this subject. In the matter of the land, I think it is a question entirely for the Irish people to determine for themselves, as I think it is in all matters relating to purely Irish local affairs. In Irish affairs I have always acted and voted upon this principle, and in accordance with the opinions of the Irish Members. My hon. Friend says if the issue of the debate turned upon the displacement of the Ministry he would not take the part he has done; he would vote for the Ministry, however much he disapproved the measure; but I say that, bad as I believe the state of things to be in Ireland, much as I believe some measure of the kind proposed to be necessary, I would not support it but for the confidence I have in the assurances of the Government that it is their intention to bring in a Land Bill which will deal thoroughly and conclusively with the Land Question. I do not believe in coercive measures simply; I do not believe in coercion as a remedy for a great grievance; and if the Government had not given the assurances they have done, that it is their intention, at the earliest moment possible, to bring in a great, comprehensive, remedial measure, I would not be here to support them. It is upon that condition that I give my support to their policy. I believe the Government have made out a case. I think that the knowledge we have from the ordinary sources of information, both public and private, apart from the assurance of the Government, is enough to satisfy every reasonable man that the state of things in Ireland is intolerable. Hon. Gentlemen say—"Look, within the last few days there has been a great change. During the first 14 days of January there were 287 agrarian outrages; since that time there have been only a few." And they point to that as a reason why this measure should not pass. I consider that to be a reason why it should pass; because, if the bare idea that Government has determined to put a stop to lawlessness has been sufficient to lessen it, not to proceed would be to show weakness, and restore and give a fresh impetus to disorder. It is said that since this proposal has been before Parliament the League has issued its mandate, and outrages have ceased, or have lessened. If that be true, I ask, why did they not issue their mandate before? Why is their mandate powerful now, and why was it powerless a few months or weeks ago? I make all allowance for enthusiasm and for the exasperation of men witnessing, or suffering under, great wrongs; but it is the duty of the leaders of a great movement to tone down those feelings and keep a check upon the use of intemperate language and upon the excitement of their followers. They should remember the people they are dealing with. The Irish are a suffering race. The condition of the West of Ireland is truly appalling. It makes one shudder to think that under any civilized Government there should be such misery, such poverty, such utter helplessness. The poor people in those parts bear their troubles with a marvellous patience; but they are, on that account, difficult and inflammable material to deal with. Their condition makes them so. They would not be human if they were otherwise. Their leaders ought, therefore, to have been careful not to stir up hostile feelings and excite bad passions among them. It is impossible that the Government of England can allow the laws any longer to be set at defiance, or permit a state of things to continue, under which the Queen's Writ cannot run, and a process-server cannot perform his duty. The hon. Member speaks of liberty. Liberty does not belong to one section of a community only, it is the birthright of all. It cannot exist without law, there can be no freedom without order; and when the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Labouchere) invokes the sacred name of "liberty," he should remember that it is the first condition as it is the greatest treasure of civilized society. It is our duty to cherish it, and not suffer it to be trampled under foot by any section of the people. For these reasons, but with the deepest regret—and hon. Gentlemen opposite will believe me when they know what I have done on Irish questions, as I shall be prepared to do again—I feel bound to support Her Majesty's Government. I shall support them because I have confidence in them; and, if we have confidence in the Government, we must trust them. In the present crisis it is of the utmost importance that we should do so. The Government should be strengthened by the support of the whole Liberal Party, because this support is absolutely necessary if we expect them to carry hereafter effective remedial measures for Ireland. Let our ranks be broken, allow the Government to rest in any appreciable degree upon the support of the Opposition, however sincere that support might be with regard to the measure now before the House, and we shall weaken their hands with regard to the remedial measures which they have promised. We shall place them at a disadvantage from which no efforts of the Liberal Party will be able to relieve them. Let us show ourselves now a united Party, and the Government will be, hereafter, in the hands of their own natural supporters. They will then be able to produce a Land Bill for Ireland which no landlord interest or Party combinations will be able to resist; and a true remedy, let us hope, will then have been found for the grievances of that hitherto unfortunate country.

THE O'DONOGHUE had heard the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) with great pleasure, and he felt sure it would be received with satisfaction by a larger circle outside the constituency of Northampton when public opinion in England and Scotland came to be enlightened upon this subject. That was the first time he had known the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) taking a course hostile to the interests of Ireland. He denied that the Land League were responsible for the outrages. From the very first they had discouraged them. The hon. and learned Member had reminded them of O'Connell's saying that the man who committed a crime gave assistance to the enemy. He did not know how many public meetings he had attended in Ireland, and he had heard that statement made so often that he felt inclined to say the people had not the smallest intention to commit any crime whatever. The hon. and learned Member challenged them to defend "Boycotting," and he rested the case entirely on the case of Captain Boycott, who had the credit of introducing a new word into the English language. Captain Boycott was an agent whose conduct made him extremely unpopular. The people "Boycotted" him—in other words, they refused to take his money in exchange for their labour. That was a course they were perfectly justified in taking, and when he saw them take it he rejoiced at it. The hon. Member for Northampton alluded to the position of Irish Members in that House. They could not but feel that it was exceptional, peculiar, and painful. Ireland was the only country in the world with representative institutions whose Representatives were utterly powerless. The result was a state of things unparalleled, and which could not be paralleled in any country enjoying a popular form of government—the majority of the Irish Members in favour of one policy, the Executive Government determined to carry out another by resorting to brute force. The right hon. Gentleman, with a high hand and in utter contempt for the franchise of the Irish people, overruled their Representatives, and showed that he was more influenced by the word of one English Member than by the appeals of 20 or 30 Irish Members. How did they sustain their statement that coercion was unnecessary? By reference to the Paper of the Government itself. According to that document there were in 1880, 8 murders, 7 assaults on the police, 17 cases of overholding of an agrarian character, some 13,000 or 14,000 threatening letters entrusted to the Postmaster General for delivery, 215 cases of injury to property—which might include anything from the blowing up of a house to the wrenching off of a knocker—101 cases of cutting, wounding, or maiming cattle, and 67 cases of firing into houses. The spokesmen of the Government had done their best to make the list look as formidable as possible, and, as presented at first, it was calculated to produce a most erroneous impression on the minds of ordinary readers. A description was given to the House of what was near being a tragic event. A father and daughter were sitting in their drawing-room after dark, when suddenly a bullet crashed through the glass and the window-shutters and lodged in the opposite wall. That was how the story was varnished up for the House of Commons and the gullible British public by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I never referred to it, good, bad, or indifferent.

THE O'DONOGHUE: I have the most distinct recollection that the hon. and learned Gentleman did.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I have no recollection of having referred to it, but I shall refer to it.

THE O'DONOGHUE said, he would, of course, accept the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman. The House had been reminded that night that that outrage had been denied by the police, and the police were straining their eyes into every case which might appear to have the quality of outrage. These men were stimulated by self-interest. They knew that every man who had no eyes for incendiary fires or no ears for seditious words would be likely to end his career as he had begun it, in the capacity of full private. But, looking at the Paper of outrages, would anyone who called himself a Liberal say that it furnished the Government with a justification for depriving the Irish people of their liberties, and placing their persons at the mercy of the police and a partizan magistracy? Suspending the Constitution would not help them to procure evidence unless they used the power of arrest as a means of torture, nor could they coerce the decision of juries, as they seemed anxious to do. In the two last cases of the suspension of the Constitution, the Government had the excuse that there were then in Ireland persons who had come from America for an unlawful purpose, and it was said that the suspension of the Constitution would, if did not compel the departure of these men, enable them to be seized. There was no excuse of that kind now, so that all they would be able to accomplish by their interference with the public liberty would be to render impracticable the carrying on of a lawful and Constitutional agitation. It was unjust in the highest degree for any English Government to hamper or prevent Constitutional agitation; and for a Liberal Government to do so was a violation of the Liberal creed, and perfectly inconsistent with the professions of those who were the backbone of the present Ministry. In a very interesting work by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, called *Young Ireland*, he found in a note a passage which, as it would apply to the present state of things, he would read.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

The O'DONOGHUE proceeded to quote a passage from *Young Ireland* with reference to the Repeal agitation in 1843, to the effect that in England critics were agreed that the distress, however serious, could not be helped by agitation, and that, on the contrary, the first step towards improvement was to be taken by renouncing agitation once for all. The wisdom of this counsel was subsequently tested when commercial depression fell upon England, and the manufacturers of the North formed the Anti-Corn Law League. In a country where there were a thousand wrongs, no redress was to be obtained except after agitation. Like the milkman who went on watering his milk till his customers cried out, the Government continued to blunder till the people rose against them. That was Sir Charles Gavan Duffy's view of the situation in Ireland in 1843. Now, the present Government were unquestionably the political heirs of Mr. Cobden, whose most trusted Colleague was now a Cabinet Minister, and it was certain that they derived considerable strength from that fact. The Government and the country could hardly have forgotten the energy with which Mr. Cobden propagated his principles by means of great meetings and unceasing denunciations of those whom he deemed responsible for the evils he combated. And yet, in their method of procedure, the Anti-Corn Law League and the Land League were identical. Mr. Cobden and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) held up the landlords of England to the odium of their countrymen; and, in like manner, the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) charged the Irish landlords with making and maintaining laws that enriched themselves and impoverished the people. In a speech delivered in London, in 1843, Mr. Cobden pointed out that the landlords of Great Britain were largely responsible for the existing distress, and argued that when prices were low the tenant farmers had to stint themselves to pay their rent, while, when prices were high, the operatives had to spend too great a proportion of their wages on necessary food. No one could suppose that such a state of things was natural; but all would inevitably conclude that the laws of wicked men had been substituted for the wisdom of God. During bad seasons the landlords

> "Revelled in a bloated and diseased prosperity, and when the people were suffering raised their rents from the capital of the trading community or the farmers. Shame upon the landlords and their order unless they rescued themselves from that degrading dilemma!"

Again, he might quote from speeches delivered by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to much the same effect. Speaking in London, in 1845, the right hon. Gentleman, whom he was glad to see again in his place, plainly fixed the responsibility of distress on the proprietors of the land, and used the following words:—

> "Although the great and powerful may not regret those who suffer mutely and die in silence, the recording angel will write down their patient endurance and the heavy guilt of those by whom they have been sacrificed."

In another passage, the right hon. Gentleman, after reminding his hearers that their forefathers had refused to be the bondsmen of Charles I., asked whether they themselves were content to be the bondsmen of the landed aristocracy. He could quote also from the speeches of the lesser stars of the Anti-Corn Law League, whose language was more rugged, more suggestive, and more unmistakeable. He had done enough, however, for his purpose to show that during the Anti-Corn Law League movement there was great excitement in the country; great meetings were held throughout the country; violent speeches were made; but there were no State prosecutions, no unjust arrests of innocent men, and no proposal to put the liberties and the lives of the English people at the mercy of an exasperated magistracy. Groundless charges were brought against the leaders of the Anti-Corn Law League; and similar charges, founded in malevolence, were made against the leaders of the Land League. So high did the feeling run during the Corn Law movement, that Sir Robert Peel, in that House, charged Mr. Cobden with holding him up to assassination. The hon. Member for the City of Cork, then, must not be surprised that he was the object of misrepresentation and false accusations. But, after all that was said and done, the cause of the Anti-Corn Law League triumphed, and the policy of Mr. Cobden had superseded the ancient and disastrous *régime* of landlordism. It was true that occasionally the Tory Party had got the direction of public affairs; but that had been owing to accident, arising from the attempts made by the Liberal Party to accommodate itself to the nominal Liberalism of Whiggery. Nevertheless, upon the strong places of the Constitution the people had got that hold which would never be relaxed, and which would soon result in complete possession. The Land Leaguers, too, hoped that their time of triumph would come. Meantime, they protested against their Constitutional agitation being suppressed by any Government, and especially by a Government professing the principles, and certainly enjoying the fruits, of the Cobden agitation. They might be told remedial measures were in store. That was no answer. They could not tell what they were. They might be inadequate; if they were inadequate, that Bill would prevent them agitating against their inadequacy. But, come what might, those who represented the Irish people would use every means at their command, public and private, to rescue Ireland from the hands of the landlords; and in the conflict which might await them they would look with confidence for the support they had a right to expect from the people of England and Scotland. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, as spokesman for the Government and the landlords, had displayed a bitterness which he had never seen equalled by anyone occupying his position. His tone and language had given a personal character to the whole of the proceedings. It was perfectly understood how that came about. A few isolated landlords, the perpetrators of legalized robbery, had, under the pretence of requiring protection, been running up to Dublin and pouring their foul calumnies into the Chief Secretary's ears. The Irish Members treated the words of the Chief Secretary as valueless, because they knew the sources of his information. Of his own knowledge the right hon. Gentleman knew nothing about Ireland. His statement that the Land League held the people in a state of terror, was utterly opposed to the fact. The Land League was in profound sympathy with all the people, save the landlords and the wretched blackguards who had been employed to deprive the people of their liberties. The result, however, would be that the Coercion Bill would become law, and, owing to the half-hearted policy of the Government, there would be no chance of carrying a good measure of Land Reform through the other House, where the territorial element was predominant. Nevertheless, the Irish people would struggle on. The action of the Government—the introduction of the Coercion Bills—so far from depressing their spirits, had raised them. They relied on the justice of their cause. They had the great Irish people at their back. There was nothing wanting to the national strength—nothing wanting to complete the national array, and they looked for sympathy to the lovers of freedom throughout the world.

Colonel COLTHURST said, he deplored the position in which a large section of the Irish tenants had been left by the failure of the Disturbance Bill last Session. There were many things in the action of the Land League which he disapproved, and he had little confidence in the leaders of the League. Mixed up with the evil which the Land League had done was at least thus much good—that it had kept those people in their farms. No doubt, many evictions were suspended either by the tenants being re-instated as caretakers or by the decrees not having been enforced. No doubt, many had retained their homes by the kindness of the landlords; but in most instances that result was obtained by the state of public opinion. But it might happen that the present state of feeling in Ireland would die out, and then those tenants would be liable again to be evicted from their holdings. If, however, the Government had given indications of what their Land Bill was to be, the excitement would have subsided. The House ought to consider the position of the tenants whom the Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year was designed to benefit. The Government, and every Member who voted for that measure, were bound to see whether some means could not be devised, and some provision added to the proposed Land Bill, whereby those tenants would, at any rate, be placed on as good a footing as they would have held if the Compensation for Disturbance Bill had become law. He had seen an extract from the resolutions arrived at by the Catholic Hierarchy at Maynooth. They expressed confidence in the present Government, but expressed a fear less the passage of a Coercion Bill should make it more difficult for the Government to pass a satisfactory Land Bill, if not in that House, at least in "another place." He thought that statement well worthy of the consideration of the Government.

Sir HENRY TYLER intended to vote in support of the measure introduced by the Chief Secretary. His chief reason for taking this course was that the state of Ireland was intolerable. Irishmen might well exclaim—

"Alas! poor country,
Almost afraid to know itself! It cannot
Be call'd our mother, but our grave."

The statistics of crime, so often referred to, gave, in reality, no adequate impression of the state of the country. It was not the number of outrages committed that had to be considered, but the amount of terror that had, by means of them, spread over a great proportion of the country. There was a tornado of terrorism exercised by the Land League over the people, which made honest men afraid to do their duty, or even to pay their just debts. They had heard too much about coercion in connection with the Government measures. Protection was the better term to apply to the steps contemplated by the Ministers—protection from the coercion of the Land League. As long as so mischievous an organization as that ruled the country there could be no repose, security, or comfort for the great majority of the people, and he hoped that the Bill which the Government was now introducing, though they had been somewhat late in bringing it forward, would alleviate the evils from which Ireland was suffering. They had reached a crisis in the history of Ireland when it behoved the right hon. Gentlemen composing the Ministry to act like statesmen. The only fault he had to find with the otherwise manly speech made by the Chief Secretary in introducing the Bill was that portion in which he said he was sorry he had ever entered Parliament, because he was now placed in so responsible and difficult a position in regard to Ireland. That was not, to his mind, the kind of language for a great statesman to use. Let the Government act with a firm hand, and they would have nothing to regret or to fear. What was wanted to restore tranquillity to Ireland was good and kind government, with firmness and justice; whilst resident landlords, enterprize, improved agriculture, and revived manufactures would tend to make it rich and prosperous. But the existence of the Land League rendered all such things impossible in the country, and that would be so as long as it exercised its present power over the people. The whole history of Ireland had been one of constant revolution and disturbance, caused by an attempt to govern it in a way not fitted to the people of the country. No people were so easily governed as the Irish, if they were only governed in a proper way and under a suitable Constitution; and there was no country so difficult to govern as Ireland, when it was in the hands of an organization whose object was to stir up strife and to incite the people to rebel against law and order. Believing that the Bill of the Government would do something towards restoring peace and security to that country, he would give it his cordial support.

MR. BYRNE rose to support the Amendment, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. BYRNE went on to observe that, admitting for the sake of argument that Ireland was in a bad state, a good and efficient remedy should be promptly applied to that state of things. But he indignantly protested against coercion as a remedy. A good Land Bill, and not coercion, was the proper remedy to be applied to Ireland. It would be a wise and statesmanlike course to bring in remedial measures at once, before any attempt was made to coerce the country. The state of Ireland was to be attributed to bad legislation in the past. The case made out by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was incomplete and unconvincing. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman, which was delivered with so much bitterness and with such bad taste, was founded upon mere official figures. The number of offences that had been committed in Ireland during the past year was fully accounted for by a series of bad harvests, and he was afraid that things would be little better during the remainder of the winter. The existence of the Land League showed that the people of Ireland were determined to protect themselves. The passing of this Coercive Bill would irritate the people, and make them despair of obtaining justice from England, and would compel them to take the law into their own hands. He should feel himself perfectly safe under this Coercion Bill if its administration were in the hands of the Chief Secretary or of the Lord Lieutenant; but the fact was, that it was the minions and understrappers of the Government who would really exercise these extraordinary powers. Even at this moment they were threatening the people of Ireland what they would do to them when this Bill became law. The fact that the Bill was proposed to be retrospective was a proof of the wickedness of those who introduced it. He thought all the lessons of history showed that a coercive policy must inevitably lead to recklessness and disorder, in which people who were coerced would stand up to protect what they deemed to be their rights. In former days it had not infrequently happened that physical protests against coercion had proved successful; and he therefore urged upon Her Majesty's Government to try remedial measures before proposing to resort to coercion, in order, if possible, to restore in the minds of the Irish people a feeling of confidence that the British Parliament had an earnest desire to redress their wrongs. The Party to which he belonged had been called agitators and obstructives; but he would remind right hon. Gentlemen opposite that they had themselves agitated to obtain Office, and it was by virtue of agitation they now occupied places on the Treasury Bench. The Members of the Opposition were agitating to regain Office; and even the Members of the Fourth Party were agitating for Office, and hoped some day to get it. The Irish Members were actuated solely by the desire to benefit their country. They were not agitating for Office, which they did not desire, and they dare not accept the humblest appointment from the British Government. A large body of the Irish electors had assisted the present Government to accede to power, in the belief that their wrongs would be remedied; but in this hope they had been grievously disappointed, and the effect was to be seen in the fact that at every by-election, since the General Election, neither the Government nor the Conservative Party had dared to run a candidate in opposition to the nominee of the Land League Party. The hon Member was proceeding to condemn the ventilation of the House, and to explain how he had been taken ill, and wanted to go abroad for his health, and how his constituents requested his attendance at meetings throughout his county during the Recess, when——

MR. SPEAKER said, the remarks of the hon. Member had nothing to do with the Question before the House. He must ask him to confine his speech to the subject of debate.

Mr. BYRNE explained that he was only illustrating what coercion was. Again he called upon the Government to be wise in time, to bring in a remedial measure before it was too late, and to leave coercion to stand by until the occasion required it. This he said, that whether the Land Bill happened to be a good Bill or a bad Bill, the Irish people, having shaken hands over the religious question, were united; they were more, they were actuated by motives which would lead them to help themselves, and they all knew the old motto, that people who helped themselves received assistance from above. If the Bill were not a good one, he would suggest to the people of Ireland to form a Land Company, as had been done in Birmingham for political purposes; to buy land wholesale and sell it retail, thus securing the freehold for large numbers of persons. That would be a perfectly legal combination, and only the landlords would lose by it.

Mr. SPEAKER said, he must again call upon the hon. Member to speak to the Question before the House.

Mr. BYRNE said, he could only add in conclusion that, on behalf of the people of Wexford, he protested against coercion being applied to Ireland.

Mr. WILLIAMSON said, he desired to give some of the reasons which compelled him to support the Government Bill. It was with no pleasure, but, on the contrary, with the greatest reluctance, that he would give his vote for so exceptional a measure. But if only one-half of the case presented to the consideration of the House by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland were well-founded, it would more than justify the course that right hon. Gentleman intended to take; and they would have good reasons for adopting exceptional legislation to put an end to the reign of terror in Ireland, to the outrages which had been so lamentably frequent, and to destroy the malignant power of the unwritten code of the Land League. All the efforts that had been put forth to minimize the prevailing evils had utterly failed. The Irish Members had met the facts of the right hon. Gentleman with empty declamation, but with no reasoning or substantial effort to disprove them; and he had, in fact, heard no refutation of the charges set forth in the indictment of the Government. Even the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) conveyed to his (Mr. Williamson's) mind the impression that he did not give the House absolute truth, but only truth cramped and qualified in eloquent harangue. The hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), in his speech on Tuesday evening, dealt in threats and in assumptions regarding his own vast influence in Ireland, but did not adduce one single solid argument against the necessity for this protective legislation. He spoke, indeed, apologetically for the peasant who committed the crime of maiming poor dumb animals, and suggested that diabolical crime in Ireland ought to be judged by a different canon from that prevailing in other Christian lands; and he (Mr. Williamson) was astonished to hear re-echoed sentiments akin to those once expressed in that House, not vehemently condemning, but only expressing a preference for the maiming of cattle to the shooting of landlords. When such apologies for crime were uttered in that House, what could they expect from the poor peasantry over whose minds hon. Members wielded, as they boasted, so vast an influence? The hon. Member for Tipperary threatened the House with the enmity of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and in the same breath threatened that priesthood unless they yielded unswerving allegiance to the behests of the Land League. Happily, there were priests and priests. Some of them were agitators; others were law-abiding, like many of their flocks. But the hon. Member told them that they would look in the direction of Washington if these measures were carried into effect. If the hon. Member, in making that statement, meant it to be believed that the American people had any love for the Irish nation—especially for Irish demagogues—he was seeking to impose on the credulity of the House. It was true that there was an Irish-American population in the United States, which undoubtedly sympathized to a certain extent with Irish agitators; but that section was intensely disliked and distrusted in America, and the appeal to Washington was as ridiculous as it was puerile. Although he should have liked to have before him the outlines of the projected remedial measures — those which were to deal with the Land Question—there was this argument in favour of first dealing with the measures for the protection of life and property—namely, that the Government could not be charged with having been influenced by the reign of terror in Ireland to prepare remedial measures of a sweeping character with reference to the occupancy of the soil. Yet, as he was not aware of the character of the projected Land Law Reforms, he must discharge his conscience with respect to the measures now under consideration by saying that it was only because he believed the Land Bill would be of a thoroughly liberal and satisfactory character that he could vote for coercive measures taking precedence. Hon. Members representing Home Rule constituencies, he was persuaded, did hon. Members sitting on that side (the Liberal) of the House very great injustice in imputing to them disclination to grapple with this question in a thorough and complete fashion. It was a pure assumption on their part to pose in the attitude of the only true friends of Ireland and the only Irish patriots. His conviction was that among the Home Rule agitators were to be found at this moment the very worst enemies of Ireland. Their aim seemed to be to thwart and prevent all useful legislation in this country, and he took this as an indication that they were pursuing ulterior ends, such as the separation of Ireland from this Kingdom under the cloak—[*Cries of* "Order!"]—of the Land League agitation.

MR. M'COAN: I rise to Order, Sir. It would be interesting to young Members, who have not yet had much experience in debate, to know if it is permissible to read speeches? I shall be glad to have a ruling on that point.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Allow me to say I am not reading—["Order, order!"]—

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must confine himself to the Motion before the House, which is a Bill dealing with the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland; and a speech cannot properly be read.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he was endeavouring to explain the reasons on which he entirely assented to the introduction of such measures, and he endeavoured at the same time to add that he did so with the greatest reluctance, and only in the expectation and hope that a very ample remedial measure of Land Reform would be introduced. He also took the opportunity of telling hon. Members on the opposite side (the Home Rulers) that they had done a very great injustice to other hon. Members in saying that they were the only well-wishers of Ireland and the only true patriots. He did not think he had gone beyond that point, and he hoped they would allow him to deal with the question as well as he possibly could. Let not Irish Members conclude that he was in favour of a tinkering land measure. Nothing but a sweeping measure was adequate to the emergency. Nothing would suit the urgency of the case—but (1) security of tenure; (2) fair rents; (3) absolute property in improvements and right of sale; (4) adequate measures for the creation of a peasant proprietary; and (5) the reclamation of waste lands. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now discussing the Land Bill, which is not now before the House.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, that if he was out of Order to touch on this question, he should submit to the ruling of Mr. Speaker; but he wished to discharge his conscience on this matter. He hoped the Government would introduce a sweeping measure of Land Reform, and it was only on that condition that he could support the coercive measures now introduced. It was his intention to support the Government in the course they now proposed to take.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he believed that every point of the Chief Secretary's speech admitted of refutation. The right hon. Gentleman had been guilty of unintentional unfairness to himself personally in referring to the speech he made at the Castle Island meeting. The Government knew what he did say, for the Government Reporters were present, and he took pains to secure their accommodation. The impression produced by the reference to that speech was, that he was, to a certain extent, responsible for the alleged increase of crime. Instead of that, he made every appeal he could to the people to abstain from illegal action. He implored them to abstain from everything which could bring them into collision with the authorities; and knowing that there had been some recent cruelties in the neighbourhood, and having heard, on what he believed to be good authority, that a man's life was in danger, he went so far as to name that man, and to urge everyone not to shoot him, and not to injure him, and not to injure anything belonging to him; and he had reason to believe that this appeal saved that man's life. He also urged the people to abstain from attempting to injure any landlords, and to confine their action to what was legal and Constitutional. The Chief Secretary argued that crime was greater now, with a population of 5,000,000, than it was in 1844, with a population of 8,000,000; but he ignored the figures for 1845, 1846, and 1847, when crime was higher than in 1844, while he produced the impression that in 1844 it was exceptionally high. The outrages numbered 8,000 in 1845, 12,000 in 1846, and 20,986 in 1847, compared with 5,600 in 1880. The right hon. Gentleman did not show the real significance of the Returns for Ireland by comparing them with those for other countries. The latest complete Judicial Statistics were those for 1879. In Ireland there were 22 murders, compared with 71 in England; for these offences 51 persons were apprehended in Ireland, compared with 30 in England; and 21 were committed for trial, compared with 26 in England. The total number of indictable offences in Ireland was 8,089—including 650 threatening letters — and the number of persons apprehended was 5,138, compared with 52,447 offences and 23,658 apprehensions in England; so that in Ireland the offences were fewer in proportion to the population, and the apprehensions bore a higher proportion to the number of offences, than in England. The offences committed in Ireland, agrarian and non-agrarian, were moderate in number compared with those in England and Scotland. Yet coercive legislation was not proposed to be applied to those parts of the United Kingdom. Passing from the more heinous to minor offences, the cases of cruelty to animals which had been referred to were in Ireland 1,465, while in England, for an equal population, there were 2,065. The cases of firing into dwellings, shooting at and doing bodily harm, were in 1879, 181, while in England they amounted to 1,754. The burglaries and cases of housebreaking in Ireland were 209, while in England they amounted to 2,930. The cases of arson and wilful burning in Ireland in 1879 were 257, while in England they numbered 1,180. In Queen's County, in 10 months there were only 5 cases; three of those being the sending of threatening letters, while in Durham, in 1879, there were 6; in Hereford, 5; in Lincoln, 6; in Huntingdon, 7; in Bucks, 7; in Devon, 10; in Hampshire, 11; and in Shropshire, 23. The Returns of the right hon. Gentleman would not bear investigation. During the last 50 years there had been no fewer than 48 Coercion Acts, and there was no Minister who had been connected with so many of them as the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. He would figure as the Coercion Premier. They found themselves now in 1881 in precisely the same position as they were in 1830, more than 50 years ago. Then, as now, coercive legislation was proposed for Ireland; the leader of the Irish people was under prosecution; the hastily drawn up indictment was surrendered count by count, and the indictment itself found to be worthless. Then, as now, the occupants of the Front Opposition Benches cordially supported Ministers in their coercive measures, and the Ministers proposing those measures, protesting that they were not to their taste, promised they would be supplemented by remedial measures. Then, as now, coercive measures were carried, but remedial measures were not. The debates of 1830 would furnish useful reading at the present time. Lord Althorp observed that he by no means intended to say that the only policy which Her Majesty's Government were to pursue was to repress agitation by force. Having firmly repressed seditious conduct, they would then show the people of Ireland that there was every disposition to redress their grievances. What became of the fine promises of Ministers? That which would become of the promises of Ministers to introduce remedial measures this year. Conservatives would never allow them to pass remedial measures. When the time came, those men who were now so anxious to gag the Irish people would be the first to use every Form of the House to prevent the progress of the remedial proposals of the Government. Sir Robert Peel, in 1830, said he should be ashamed of himself if he did not cast into utter oblivion all Party and political differences, and expressed a steady determination by all means in his power to support the King's Ministers in all extremities; he would support them in all their proceedings, and should they make any slips he would put the best construction upon their conduct. Sir Robert Peel went on to say he would listen with favour to any proposals of a conciliatory nature coming from the noble Lord; but they must be proposals doing justice to all parties. That was almost identical with the language of the present Leader of the Opposition. But there was one good and honest Liberal in the House in 1830, who, perhaps, had done as much for the English people as any Minister—he meant Mr. Hume. Mr. Hume said he regretted that Ireland had hitherto been governed by force, and he had, in consequence, hailed the accession of the present Ministry, in the hope of their acting on the principle of conciliation; but they had been guilty of acts of which every other Ministry would have been ashamed. Mr. Hume further said he denied that it was in the power of Mr. O'Connell, or any man, to agitate a great country unless that country was filled with discontent from reasonable causes. He (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), when he said the other night that when they began these coercive measures they did not know where they would end. They would get on an incline where they would no longer be able to control their own movements. In 1831 the Government of the day passed a Coercion Bill, and were compelled also to pass another in 1832, and similar measures in each of the two following years; and so the record of Irish legislation went on from year to year, almost without intermission, down to the present time. He might remind them that the Coercion Bill of 1831 was immediately followed by two outbreaks, which completely showed its futility. What guarantee had they that the same thing would not occur again? He seriously feared that his apprehensions might be realized, and that the people might seek channels of action that would lead to the most deplorable consequences. What fact could more strongly condemn British policy in Ireland than the reduction of the population from 8,000,000 in 1844, to 5,000,000 in 1880? That diminution was caused by the fact that the people had been placed at the mercy of the most inhuman and the most unscrupulous men who had ever existed. He believed, indeed, that all the evils of Ireland were traceable to the baneful influence of the privileged landlord class. To that influence, and not to the action or the progress of the Land League, he attributed the increase of crime during the past year. The House would be able to judge for itself of the increased harshness of the landlord, when he stated that in the first quarter of last year there were 1,167 evictions; in the second, 1,355; in the third, 2,158; and in the last—the quarter during which the Land League was fully developed—only 316. The Reports of agrarian crimes showed uniform increase during the whole of the year; but the fact was that the outrages naturally went on increasing for some time after the highest number of evictions had been reached, and did not, therefore, diminish in the last quarter of the year. While he was on the subject of outrages, he wished to mention that the threatening letters that were received in Ireland were certainly not all written in that country. His belief was that the majority of such letters were concocted in London. He knew of one glaring case of that description, and the letter was sent to a lady, whose whole life had been one continual act of charity, and against whom the only imputation that could be made was that she had fed and clothed starving children on the immense estates of Lord Lansdowne. He, himself, had received several such letters that had been posted in London. That very day, before coming to the House, he had received one, for the postage of which he had to pay 2*d.* It began, "Mr. Arthur O'Connor," and the opening sentences were so vile, so foul, and abominable, he would not outrage the decency of the House by reading a single word of them; but it was all pure Saxon. In the second paragraph, the writer went on to say—

> "If Parnell did not support you with the money which he cheated the Yankees out of you would be starving, as Stanley kicked you out of the War Office, where you were a messenger, or something of the kind. You are the lowest of all the low-lived Irish blackguards, and you had better hold your charity-school tongue or I will send a circular regarding you to all the Members. I shall leave the envelope open, so that anyone may see this."

He would, further, observe that in 1831, when the state of Ireland presented a parallel to the present situation, Major Warburton, a resident magistrate in Ireland, and an Englishman, bore testimony that the destitution produced by turning persons out of their land when they had no other means of subsistence was a very great source of crime. Having quoted other authorities in support of his argument, the hon. Member complained that the English Press had worked up the minds of the English people against the people of Ireland and their Representatives. The Chief Secretary to the Lord Lientenant, he alleged, had, the other night, spent an hour in bringing a railing accusation against the Irish nation, and had also manipulated figures so as to cast aspersions upon them. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to suspend the Constitution, and to place the liberties of every man in Ireland at the mercy of any unscrupulous magistrate who might have a grudge against him. On what grounds, he asked, was the Constitution to be suspended in his county (Queen's County), where there had been only two agrarian crimes in 12 months? There was no county in England as free from crime of every description. Every single grievance which had been redressed in Ireland had been redressed after keen, persistent, and determined agitation. When the people of London pulled down Hyde Park railings in their agitation for Reform, no Coercion Act was brought in to repress them. The Government might arm themselves with whatever coercive powers they pleased; the Irish Members were determined to exercise their Constitutional rights as citizens outside of that House, and also to assert their just rights as Members of Parliament.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: Sir, I should like, with the permission of the House, to address a few words to it on this question before the debate comes to a conclusion; and first, I must say, which I am sure every Member of the House will believe, that I am very sorry that after being for 37 years a Member of this House I have not lived to see the time when a recourse to restrictive or coercive measures for Ireland has become absolutely unnecessary. During that long period there have been several measures of this kind—not exactly like this, but having the same general purpose—and I think I may say that there is not one of those measures that I have felt it my duty to support. I think there must have been one at least, or more than one, which I did not oppose; but, generally, my disposition was to give a fair opposition to measures which I could not, under the circumstances, approve of. Now, I am of opinion, looking back over that period, that there was not one of those measures that was not, at the time, necessary. I never for a moment disputed that the Government were necessitated or obliged to bring in some kind of measure of repression under the facts that were stated to the House, and which we all knew to prevail; but I complained that the Government did nothing else but that. There was no admission even of grievances, and there were no promises of any attempted remedy, and, therefore, I felt myself at liberty either to oppose, or not to support, the propositions brought in by the various Governments connected with the evils to which I have referred. Now, hon. Members who sit in that part of the House (the Opposition) will not deny, I think, for a moment, that I have for 30 years past not only admitted the wrongs and grievances of the Irish people, but that I have on many occasions, and on more public occasions probably than any other Englishman connected with public affairs, urged upon the landowners of Ireland, and upon the people of England, remedies which I thought necessary for the grievances of the Irish people. I may, in some confirmation of it, relate a little incident that took place just outside the door of the House of Commons a very short time before the late John Martin, the Member for Meath, finally left this House and died. He met me at the door and he came up to me. I had never spoken to him before in the House, and he said—"I want very much to shake hands with you." I was rather surprised, but I gave him my hand. He said—"I have watched your public career from the first, and I never knew you say a single word or do a single thing that was insulting to my country;" and he added—"I want to shake hands with you and thank you for it." And then, in a manner which was sad to me, but in a sense amusing, he said—"But, after all, I know that you are my enemy." [Mr. BIGGAR: Hear, hear!] It shows, at any rate, I think, the honesty of Mr. Martin and his sympathy with an Englishman who, as he thought, had always been willing to do justice to his country. Now, I was not content during the whole of those years with the statesmen with whom there was no specific but force, and I hold just the same views now. If this Bill were brought in, and if it were not known, and were not promised, that there would be accompanying that Bill, and in the same Session of Parliament, a large measure of remedy for the grievances of the Irish people, which are admitted, I should not be sitting on this Bench now, or be a Member of this or any other Administration connected with such a proposition. It is not my intention to enter into the figures which have been so freely used on both sides of the House with regard to the state of Ireland at this moment. I must leave, as I do leave with perfect confidence, that question as it was left by my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. There can be no man in this House more informed on this matter; and I undertake to assert that there is no man in this House more anxious to place the exact and unexaggerated figures before the House. I shall, therefore, not go at all into the figures which have been quoted. I might, if it were necessary, refer to the various statements of the Press in Ireland and England, which, if there has been exaggeration in any particular, still I doubt not, in the main, have given a fair description of the condition so far as their reporters could discover it. I might refer to the private letters which I dare say almost every hon. Member of this House has received. I think I have received more letters during the last six months from Ireland than, perhaps, in the whole course of my political life; and they have not been only from landowners, but from farmers, shopkeepers, and persons connected with manufacturing trades, and from some persons whose occupations I cannot precisely describe—persons living upon their means—and from all these letters there comes but one story as to the deplorable state of the country. They do not all ask for a Bill of a restrictive character. They do not condemn the agitation in some cases, or the remedies which they thought were necessary; but the main tone and the main contents of these letters are such as to make me satisfied that the condition of the country during the last two or three months has been drifting on from bad to worse. Many of us know that in past times we have had in parts of this great City many refugees, some from Russia, some from France, many from Italy, and so forth; we have now a new class of refugees—those who have come here from Ireland. I asked a gentleman one day, whom I met, how it happened he was here. He was a proprietor of land in Ireland—not to a very great extent—and he was an agent, I believe, to a considerable extent. I asked him what had brought him here; and he said—"Well, the fact is I am a refugee;" and not long afterwards I received a note from him, in which he said he had been intending to go over, but in consequence of the accounts which he had heard of the special hostility to himself, the intentions with regard to himself, to his life, he had been implored by his wife and family to remain for the present in England. [*Laughter from* MR. BIGGAR.] The hon. Member for Cavan smiles and laughs. Nothing appears to give him more pleasure than the narration of facts of this kind. I confess I think the subject is one which requires to be treated and considered in a very different spirit. Then, if I shut out the figures, to which I will no more refer, if I shut out the writings in the Press, and the private letters, and the refugees, who are amongst us, I might turn to the admissions of the leaders of this great movement in Ireland—the demands and declarations of the leaders and promoters of what is called the National Land League. They tell us that the law of Parliament throughout Ireland is suppressed. That is a statement they not only lay before the House, but of which, in some sense, they boast. They boast, it may be, of their power—I doubt if it is their wisdom or their patriotism. They say that the Association with which they are connected is supreme; and one hon. Gentleman told the House the other evening that if under this Bill, if it should pass, any single man were arrested, the immediate result would be that the whole payment of rent throughout Ireland would be absolutely put an end to. Now, if that be not a very serious condition of the country, I am at a loss to know what can be so. I am not a great friend—no friend at all, but a great enemy—to the landlord system of Ireland, and have been so ever since I knew anything about it. Since 30 years ago I took the pains, on two separate occasions, to travel with a most informed Irishman throughout nearly all the counties of that country. I have since, from that time to this, condemned the state of land-owning in Ireland and the state of land tenure; and I agree with hon. Gentlemen opposite that it is impossible to look for a future, tranquil and prosperous in that country, till this great question is fairly grasped and dealt with by the Imperial Parliament. But I am not going to contend at all for the illegality of the Land League. If you like, we will consider it perfectly legal, as it is on the paper and in its resolutions. I am not about to call that in question. A learned Judge decided otherwise, and I will not dispute his *dicta;* but what I maintain is, that the results are illegal and evil, in a certain direction, to the last degree. The hon. Member for Tralee (The O'Donoghue) spoke about me this evening. I am sorry I was writing upstairs at the time and did not know he was referring to me, or I should have been here to listen to what he had to say. As it is, I understand that the hon. Gentleman made several quotations from speeches of mine delivered about 30 years ago. [The O'Donoghue: Two speeches.] Two speeches. I thought it was more—speeches delivered 30 years ago, in connection with an agitation which I was then associated with—that of the Anti-Corn Law League, for the abolition of what was called Protection, but what was in point of fact, whenever there was a bad harvest, a periodical famine for the poor people of this country. The hon. Member wanted to show that the two cases were parallel, and that in point of fact our League did the same sort of thing, not only in its constitution, but in its effects, as the League with which he has lately become connected. I venture to say that the only likeness there is between them is in the name, which I suppose they have stolen from us. [The O'Donoghue: You denounced the landlords.] From 1839 to 1846 our agitation was continued. We held as many meetings, probably, as was stated the other night to have been held in Ireland by, I think, the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon). He was complaining that public meetings were suppressed in Ireland, and yet he stated that 450, I think it was, had been held there by the Land League during the last two years. I do not know at once how this passage is to be reconciled with that; but I say that from 1839 to 1846 no man ever heard any of the recognized leaders or lecturers or speakers of the League say anything that was calculated to bring people to disobey the law and to do violence towards their neighbours. If your League had been conducted as our League was, I should not have opposed you. I would, on the contrary, have sent you a subscription, and I would have been one of your members. Does anyone suppose that my right hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Villiers), who was then the Parliamentary Leader of the agitation, ever uttered the observations and the menaces which we have heard from the Bench during the present Session? Can anyone find out in the public speeches either of my late Friend, Mr. Cobden, or of my own, any passage which leads to the condition of things which not only exists in Ireland, but which is boasted of and is supported constantly by the voices and with the approbations of the hon. Gentlemen whom I see opposite? There was strong language used. I am not a bit ashamed of strong language, and it is sometimes even very necessary. I recollect a passage in a speech of one of our Friends, the late Mr. Fox, who at one time sat on this side of the House as Member for the borough of Oldham, in which he said—

> "The Corn Law is the harvest of Death as well as of the landowners; and monopoly saith unto corruption, 'Thou art my brother.'"

That was a strong expression, though it was true, too; but it did not stimulate any man to violence. We had branches all over the country, just as the Irish National Land League has, and active men in every district, in the boroughs, and in many of the villages in the counties; but it was never said that any single person connected with these branches carried on the sort of practices which have become common with your branches—[The O'Donoghue: What, Sir? What practices?] The hon. Gentleman says "What?" We have heard lately a good deal about Land League Courts. Were there any Courts in our time? During a portion of the time when our agitation was conducted there were a great many incendiary fires in the East of England, particularly, I think, in the county of Suffolk. But all we did with regard to these was that we asked Parliament to grant a Committee of the House to inquire into the cause of them—[The O'DONOGHUE: And who refused?]—to inquire into the cause of them; and no single word of ours, in the House or out of it, or any single line written in our accredited organs—our newspapers—ever stimulated for a moment any crime either of that or of any other kind. [Mr. SEXTON: Nor have we.] If that be so, one is driven to the conclusion that your population is less indisposed to crimes or offences of this kind than our population. It is, and it has always been, my wish in everything I have said about Ireland for 30 years past never to cast the slightest stigma, the slightest slur, on the character of her people. I could spend a few minutes speaking of their virtues; and I believe when there are vices and errors, and offences and crimes among them, they arise rather from the condition into which those who should be their superiors have brought them, than from their own hearts. No, Sir, with us, in our agitation, there was no language of menace, no teaching in favour of any crimes; there was no outrage, there was no terror. I call to witness every man who remembers the time that our speeches, strong as they might be, condemnatory as they might be of the law we condemned, hostile as they were to the landowners by whom it was supported, still our speeches were always conceived in what I call a noble, a moral, and an elevating tone, and we directed the people to their own political efforts and to the ultimate justice of Parliament for the remedy of the grievances of which we complained. But what, Sir, is it that these Gentlemen have done? They have, in my opinion, to a large extent, demoralized the people whom they profess to befriend. Sir, we have heard a voice which has passed through the counties of Ireland, telling every tenant not only that his rent is too high, which, in many cases, may be true, but that he is at liberty to fix his own rent—that is, his own price for something which he has bought; and that, if he likes, and if he finds the condition of his family is such that it would be convenient and agreeable to pay no rent at all, then he is at liberty to pay no rent. ["No, no!"] I am not stating anything here which any man on the face of Great Britain and Ireland can fairly contradict. Why, I had a letter the other day from one of the most respected men in Ireland, I believe, and he told me that when his rents became due, some rents were paid; but a number of the tenants wished that he should give a receipt for only one-half the money which had been paid. You know perfectly well what was the meaning of that, and what was the purpose of it. It was that this paper, with a lie on it, might be presented to your friends of the Land League Committee, and that, being so presented, they would be spared from the menaces, the terror, and, it might be, the outrages to which they would otherwise be subjected if it were known that they had paid the full rent. I have no liking for high rents. I am not an Irish or an English landowner; therefore, I have no personal interest in the matter. My sympathies are all with the Irish tenantry, and I would do anything that lay in my power to improve their condition; but to improve their condition the very last thing I should think of doing would be to destroy their honest feeling and sense of honour. I could tell hon. Members opposite, the hon. Member for Tralee, who has attempted to tarnish the fair fame of the Anti-Corn Law League, that if his Association had been conducted on the same principles, and with the same regard to law, I should have been glad to see it, as I believe it would have been, successful all over Ireland, and I should have rejoiced in the ultimate triumph which it would have achieved. [An hon. MEMBER: It will succeed.] Now, there have been two or three speeches about which I should like to say a word or two. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), at the beginning of the evening, interested and amused the House in a speech that was, in many parts, interesting, and, in some parts, amusing. We had also—I think it was yesterday; but the days are becoming so confusing that it is difficult to recollect whether it is Wednesday or Thursday—we had what I might call a vivacious and powerful speech, if it had been all right, from the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen). He reminded me of a neighbour of his, Lord Ravensworth, then Mr. Liddell, who, when in this House, was a very fluent speaker. I recollect his making a speech, and I was sitting with a Member from the North, who said to me, pointing to Lord Ravensworth—"He makes a very good speech, if you do not listen to what he says." I thought of that when I was listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Newcastle. Nothing could be more ready, nothing more fluent, than his language; and I was only sorry that there was not something more in it that was worth listening to. I can conceive of circumstances in which all that he said would have been worth listening to; but not in the circumstances in which we are placed, for there was a great deal said by him, and by the hon. Member for Northampton also, about the oppression and the tyranny of the Government. The oppression described by the hon. Member for Newcastle was that the Government were anxious that Parliament should do, as speedily as possible, what the Government and what Parliament believed to be a necessary duty. Yet he insisted upon it that every hour taken from private Members was an oppression to those private Members and an injury to the country. If the Government had proposed that the House should only meet twice a-week, then he might have said that the country suffered, if the country would suffer, of which I am not sure. But if the House were engaged honestly and perseveringly in its duty, it does not matter to the country whether it is my proposition, or yours, or any other hon. Gentleman's which is before you. If it be worth discussing and considering and passing into law, surely Parliament is doing its duty to the country. Then we are taxed with the tyranny of which the hon. Member for Northampton spoke, when he told us of the tyranny to be inflicted by this Bill upon the people of Ireland; but the hon. Member knows perfectly well that, on former occasions, there have been times when similar enactments have been put on the Statute Book, and not a man in 100 of the Irish people knew of their existence. A law of this kind becomes a tyranny in the hands of tyrants; but in the hands of men who are liberal and just, it may be a law of protection and of great mercy to Ireland. ["No, no!"] Who dares to say—[*Cries of* "We do!"]—who dares to say the contrary, and say it honestly? Who dares to say that he cannot look and see the truth across the narrow strip of water which separates Ireland from Great Britain, and see men sitting here who have not devoted their lives to the cause of freedom? [*Cries of* "Some of them!" *and* "Not Irish freedom!"] Some hon. Gentlemen say—"Not Irish freedom!" Well, in the 50 years just passed, Ireland has made great progress in freedom, and it has made that progress by the constant desire to do the Irish people justice on the part of those who sit on this side of the House. I am glad to know and to believe that the people of Ireland themselves, when the frenzy of the moment shall have passed away, will come to the same conclusion. I take it as one of the things most cheering in this disturbed state of Ireland that all the figures of the magistrates, whom you blame, and of the police, whom you distrust, have not been able to show more than the death by violence of seven or eight people within the last year. That shows how great strides the Irish people have made from the barbarism of 50 years ago, and I take comfort in believing that, notwithstanding the present time of trouble, there is visible in the Irish people throughout an improvement which those who are not acquainted with their condition now, but who were acquainted with their condition 50 years ago, would hardly think possible. The wages in Ireland are double, nay, triple, what they were 50 years ago. All over Ireland people are better dressed, and, with certain temporary exceptions, better fed, than they were 30, 40, or 50 years ago; and notwithstanding all that we see, and all that is true and to be regretted in the condition of Ireland, the population of that country are far superior in condition, and intelligence, and civilization than in the days when I entered this House. I say that no man can doubt—at least, I will not appeal to the reason or conscience of any man who can express a doubt that it is a great and grievous trouble to Members of the present Administration —[Mr. BIGGAR: Oh, no, not the slightest.]—that they have felt themselves compelled to submit a measure like this to the House of Commons. It is only under a solemn sense of duty, from which it is impossible to shrink, that we ask the House to support us in a measure of restriction—restriction, as we believe, to the few, and I have no doubt, as it will be exercised, a measure of mercy to the many. This Bill will only be temporary. Many persons, not so scrupulous as we are on these matters, will say that it ought to be continued for a longer period than the 1st of September next year. [An hon. MEMBER: For ever.] No, not for ever. We hope the disturbing elements will only be temporary, and that the measure, therefore, will only be temporary. I trust that the Land Bill, when it comes before the House—and the sooner this Bill is disposed of the sooner the Land Bill will be on this Table—will be a great and a comprehensive measure, and that it will be a durable monument, worthy of the memory of this Parliament and of the Administration of which my right hon. Friend near me is the head.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Bright) to his political career as a proof of his devotion to the cause of Irish freedom was one which would go straight to the hearts of millions of the Irish race at home and abroad. But as one of those upon whom the right hon. Gentleman could not fix responsibility for any of the troubles that had taken place in Ireland, he was anxious to say that, notwitstanding the impressive speech with which the right hon. Gentleman followed that appeal to his own great career, he was determined that his attitude in this debate, as an Irish Representative, should place him above even the suspicion of a compromise with coercion. The right hon. Gentleman commenced his speech by a comparison between the Corn Law League, with which his name was so honourably identified in history, and the National Land League of Ireland, and he was good enough to say that if the National Land League had maintained their organization in as peaceful and Constitutional and legal a manner as he and his Friends had conducted the Corn Law League, he would have inscribed his name on the list of members, and would have sent them a subscription. He was certain that the right hon. Gentleman was sincere in making that declaration; but did he not recollect an agitation in the history of Ireland as great as his was, conducted in as peaceful and Constitutional a manner as his was—the agitation conducted by that great champion of moral force, Daniel O'Connell? How many Englishmen possessing the right hon. Gentleman's influence said to Daniel O'Connell, "You have wisely walked within the lines of the Constitution; you have commended yourself to the sympathies of English Liberalism; put our names on your list of members, and be kind enough to accept our subscriptions?" The right hon Gentleman had made an appeal to history which was of a two-sided character. He had followed the path of the Prime Minister, who in a recent speech referred to Daniel O'Connell as an example of a leader whose movements they should endeavour to emulate; but neither the Prime Minister nor the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster now told the House that notwithstanding Daniel O'Connell's Constitutional and peaceful method of agitation, he nevertheless found himself denounced as an abettor of assassination, was dragged through the mire of a Police Court, and made the victim of a hired Press in Dublin, paid by official money supplied by a Liberal Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The Liberal Viceroy to whom he referred was the late Lord Clarendon, and the newspaper scribe whom he hired to vilify the Young Ireland Party was a man named Birch, who published a journal called *The World*. [Mr. GLADSTONE dissented.] The Prime Minister incredulously shook his head. The right hon. Gentleman would find in the Police Records of Dublin the proofs of the accusation, and an acknowledgment by the criminal himself. [Mr. GLADSTONE: O'Connell is dead.] He was afraid that as they did not possess the tranquillity of a debating society, they were not in a frame of mind to settle the question of a date. He simply adhered to his statement, and he should be glad to discuss the matter with the right hon. Gentleman, or anybody else, at a time when they should have an opportunity of calmly testing the accuracy of what he said. How did the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster himself fare in his peaceful and Constitutional agitation in connection with the Corn Law League? How was he described? The right hon. Gentleman told the House the language the League employed was calculated to enhance respect for the law rather than to provoke acts of insurrection. That was not the opinion which the right hon. Gentleman's contemporaries formed of the language used by the League, for no less a person than Sir Robert Peel accused Mr. Cobden of being an abettor of assassination. Although not an old politician, he (Mr. O'Connor Power) could recollect a time when many of the English newspapers described the right hon. Gentleman as a Revolutionist and Communist of the deepest dye. No matter how careful those charged with a great National movement might be, it was not only possible but probable that at certain stages of that movement they would be implicated in charges of this kind, with just as little foundation in fact as the accusation levelled at the head of the right hon. Gentleman when he was arousing the mind of the English people against Protection. The right hon. Gentleman certainly touched the sympathies of the House when he called upon them to consider the fate of the newly-arrived refugees from Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to have come across two or three Irish landlords who had fled from their country and sought refuge in the solitude of London from the outrages of their wicked tenants. But the right hon. Gentleman only noticed one-half of the case when he shed a tear over their fate. He might go through this country, and through the large towns of England and Scotland, and he would find not one or two persons flying from the tyranny of the tenantry, but an Irish population of nearly 2,000,000, who were refugees flying to these shores from the tyranny and injustice of the vicious land system which prevented them from acquiring an honest and comfortable subsistence in their own land. He was not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman had dealt in so light and easy a manner with the speech of the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). He (Mr. O'Connor Power) had said when that speech was delivered that no man on the Ministerial Bench would be able to answer it, and he had watched anxiously for the Minister who would attempt to do so. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had made no attempt to answer it. He was a prudent man. He was not only patriotic, but as wise and prudent as he was patriotic; and, instead of answering the conclusive speech which the hon. Member for Northampton delivered in the early part of the evening, he preferred to throw a veil of humour and banter over it. The speech, as yet, remained unanswered, and it would remain unanswered at the close of the debate. The right hon. Gentleman said that coercive laws could only become despotic in the hands of a despot, and tyrannical in the hands of a tyrant. His (Mr. O'Connor Power's) theory was that no Minister was so good, or so wise, or so patriotic as to be fit to be entrusted with irresponsible powers; and if the Bill which the Chief Secretary for Ireland was endeavouring to introduce into that House was introduced, and was ultimately carried out, he and the Viceroy of Ireland would be entrusted with the greatest measure of irresponsible power which could possibly be placed in the hands of an individual—namely, the power of arresting such men as they chose to regard as dangerous to their government or their system of laws, and of keeping them in prison for a period of 18 months without arraigning them or bringing them up for trial. For the encouragement of the Irish Members, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster reminded them that the life of every one of his Colleagues had been a long struggle for freedom. He was pertinently interrupted by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), when his hon. Friend said—"Not for Irish freedom." The right hon. Gentleman himself was a remarkable exception, which proved the rule that public men in this country had too often sought to build up their reputation as statesmen, not by promoting freedom in Ireland, but by abridging whatever little freedom they possessed. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, last year and the year before, was the greatest political agitator on the face of Europe. He was the great apostle of liberty, the one great champion of the principle of nationality and freedom, and, in that sense, his life might be described as a struggle for public freedom. But where had the Prime Minister created an agitation in order to arouse public feeling or sympathy in favour of the victims of tyranny in Ireland? When, at the beginning of the last Parliament, one of his Irish Bills, having been passed by a respectable majority in that House was thrown out in "another place," the Prime Minister treated the matter as being only an Irish one. Had the right hon. Gentleman been fighting for the freedom of Greece or Bulgaria, and if he had been thwarted in a similar manner by the Whig Gentlemen behind him, and by the Tory Noblemen in "another place," he would never have taken his defeat so calmly, nor have consented to sit down quietly under the rebuff. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster went on to refer to the wonderful progress that Ireland had made in political freedom during the last 50 years; but how had that freedom been achieved? Not by patience and by yielding obedience to the law; but by rebellion, by conspiracy, and by Fenianism. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had talked so much about the material improvement of Ireland. It was a gross fallacy. Ireland's improvement, materially, had been so slight that it was not worth referring to as an example to guide them in the legislation of the present day. Here and there, in rarely-fortunate places, might be found evidences of improvement; but he could assure the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and the Prime Minister, and the Chief Secretary, who, notwithstanding the responsibilities of his position, had not yet been able to make himself acquainted with the exact material condition of Ireland, that hundreds of thousands of the population were still steeped in poverty and clothed in rags. If he, who knew the condition of these people, were to allow the statement of the right hon. Gentleman to go unchallenged, the House and the country would be deceived as to the extent of the misery and poverty of the Irish people. Whatever might be the sins of the Land League, he thought they ought to endeavour to ask themselves, before they consented to exceptional legislation of this kind, whether the resources of the ordinary law had really been vigorously employed. He had already said that he was not responsible for any of the outrages that had been committed in the course of this agitation; but he did not wish anyone to suppose for a moment that he did not in the heartiest manner sympathize with and support the recognized objects of the Land League. The object of that body, as recited to the House by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) from its official programme, was to make the cultivators of Ireland the owners of their own land, and to accomplish that object by honourable means—not by force, conspiracy, or revolution, but by means of honest purchase, when adequate facilities should have been supplied to the tenants by Act of Parliament. Under these circumstances, he held that the Chief Secretary had not made out a sufficient case to induce the House to consent to the introduction of this Bill. He had himself excepted threatening letters from the list of serious agrarian outrages. To his (Mr. O'Connor Power's) mind, threatening letters were valueless, and the reason he thought they ought to be totally excluded from consideration was that to get at the real offenders the right hon. Gentleman would have to arrest some of the landlords and their agents, who had not been wanting in industry to write these letters and post them to their own addresses. Excepting threatening letters, there had been some 1,295 agrarian offences of a serious character. The right hon. Gentleman had a police and military force of between 40,000 and 50,000 men. He had all the magistracy not only united with him in a desire to maintain the supremacy of British law, but united with him in upholding the rights of the landlords; and, nevertheless, the right hon. Gentleman came down to Parliament and said it was impossible to maintain law and order in Ireland unless they armed him with the powers of a despot, and enabled him to imprison whomsoever he pleased. Thus, in order that some 1,300 offenders might be punished, they were to put it in the power of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary to crush and imprison a nation of 5,000,000. Supposing that the Corn Law League had not been kept within the bounds of legal action—supposing that the Government of that day saw that, owing to the eloquent speeches of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and others, recourse was had to illegal practices, what would the Government have done? It would not have waited until the League had violated the law, and brought the country within a measurable distance of civil war, but would have summoned Parliament to consider what were the grievances that gave force to such a mighty national movement, and would have called Parliament together to remedy the wrongs from which these grievances sprung. The right hon. Gentleman, and those who were inclined to accept his view of the state of Ireland, must necessarily be guilty of casting very great aspersion upon the character of the Irish people. The greatest aspersion that could be thrown upon the character of any people was to say that they were not capable of civil government, and that they were unfit to live under a Constitutional system. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had substantially made that statement to-night, when he had described Ireland as being in a condition in which coercive legislation was imperatively required. Those who had had an opportunity of studying the Irish character, not only in the present day, but in some of the most difficult periods of the relations between England and Ireland, entertained no doubtful opinion of the justice-loving character of the Irish people. Those who had read the history of the country would recollect the testimony which Sir John Davis, Attorney General for Ireland under Henry VII., when he said that there was no people on the surface of the earth that loved equal and impartial laws more than the Irish, or would be more amenable to those laws if they were brought within their scope and influence. The real method of pacifying Ireland was to be found in the removal of agrarian wrong, and not in arming the Executive with exceptional power for the prevention of agrarian outrage, which, admitting for a moment the promises of the Government, was like lopping off the branches of a decaying tree, instead of striking at its roots, and was also a further illustration of the invariable policy of English Parliaments to deal with Irish matters in a hand-to-mouth fashion. In regard to the statistics laid before the House by the Chief Secretary, in numerous cases the same offences, committed by the same persons against the same individuals, were repeated; and, consequently, the grand total of agrarian outrages assumed the dimensions which really took away the breath of the House, when the Chief Secretary made his opening statement the other evening. He protested against the manner in which the Chief Secretary made that statement. The right hon. Gentleman assumed a dramatic attitude throughout. He could not congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on his elocutionary powers. He achieved a magnificent failure; and, when describing some outrage committed on a farmer by persons supposed to be instigated by the Land League, he said they fired at him through a window—and the right hon. Gentleman paused to add that they did it through a long gun. He reminded the right hon. Gentleman that harrowing pictures might be drawn from *The Police News* of brave English "gentlemen" kicking their wives to death and beating their children in the most revolting and cruel manner. He urged that more mischief than good would be accomplished by involving the innocent in a punishment which was intended only for the guilty. As it had been before so it was now. English prejudice stood in the way of Irish reform; and the Prime Minister, in the speeches he had made, had done much to fan and inflame the passions and prejudices of his countrymen against Ireland. He regretted that the attention of the House had been drawn very considerably away from the real question before it, which was the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons). Not only ought not the Chief Secretary to obtain leave to bring in this Bill for the coercion of the people of Ireland, miscalled "A Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in that country," but, in the words of the Amendment, "precedence should be given to remedial legislation." He would ask his hon. Friend the Member for Dublin how many of Her Majesty's Ministers had attempted to grapple with that proposition since it had been submitted to the House? Not a single Minister on the Treasury Bench, and not one of their immediate supporters behind, had thought it worth his while to approach that question. It was a proof that they had not been treating the House of Commons as a deliberative Assembly, or they would have taken up the matter under deliberation, and endeavoured to show how it was they had not fulfilled their promise, if coercion was necessary, of accompanying coercion with remedial legislation. He held that the case of the Chief Secretary had utterly broken down, and that it had been conclusively proved that coercive legislation might be put on one side altogether, and remedial legislation introduced. They had not taken that course; and consequently the House was likely to be involved for several weeks, and probably several months, in the task of instructing Her Majesty's Government as to the best way of governing a people whom they knew and represented, but whom, he was sorry to say, Her Majesty's Government did not yet understand. There was never yet, in his judgment, a people engaged in a more justifiable struggle than the struggle in which the people of Ireland have been engaged during the last two years for the purpose of effecting a reform in the Land Laws. It was true, no doubt, that crimes — abominable crimes—had been committed; and whoever would bring the perpetrators of those crimes to justice, and to speedy justice, would receive his hearty gratitude. He had no sympathy with crime; but he would make no compromise with coercion either in the House or out of it. But even at that hour he would ask Her Majesty's Government to pause before they entered upon a policy which all previous history and experience in Ireland showed could only instigate to rebellion, stimulate the spirit of revolution, and do still more to postpone the day for which true Irishmen and true Englishmen were ardently looking forward, when the strife of centuries might be brought to a close, and Ireland be made prosperous and happy, under a Government and a Parliament of her own, still united with the people of this country in every great struggle for the improvement of humanity.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. William Fowler.*)

MR. GLADSTONE did not think that the debate ought to be closed at so early an hour, and hoped that it might be continued for some time longer.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS also hoped that the House would consent to go on with the debate for a short time longer.

MR. W. FOWLER said, he had no objection to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. W. FOWLER said, he had only moved the adjournment of the debate because he thought that the House might be somewhat fatigued and indisposed to continue it. Personally, he was quite prepared to say a few words even at that late hour. The more he heard upon the matter the more satisfied he became that the whole question before them really resolved itself into this — Had they confidence in Her Majesty's Government, or had they not? Had they confidence that Her Majesty's Government would place the right Bill in the right place, and bring before Parliament the measures that were necessary for the pacification of Ireland along with their remedial legislation? If they had, then the only question was which should come first—remedial legislation or coercion. The object of the Amendment was to give preference to remedial legislation; and the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) found great fault with them for wandering away from that question. He (Mr. Fowler) wished to grapple with it, and he repeated that the real question was whether they could trust Her Majesty's Government when they told them that they really required these powers in order to deal with the present condition of Ireland. He believed that their supporters could trust the Government, because they knew that they hated and detested coercion, and reluctantly came to the conclusion that it was necessary. At the same time, they believed that remedial legislation was necessary. He heartily agreed with them; and although they had not told the House exactly what they were going to do, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) had told them that they were to have a really strong, powerful, and comprehensive Land Bill, which would satisfy all who had at heart the good of the people of Ireland. Were they to trust this statement, or were they not? ["No!"] Hon. Members opposite said that they had no confidence in the Government. But the House had, over and over again, shown their confidence in the Government by their votes; and he failed to see what was to be gained by all these dry and dreary discussions, in which the same things were repeated over and over again. It always came back again to the same question—whether they could or could not rely upon Her Majesty's Ministers. The hon. Member for Mayo asserted that the debate had wandered from the real object at issue; but the hon. Member and his Friends had certainly wandered a good deal more than anybody else. They had raised many points that had nothing to do with the Amendment; and there had been, for instance, many comparisons drawn between the crime of England and of Ireland. It was said that there was more crime in England than in Ireland. He sadly confessed that the allegation was true. They all knew that it was so, and that the social crime of Ireland had always been less than the social crime of England. He admired the character of the Irish people in this respect; but there had always been this great distinction—that when the land of Ireland was touched the Irish people never shrank from any outrage in order to vindicate what they considered to be their rights. That was the difficulty to be dealt with at the present moment. They had not yet satisfied the Irish people about the Land Laws, and they were still struggling for reform; but, as the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) told them, there was a great deal more behind it, and the desire was to get rid of the landlords of Ireland in order to make the independence of the country the more easy to be obtained. All the talk about the difference between crime in England and crime in Ireland was entirely beside the mark, because, after all, it was not a question of any comparison of that sort; but the real question was, what was the condition of the country at this moment? Was it not the fact that a reign of terror existed in Ireland? That was what was before them. In point of fact there was a reign of terror, and the only law observed in Ireland was not the law of Parliament and of the Queen, but the law of a secret, and, he would add, a vile conspiracy. That was the condition of things which had been placed before them by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. Hon. Members opposite asserted that what the Chief Secretary said was not correct, but was much exaggerated. What they had to say was that they believed the statement of the Chief Secretary, and that they were prepared to give him their votes. All this talk, therefore, about the difference in the state of crime amounted to nothing. They had a Land League in Ireland creating a reign of terror. In England men were able to go where they liked and do what they pleased, and they were able to enforce their rights. But in Ireland, if a man sought to enforce a particular kind of right, he was subjected to the secret dictation of men who went about threatening his life, firing into his house, and committing all those evil deeds which hon. Members opposite admitted to be so very wrong, but declined to do anything to stop. He should like now to say one or two words as to what, in his opinion, was the true cause of the present condition of things. He admitted to hon. Members opposite that there was a good deal to be said in favour of the people of Ireland, and that there were grounds for their feeling a detestation of England. He acknowledged that the history of Ireland had been a sad and a gloomy history, mainly owing to the cruelties of the English Parliament in past centuries. No doubt, this country had systematically destroyed the trade of Ireland, and had done everything she could to damage and destroy the Sister Kingdom. He admitted all that. He admitted, also, how frightful the confiscation of land had been in times past. He admitted, further, that the penal laws with regard to the Catholics of Ireland were a disgrace and discredit to a civilized country. There could be no doubt about it. And all these things showed that there was some reason for the feeling of the people of Ireland with regard to England. But did they justify the present condition of affairs and form a reason why it should be allowed to continue? Such a conclusion would be ridiculous and absurd. They had admitted, and did admit, that the people of Ireland had good cause for her hereditary hatred of England; but it was not the present Parliament that was to blame, but generations long passed away. He was sorry to hear hon. Members opposite speak slightingly of the legislation of modern times. This Parliament had already been engaged in trying to do justice to Ireland; and they would have been discussing the Land Bill now if the Irish Members had not been so persistently obstructive in their proceedings. But what he had said before, and what he felt very strongly, was that nothing would justify the present lawlessness that existed in Ireland. Nothing could justify the foul and vile conspiracy of which he had spoken. Those who were concerned in it seemed to forget that he who set a stone rolling never knew where it would go or where it would stop. In discouraging the people from paying rent and doing their lawful duty, they seemed to forget the effect their speeches must necessarily have on men ignorant and even more exciteable than hon. Members opposite themselves. It was disappointing, after all the concessions which had been obtained for Ireland by men like the Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy, to find such a small amount of gratitude. Indeed, there seemed to be a feeling on the other side of the House that hon. Members on that (the Liberal) side were incapable of doing anything honestly for Ireland. The way in which hon. Members opposite had interrupted the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy showed that they entertained that feeling. But they were entirely mistaken. The Liberal Members were as anxious to help Ireland as the Home Rule Members were. The only question was how they could do it best. The Irish Members wanted to do it one way; the Liberal Members were of opinion that it would be better done in another. Instead of fighting like a deliberative Assembly they were engaged in something that was much more like a big school fight — using physical weapons rather than reason and argument. It was not that the supporters of Her Majesty's Government liked coercion any more than the Irish Members did; but they could not acquiesce in the horrible condition of lawlessness which prevailed in Ireland, and they were determined to see law and order re-established. When that was effected they were perfectly willing to consider the Land Laws with the view of amending them. He believed that it was necessary to place the tenure of land upon a different footing if they were to have a better state of things in Ireland. But the sooner they got rid of the system of Obstruction which was now resorted to the sooner would they be able to proceed to remedial legislation; and he did not believe that any true friend of Ireland would encourage hon. Members opposite in the course they were pursuing. Did they suppose that the Parliament of England would permanently allow this state of things to go on? It was impossible; and those who encouraged the people of England to become irritated upon the question were neither the true friends of England nor of Ireland. They ought to deal with the matter as intelligent men, and not as excitable debaters. They ought to consider what the real wants of Ireland were, and not try to bolster up what might have been said in other places. If hon. Members thought that England and Ireland ought to be separated, let them bring forward a Motion for the Repeal of the Union. That, however, was not the question before the House now. They had the promise of a Land Bill; let them proceed to discuss it as rapidly as possible. The Irish Members said that coercion stood in the way. Who was responsible for that? It was the men who had established this secret conspiracy. They were responsible for it, and not the poor and ignorant men who followed their lead.

MR. DILLON: I rise to Order. Is the hon. Member in Order in charging hon. Members with conspiracy?

MR. SPEAKER called upon Mr. W. FOWLER to proceed.

MR. W. FOWLER said, it appeared to be a question of terms. Hon. Members said there was no secret conspiracy. Well, then, was there an open conspiracy?

An hon. MEMBER: No; only agitation.

MR. W. FOWLER thought that what was going on in Ireland was a conspiracy against law and order.

MR. BIGGAR: I rise to a point of Order. Is the hon. Member justified in saying that any Member of this House is guilty of a conspiracy against law and order?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cambridge is in possession of the House, and is entitled to proceed. If the hon. Member had made any allegation that was irregular, it would have been my duty to call him to Order.

MR. W. FOWLER, in resuming, said, that it was not the poor deluded men who followed the lead who were so much to blame, as those who originated the conspiracy, or whatever hon. Members opposite might choose to call it. The leaders, the founders, and the originators of the movement were those who were really to blame, and it was they who were standing in the way of a Land Reform, because they had created the terrible state of things which existed in Ireland by reason of their illegal machinations. That was the cause which had induced Her Majesty's Government and the Parliament of England most reluctantly to say that they must deal with the question of order before they dealt with the question of the Land Laws. He felt that they were in a great crisis; and he appealed to hon. Members opposite, if they were open to any appeal, not to stand in the way of the reforms which they themselves said were so important and so essential to the future welfare of their country. Let them go to business, and not waste their time longer in wrangles and disputes. He believed they would find that the present Parliament was well disposed to deal with the question of the land. They were not going to have any half-and-half measure of Land Reform, but they were told they were to have a real measure; and Conservatives and Liberals, he was glad to say, were joined together in supporting it. ["Oh!"] It was perfectly true. The Conservatives and Liberals of Ulster had joined together in a common programme for the benefit of the land of Ireland; and hon. Members opposite were standing in the way by obstructing the discussion of the measure. The Parliament of England was strong enough, and was determined that its will should be carried out. They knew it must be done, and it would be done. He could trust right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, for they had to deal with men whose antecedents they knew, and who had been the friends of freedom all their lives. No hon. Member opposite was so ignorant of history as not to know that the Prime Minister had always been the friend of freedom. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had told the House that "it was all a question of how these things were handled." For his own part, he hated with his whole soul any law that was opposed to freedom; but it was the men who were responsible for the state of things in Ireland who had rendered such a law necessary. He trusted the present debate would end without any more of those unseemly wrangles that had occurred within the last few days; and, having entire confidence in Her Majesty's Government, he should give his vote in support of the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Richard Power,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

AUGMENTATION OF BENEFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL [*Lords*].—[BILL 68.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

POSTPONEMENT OF COMMITTEE.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he had promised the hon. Members who had some Amendments to propose to this Bill that he would give ample Notice of going into Committee thereon; and as he scarcely felt that sufficient Notice had been given, he would not proceed with the Bill that evening.

Committee *deferred* till *Thursday* next.

RIVER FLOODS PREVENTION BILL.

(*Mr. Magniac, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Hubbard, Mr Biddulph, Sir Charles Reed.*)

[BILL 35.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Magniac.*)

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT thought the House should have some explanation with regard to this very important Bill. It was, in his opinion, rather a strong order to ask that the Bill be read a second time without any explanation whatever being afforded. He was perfectly ready to admit that the question was one which required to be dealt with immediately. Her Majesty's Government had introduced a Bill dealing with the matter in "another place," and the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Magniac) was quite right in bringing forward his measure in the House of Commons; but it was altogether another thing to pass the second reading of a Bill of this important character, without having any explanation from its author of the provisions which it contained. It was desirable to know to what extent the hon. Member would like the Bill to apply, and what modifications he would be prepared to accept in Committee if the Bill were read a second time that night. Again, he would like to know how it was intended to deal with the various classes of land; whether middle and higher lands would be charged, and at what rates? Then there were the obstructions caused in some rivers by mills, canals, &c. All these were points of serious importance, and he was quite certain they could not be properly discussed at that hour (12.30). If it was the intention of his hon. Friend that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, and if he could persuade the Government to send it to a Select Committee together with their own Bill, the position would be different, because he held that the more information which could be obtained with regard to matters of the kind, the better. His hon. Friend had, as a member of a deputation in connection with this subject, set before the President of the Local Government Board a clear and decided case that legislation was required; and the right hon. Gentleman had replied that, at an early opportunity, he would introduce a Bill dealing with the evil. That Bill had been introduced, and his hon. Friend the Member for Bedford had also brought in a Bill upon the subject. The pressing necessity of dealing with the question was so absolute, the floods having already done an infinity of mischief to the best class of land, to towns, and to various other interests, that he asked his hon. Friend both to explain the Bill and the course he intended to pursue with respect to it.

MR. ONSLOW said, this matter, which was, no doubt, a very important one, had been much considered in that part of the country which he had the honour to represent, and had also been the subject of allusion in the Queen's Speech. He thought, therefore, the House should be informed by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board whether the Bill, for which a second reading was asked, was likely to interfere with the measure introduced by Her Majesty's Government in "another place?" He would be the last to oppose any remedy for the grievous state of things caused in many parts of the country by the overflowing of rivers; but he had not expected that a Bill of such importance would be brought in at that hour of the night. Very few hon. Members interested in the question had any idea that this would be the case; and for that reason he appealed to the hon. Member for Bedford to allow the Bill to stand over till some more opportune time. Her Majesty's Government having introduced a Bill dealing with the subject in "another place," it certainly appeared somewhat inconsistent that a private Member should also bring a Bill of the same character before the House. No doubt, the Bill of the hon. Member for Bedford was important, and would probably do a great deal of good. At the same time, it was quite impossible to consider it properly at half-past 12 o'clock; and he would, therefore, ask him to defer the second reading to a more convenient moment.

MR. MAGNIAC said, his object in asking for the second reading of the Bill that night was in order to place it in such a position as would be most convenient for referring it to a select Committee together with the Bill which he understood would come down from the Lords, supposing that the Bill should be passed in "another place," and be sent down for consideration. Without criticizing the other Bill, he had made himself acquainted with its provisions, some of which appeared to him less preferable than those contained in his own Bill, and *vice versâ*. But he did not think any measure would satisfy the country unless it was referred to a Select Committee, in which it could be considered with greater care than in that House. It was a Bill full of detail and questions affecting private interests of bodies that in the course of the last 500 years had been created by Acts of Parliament. He felt sure it would be the desire of the House to submit the various questions of private interests to the full and fair consideration which they would receive at the hands of a Select Committee.

MR. DODSON: I do not rise for the purpose of offering any opposition to the second reading of my hon. Friend's Bill. He has devoted a great deal of time and attention to this subject, and is himself a very competent authority to speak upon it. The Government, at the solicitation of a deputation of which my hon. Friend was a member, have introduced a Bill upon this subject in "another place," which, looking at the state of Business in this House, I think was the best course to pursue. I trust it will pass the House of Lords and come down here; and it is my intention, as at present advised, to move that it be referred to a Select Committee, for the purpose of carefully considering its clauses. Now, the proposal of the hon. Member is, that his Bill also should be referred to the Select Committee. In saying that I have no objection to the second reading of this Bill, I must couple it with the request that he will not press it to any further stage before the Government Bill, now in the other House, is discussed here. I hope my hon. Friend will be a Member of any Select Committee that may be appointed for the consideration of that Bill, and that I shall, in any case, have the benefit of his assistance in passing it; but I cannot now enter into any engagement with him with respect to referring his Bill to a Select Committee. But my hon. Friend will be able to move any provision of his Bill as an Amendment to the Government Bill, whether it goes to a Select Committee or not. As I am desirous that a question of such importance should be settled in the present Session, I am only afraid that if we attempt to ride two horses at once we may come to the ground between them; and that is my sole reason for abstaining from giving my hon. Friend any undertaking at present.

Mr. MAGNIAC said, he only wished to get a Bill passed that Session. He should do all in his power to further the passage of a good measure, whether it was his own or that of the Government. He had, on a former occasion, given way with regard to this Bill, in order to facilitate the Business of the House, and he trusted that it would now be read a second time.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he rose for the purpose of moving the adjournment of the debate. It was then 20 minutes to 1 o'clock, and it was utterly impossible at that time to begin a discussion upon a Bill of such magnitude as the present, and to go through a debate on the second reading with anything approaching a second reading discussion. Her Majesty's Government had taken the subject into their hands, and had introduced an important Bill into the House of Lords, and the discussion which would take place there would be of great advantage to the public in dealing with the question. There was also a Private Bill before the House, which, when considered, he ventured to think would be found of an objectionable character — that introduced by the Thames Conservancy Board with respect to the River Thames. It was a matter of surprise that the Government had not found themselves in a position to include in their Bill provisions relating to the River Thames. Taking that into consideration, together with the fact that few hon. Members had any idea that the Bill of the hon. Member for Bedford would be taken that evening, he thought the House would see the advantage of adjourning the debate until such time as they were in possession of the Government views upon the subject, and the course likely to be taken with regard to the Bill relating to the River Thames.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Lord Randolph Churchill.*)

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I hope the House will not accede to the Motion of the noble Lord. The noble Lord entered the House after the discussion of this Bill had continued for some time, and is probably not aware of what has taken place. Hon. Members opposite were, I think, perfectly justified in asking that the Bill should be placed in a position to be referred to a Select Committee. Everyone has agreed that no inconvenience can possibly arise from the second reading; and I can assure the noble Lord that he will have, in the course of the present Session, every opportunity of considering its provisions. Everyone knows there are other Bills on the subject, and that it will be an advantage to the Committee to have their provisions before them.

Mr. GORST complained that a Member could not ask a question about a Bill brought in at that time in the morning without some Member of the Government getting up and charging hon. Members with a desire to obstruct. If any other Member but the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary had made such a charge he would probably have taken more serious notice of it; but, under the circumstances, he thought it might be passed by. The question was, whether this Bill should pass the House without any discussion at all at 1 o'clock in the morning? Nobody had supposed that the discussion would come on, and it was quite by accident that anybody was there who had ever considered the Bill, or had had any knowledge of the subject-matter of it. He did not understand that the proposition made by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board was that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. He should like to know what the proposal was if it was not that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. He did not understand the observations of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, because he had just stated that the only object for reading the Bill a second time was that it should be in a position to be referred to a Select Committee. If there was no such intention, then what was the good of putting it into a position to be referred to a Select Committee? Before the House decided the question, he should like some Member of the Government, or someone who was in charge of the Bill, to say whether the Bill was to be referred to a Select Committee or not. If it was, he did not see any very strong objection to reading it a second time for that purpose; but if it was not to be referred to a Select Committee, he should certainly support his noble Friend in resisting the second reading at that hour without any discussion at all.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that, under the circumstances, he should not press his Motion; but he had been perfectly serious in the proposition he made. He might be permitted to explain that he represented a constituency several parts of which bordered on the Thames, and were greatly damaged by floods, and he certainly had no idea that the Bill would be brought in that night. He thought that the charge of Obstruction made by the Home Secretary was decidedly uncalled for; but, under the circumstances, he would not press his Motion to a division.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. GORST wished to know, whether the Home Secretary or the President of the Local Government Board was right? Was the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee or not? Because the conduct of himself and his noble Friend would depend upon that.

MR. DODSON: The hon. and learned Member for Chatham seems to believe that there is a discrepancy between my statement and that of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary. I said that I would not object to the second reading of the Bill. The hon. Member who has charge of it (Mr. Magniac) said he wished to have it read a second time, in order that it might be in a position to be referred to the same Select Committee as that to which the Government Bill might be referred. I said, upon that, I would support a second reading; but I would reserve my judgment in regard to further action. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, repeating the words of the hon. Member who moved the second reading of the Bill, said he agreed that the Bill should be placed in a position for reference to a Select Committee.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, the question was simply this—the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Magniac) said if the Bill was read a second time he should be prepared to refer it to a Select Committee. On that understanding, he had no objection to that course.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

BARRISTERS' ADMISSION (IRELAND) BILL.—[BILL 54.]

(*Mr. Callan, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gray.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. CALLAN, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it had been in the hands of hon. Members for some time; and he wished to explain that the measure had two clauses, with one object. In the reign of Henry VIII.—when, apparently, it was considered that Ireland was in a barbarous condition, and that it should be civilized by a course of dinners at the Inns of Court in London—a Bill was passed which this measure proposed to do away with. Leave was given in 1859, by a majority of 56 in a House of upwards of 300, to introduce a Bill for a similar object; but it was not proceeded with in consequence of a circumstance that sometimes happened unexpectedly—a General Election—and the parties interested retired into private life. Since he had had the honour of a seat in the House he had twice introduced a Bill on the subject; but Notice of Motion under the half-past 12 Rule had prevented his going on with it. There was no Notice of opposition to the Bill; but, seeing that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin was about to rise, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman objected he would be prepared to propose that the Bill should be read a second time, and then to name a Committee and give time for it to be considered.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Mr. PLUNKET said, he hoped the second reading of the Bill would not be agreed to. His right hon. and learned Friend the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) had left London that night for Ireland; but he would take the course which he knew that his right hon. and learned Friend intended to take. He did not propose to raise a long debate at that time of night; but he wished to state exactly how the matter stood. The hon. Member who moved the second reading said he would have no objection to some postponement, in order that the matter might be referred to the Benchers in Ireland. But there was no reason for any postponement for that purpose, because he had in his possession a letter from the Secretary to the Benchers of King's Inn requesting him to oppose the Bill. A similar letter had been sent to his right hon. and learned Friend the late Attorney General for Ireland, who had left London entirely under the impression that the Bill would be resisted by the Government. This matter had been before the Benchers in Dublin again and again—in 1874, in 1878, and he believed, also, only a few days ago, when the Secretary was, as he understood, directed to forward to the Irish Executive resolutions in favour of resisting that proposal. It was an old practice that required students at the Irish Bar to eat a certain number of dinners in London, and that practice had been found to work very beneficially. The Benchers thought that it should be maintained, believing that its abandonment would have a prejudicial effect. He had practised for some time at the Irish Bar, and he never heard the system complained of. It had been found most useful for the younger men preparing for the Irish Bar to come and spend some time in London. They only came for four terms out of twelve; and it had been found that, among other advantages, it had led to valuable study in London, where it was very desirable that the students should have an opportunity of studying the English law as it was taught there. The ground upon which he requested the Government to assist him in resisting the Bill was that it was the unanimous opinion of the Benchers, who were the custodians of the interests of the Bar in Ireland, that the Bill would be very injurious if it became law. They had requested him and the Irish Government to resist the Bill; and, therefore, he trusted that they would not assent to the second reading. If it was now read a second time it would come by surprise to all who opposed it, because they were entirely under the impression that it was the intention of the Government to resist it.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN wished to understand what it was the right hon. and learned Gentleman wished to preserve to Irish law students. Perhaps he had informed the House that it was the privilege of eating a certain number of dinners. Well, there was nothing more enjoyable than a good dinner in London, unless it was a good dinner in Dublin; but the right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke as if by the consumption of beef and mutton there was to be swallowed a vast amount of legal lore. If the Irish students were asked to attend lectures in London, he could understand, and might even support, the opposition; but what advantage was there to a student coming to London by the night-mail, going through his dinners as fast as he could, and speeding back to Dublin? He had heard this question debated before. The practice was said to promote genial intercourse. That he could understand. He was for promoting genial intercourse; but he was astonished at the right hon. and learned Gentleman supporting that relic of barbarism. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had been a lecturer on law himself, and he knew that the reason of this practice was the idea of training Irish barbarism to learn the manners and dress of the English people. Yet he had come there to say that the Benchers in Ireland desired to continue the practice. Would he inform the House what for? If he could feel sure that the Irish students would get some legal instruction in London he would support the opposition. But he objected to the maintenance of this absurd law, which compelled students to come to London to eat so many dinners, and then to go back to Ireland, knowing nothing of learning, nothing of the law which was so admirably taught in London; but, perhaps, knowing what they ought not to know or see in London or anywhere else.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I do not precisely see the reason upon which this regulation is based. I do not know that the eating of dinners at the English Bar is of any great service. It may be; but I do not precisely see what is the advantage to the Irish barrister of eating these English dinners, and I can quite conceive that there is considerable expense in coming here for that purpose. I think that what the hon. Member (Mr. Callan) suggested was fair, that if the Bill was read a second time he would give an abundance of time for representations to be made from Ireland; and to any persons in Ireland who might be opposed to it to bring their objections before the House for further consideration. I cannot see that there is anything that need prevent us from reading the Bill a second time; but it must be distinctly understood that, in assenting to that, we reserve our power to take another course in Committee, if we find anything between now and then to make that necessary; and I now suppose there must be reasons against the Bill, or hon. Members would not have such strong feelings as they have about it. The reasons are not given to-night, and I cannot see how we can oppose the second reading, although we reserve our power.

MR. SEXTON could not see, in what had been said from the Front Opposition Bench, a scintilla of argument in favour of the present system. No doubt, the Benchers in Dublin and the late Attorney General for Ireland thought it should be maintained; but he thought the House would consider it upon its merits. It simply amounted to a heavy fine on Irish students, and he would remind the House that they had more than once petitioned against it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said, he understood that there was a very strong feeling among Irish Members in favour of maintaining the system; and he should like to know whether the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland, who was in the House, would give the House the reasons which had induced the Government to differ from the right hon. and learned Gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): It may be my misfortune on this occasion; but I am myself one of the Benchers. I have not had the opportunity of formally communicating with the Benchers in Ireland. But I have received from the Under Treasurer the Resolutions which have been mentioned, and they are of the most absolute character. They are a repetition of what has been resolved by them over and over again, and laid before the House, in 1872, in 1874, and in 1878.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Which way did their opinions go?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): Against any change.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN wished, before this matter was decided, to say that this requirement for Irish law students to spend a portion of their time in London, the only object being to eat a certain number of dinners there, was regarded by a very large number of people in his country as an insult to the Irish nation. He had certain knowledge of the fact. The custom against which he protested had come down from a time when the Irish people were regarded as barbarians, and when it was considered essential for the learning of law, or the learning of anything else, that Irishmen should come over to England to get some notion of civilization, of art and science, in London. There were schools of law existing in Ireland at the present moment perfectly capable of preparing students for the Profession. What was gained by requiring those students to come over here? Certainly, no good. They came over for a holiday, knocked about London for a short time, and then went back no wiser in law than when they came, and, he feared, not better men. As he had said, the arrangement was regarded as one dating from ancient times, and, as to the Benchers and their opposition to any interference with it, the fact was they were not a reforming body. They would perpetuate the arrangement if they possibly could. The spirit of reform was not amongst them; but if hon. Members would go to the law students of Ireland and ask their opinion on the matter, he would be bound to say they would tell a very different story.

Mr. LITTON said, he had not the honour to be a Bencher, although he had great respect for those who were. He had, however, had some experience of the Irish Bar, and he thought he could give the House the opinion of the great majority of gentlemen there engaged. He believed the great majority of Irish barristers would vote unanimously for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON only wished to say one word on the matter. It had always appeared to him to be a great injustice that gentlemen studying for the Irish Bar should be obliged to spend a portion of their time in London in order to study what they could study equally well in Dublin. He looked upon it as a sort of penalty inflicted on Irish students. Ireland had produced some of the most distinguished members of the Bar, and when they considered the great attainments those gentlemen brought to the Profession in Ireland—advantages derived from their great University—he thought they might well adopt the proposed reform.

Mr. WARTON did not think the view taken of this matter by the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. T. D. Sullivan), that the existing arrangement was an insult to the Irish nation, was the right view of the question. That was the first occasion, he believed, on which the subject had been brought before the House in the long catalogue of so-called Irish grievances. It had struck him as somewhat curious that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, with all the various cares and anxieties of his present position on him, and the numerous reflections which had been cast upon his past and present policy staring him in the face, had managed to take upon himself the conduct of another Department of State and to usurp the functions of the Law Officers of the Crown. He (Mr. Warton) would not say what he thought of the right hon. Gentleman's conduct; but, as a Member of the English Bar, he had certainly felt a little of—he would not say what—when he observed the course taken by the Chief Secretary. He knew the right hon. Gentleman's power in Ireland, still did not believe that he was quite omniscient, or that he was the right officer of the Government to rise on such a subject as this. The opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown, and those who had held that position in the former Government, ought to be taken before the House came to a conclusion on this subject. From the statement of the Solicitor General for Ireland it was clear that the Irish Benchers had remonstrated every time it had been sought to pass such a measure as this, and he thought that some respect ought to be paid to the opinion of those gentlemen. [An hon. Member: The Benchers are not the Bar.] No, it was true the Benchers were not the Bar; but the Benchers kept the Bar in order, and sometimes even the Irish Bar required keeping in order. The gentlemen at the Bar ought to obey their superiors, and the Benchers who unanimously protested against this Bill ought to be obeyed in the present instance. The hon. and most learned Member for Tyrone (Mr. Litton), who was interrupting him, had made use of a peculiar expression in his speech. He had said that the unanimous feeling of part of the Bar was in favour of this alteration. No doubt, also, those who objected to it were unanimously against it; but that kind of argument or expression was hardly of a legal character. The subject was one of importance, and seriousness; and, especially when they heard these inflammatory statements about insult to the Irish nation, it was incumbent on them to keep their heads clear in considering it. The importance of discipline was manifest, and when they saw that there was not a single voice raised amongst the Irish Benchers in support of the alteration they should be careful how they interfered with the existing state of things. It was not for them to sneer at eating dinners. They ought to resist the measure in deference to the Benchers, for it was for that body and the Law Officers of the Crown alone to decide and to resist it also, because of the moment at which it was brought in. No one had expected the Bill; even the Chief Secretary had not known what was taking place when it was brought on. The right hon. Gentleman could make up his mind rapidly, in a moment of time, on a matter that did not at all concern him.

Mr. CALLAN wished to save the House from a waste of time. Looking at the spirit in which his proposal had been received, he was sorry that he had made it; but, in order that there should be no division, would it not be well to put off naming the Committee until that day month? If that suggestion were not accepted, and the House was forced to proceed to a division, and if the measure was read a second time, he would fix the Committee for to-morrow.

MR. PLUNKET said, he had no right to speak again; but perhaps the House would grant him indulgence for a moment. He would not put them to the trouble of dividing, as he knew he should not succeed; and, under the circumstances, he would not resist the suggestion of the Chief Secretary, it being understood that the course to be pursued subsequently should be left quite open. It was not a very usual practice on Bills of this kind to agree to a second reading under such circumstances, still he should not object further.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* 24th February.

COMMONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider every Report made by the Inclosure Commissioners certifying the expediency of any Provisional Order for the inclosure or regulation of a common, and presented to the House during the last or present Sessions, before a Bill be brought in for the confirmation of such Order:—That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power in respect to each such Provisional Order, to inquire and report to the House whether the same should be confirmed by Parliament, and, if so, whether with or without modification; and, in the event of their being of opinion that the same should not be confirmed, except subject to modifications, to report such modifications accordingly with a view to such Provisional Order being remitted to the Inclosure Commissioners: — That the Committee do consist of Mr. SPENCER WALPOLE, Mr. LEVESON GOWER, Sir WALTER BARTTELOT, Mr. PELL, Mr. ASHTON DILKE, Mr. BRYCE, and Five Members to be nominated by the Committee of Selection:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (JUSTICES DISQUALIFICATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. PUGH, Bill to amend "The Licensing Act, 1872," so far as relates to the Disqualification of Justices, by making the Disqualification of Justices who are retailers of intoxicating drink absolute within the districts specified in the Act, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. PUGH, Sir EDWARD REED, and Mr. RENDEL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 77.]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 28*th January,* 1881.

SOUTH AFRICA — THE TRANSVAAL (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—REPULSE OF A BRITISH FORCE.

QUESTION.

EARL CADOGAN: As I see the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies in his place, I wish to ask him, Whether he has received any further information with reference to the advance in the Transvaal?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: I am sorry to say that Her Majesty's Government have received unfavourable information on the subject. We have just received a telegram from Sir George Colley, the General Officer Commanding in Natal, addressed to the Secretary of State for War, and dated the 28th of January. It is as follows:—

> "Attack on Pass repulsed. Casualties heavy; not yet known. I hold the camp three miles from Neck until arrival of reinforcements."

AFGHANISTAN—CANDAHAR.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

LORD WAVENEY, on rising to move—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that Candahar with the dependent territory be constituted into an emporium of trade and commerce under British administration and government,"

said, he had brought the question forward last Session without being able to arrive at any practical result; but he should, on the present occasion, base his argument mainly upon Papers which had been issued by the Government since the date of his last addressing their Lordships on the subject. He would state, at the outset, that, in his opinion, the behaviour of the Wali of Candahar had rendered it unnecessary for us to take him into consideration in any arrangement which might be made with regard to that City. The two Afghan wars in which we had been engaged, and which had cost so many soldiers and so much money, had proceeded on a hypothesis which facts had fully refuted, and the time had come when a more enduring system of policy than that which we had hitherto attempted should be conceived. The history of Afghanistan had for a long time been one of intrigue based, now on tribal impetuosity, and now on the influence of foreign Powers, this last being an inevitable factor in all questions of the kind. A strong and homogeneous Afghanistan had never existed certainly since the time of Dost Mahommed. The despotism by which it was ruled was a fortunate accident; and as soon as the place of the Ruler had to be supplied intrigues arose on the one side and on the other with the object of securing foreign aid. He was, therefore surprised to find that, in the opinion of several Members of their Lordships' House, Russian intrigue, or intrigue with Russia, in this matter was a fiction and a myth. Soldiers and diplomatists had an undoubted value; but on many occasions they had failed in attempting to deal with Asiatic intrigues and Asiatic governmental arrangements. It was impossible to tell from day to day what might happen in any part of Afghanistan which was not dominated by British sentries. They did not know what might occur at Cabul; but it was clear there was disquiet. He held that we had gained nothing of certainty by the conflicts in which we had been engaged in Afghanistan; and with respect to the cost of those struggles we had not only lost many valuable lives, but had seen in the confusion of our Indian finances how uncertain the financial end of any war might be. We had, therefore, gained nothing by these two wars, which had cost from £35,000,000 to £40,000,000. It was very difficult to ascertain what the positive cost of these wars had been, owing to the confusion into which our system of Indian finance had fallen. In addition, however, to the money expenditure, they had to take into account the injury done to industry and commerce; for war was notoriously a destroyer and waster. But what had they to expect for the future? He feared they had to expect from the system they had hitherto adopted the possible recurrence of disasters such as they had already experienced. That, too, appeared to be the opinion of the noble Marquess the present Viceroy. He could only say that if the future was to see a repetition of the past, there would be many men whose hearts now burn within them at the relinquishing of Candahar, who would say—"We have lost the power of governing, and it is folly for us to think of extending our Empire beyond the Indus." He felt so deeply what he believed our countrymen beyond the Ganges felt no less—that we had yet the power of retaining the fruit of the conquest we had made beyond the Indus—that he could not refrain from bringing the subject before their Lordships. The Indian Secretary, in his despatch of the 21st of May, stated as his objection to the retention of Candahar that permanent service beyond the Indus would be extremely distasteful to the Native soldiers of India. But if Candahar was, as he held it to be, a most important addition to our territory, could not that difficulty be got over by the employment of Natives of the country, already favourably known in our Native wars? Then, again, the noble Marquess also contended that our interference in the affairs of Afghanistan, so far from tending to the establishment of a large and powerful Kingdom, had rather led to the disintegration of the country, and to the establishment of small Provinces under independent Chiefs; and he had also called attention to the objections entertained to the officers to be placed at Candahar on behalf of the British Government; but that, in his opinion, was no reason for giving up our hold upon that City. It also appeared, by the despatches, that the only reason why the Government supported Yakoob Khan was because they had found it utterly impossible to secure a better successor for Shere Ali, or one more likely to prove a strong Ruler in Afghanistan, which hope, however, had entirely failed. There was, indeed, nothing in his opinion, in the aspect of affairs in Afghanistan which justified the Government in giving up the advantages which they had gained by the expenditure of so much blood and treasure. Candahar, it should be remembered, had not always been an integral portion of Afghan territory. For centuries it was either Persian or under the rule of what might be called an invading Power. It had been said that Afghanistan could not be strong and united without Candahar; but, as he read it, General Sir Frederick Roberts was of opinion that for the future Candahar should be separated from Cabul. He did not cast the slightest doubt upon the transparent honour of the noble Marquess; but he wished to point out how very uncertain it appeared, even upon his own showing, whether, under any circumstances, security could be obtained, should we retire from Candahar. Abdurrahman did not seem to answer all the requirements of the case as a Ruler, and it was altogether doubtful whether a successor to him could be found. He (Lord Waveney) believed it would take but little to make Candahar a second Gibraltar under British rule—not only as a military fortress, but by the moral strength it would afford to the protection of our Frontier, in which respect it would be more powerful than any number of troops we might place there. For his part, he thought that we ought to stand and rely upon our own strength, and think less of any Powers which lay beyond our boundary. Hitherto we had been the victims of the fallacy that our advance was to depend more upon military than upon moral strength; we had looked at the matter too much from the point of view of the soldier, and had trusted too much to the bayonet instead of the cultivation of friendly relations not dependent on military force. As to the importance or otherwise of the advance of Russia, he agreed that if the British and Russian sentries could send their challenges from post to post we should be just as able to contend with Russia as we should if the Frontiers were long distances apart; but he did not agree with the notion that the military strength of Russia was not increased by conquest. That view ignored the manner in which the conquests were carried out and utilized. Her plan was to send the men of the newly-acquired territory to the rear, and bring back the next generation to the Frontier, and in this way to make the people of the conquered districts facilitate her advance. The Candahar territory was described by General Stewart as nearly forming an equilateral triangle with a side of 400 miles. On the map of Great Britain the points of such a triangle would be the Scilly Islands, Great Yarmouth, and Inverary; but it must be remembered that in Afghanistan there were rocks and torrents, which impeded the advance of troops and made it more easy to fortify a few defensive positions. Of the military opinions that had been expressed, the smaller number were in favour of the abandonment of Candahar. It was too generally assumed that the road from Merv to Candahar must lie through Herat; but there was a *détour* to the south touching on the border of the great desert. The Afghans were not universally opposed to us; they were susceptible to the softening and modifying influences of our civilization. The Afghans were not Natives of Candahar; the people of Candahar objected to the Afghans; and the only advice the Wali gave to General Primrose was to turn the Afghans out of Candahar as soon as he could. On the occasion of all disturbances at Candahar the Afghans had been put out of the City. All these facts showed that we did not need a *plébiscite* to justify our occupation of Candahar, which was ours by right of conquest. The question of the occupation of a territory conquered by a more civilized from a less civilized people was one of the problems of life of which we must hope we had done our best to find a right solution. If we were to recede from all the territory we had taken in his time we should stop 1,800 miles from Calcutta on one side and at the Assam tea gardens on the other. But, so far, the soldier and the diplomatist, with all their great powers, had not secured what we desired. No doubt they had secured us magnificent military positions; but if we were to abandon some of these, or even only to retain them, the result would be a truncated, dwarfed, and miserable termination to all our advances. It would be unwise to stop the railway at the point up to which it was now finished. If it were completed to Candahar a gun from Woolwich Arsenal could be placed on the ramparts of Candahar in six weeks, and a bale of goods from Manchester would be placed in the bazaars of Central Asia within the same period. They might, and they should, withdraw the defence of the Candahar district absolutely and positively from the roster of the Indian Service. He had been informed on competent authority that no large force would be required for the defence of the City of Candahar itself. It would be unnecessary for this purpose to take any Indian soldiers beyond the Indus, because they could get hardier and cheaper soldiers in the Beloochees. He was told that with two brigades, one at Candahar and another below the Passes, the defence of the territory would be perfectly secured. The main point should be this—they should adopt as the principle of English policy the celebrated words of Victor Emmanuel, "We are at Rome and there we will remain"—"We are at Candahar and there we will remain;" and he thought few would have the hardihood to attempt to gainsay them. It was said this was a question of cost. That had been put down at £1,500,000 yearly, but then it was not an excessive estimate to put down the cost of the two Afghan wars at £35,000,000, so that the £1,500,000 was simply the interest of the expenses of two wars. Since 1849 we had also been obliged to carry on 22 small Frontier wars, which would cost at least £1,000,000 more. That expense we should avoid, for we should be masters of our own ground, defending our own territory. Thus, too, we should be walking on the old lines which had always been found congenial and consentaneous in England. The interests of commerce would greatly gain from such a policy. He would refer their Lordships to an extract from the work of Mr. Atkinson, recently a traveller on the Upper and Lower Amoor, showing how largely English manufactures would be purchased in Central Asia. Men from the most fanatical races of the Afghans passed into our territory every year with their wives and children. They were as many as 5,000 or 6,000, and were armed. They fought their way through the hills, crossed the Indus, and carried their merchandise into Northern India. To show in what light they regarded us it would be sufficient to say that when they passed into our territory they willingly laid aside their arms and lived there under our protection. But if they had the means of passing through our territory to their trade grounds, they would prefer to go by way of Candahar rather than through the hills. He had now explained the motives which had induced him to bring forward this Motion. If we were not to withdraw ourselves entirely it would be essential that we should stand on our own basis. He could not pass over the great future he anticipated from a thorough settlement of the British power in that country. It could be placed and maintained there without injury to England and with advantage to all. It could be placed and maintained there without expense to the country which it represented, to the encouragement of kindly and good feeling, and to the civilization of the wild Tribes. Commerce was always a civilizing agency, and in the early history of Europe, when it was rising from the barbarism of the dark ages, almost before feudalism existed, it was trade that revived civilization. This aspect of the case was particularly suitable to England. What was Calcutta but an armed factory? What else were Madras, Hong Kong, Singapore, and all those places which had become the centres of British rule, commerce, and civilization? He therefore begged to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that Candahar with the dependent territory be constituted into an emporium of trade and commerce under British administration and government. — (*The Lord Waveney.*)

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, that, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, it was his duty to say "Not Content" to the Motion of the noble and gallant Lord. Before, however, he made any observations with regard to the commercial, military, and political aspects of this question, he would refer to a remark made by his noble Friend with respect to the moral and the lesson we should draw from past Afghan Wars, and in particular from the war of 1841 and 1842. The moral and the lesson he would draw would be somewhat different from that of his noble and gallant Friend—it would be that for the future we should abstain from interfering with the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington in 1842 did not think it inconsistent with the honour and dignity of this country to withdraw from participation in the affairs of that country. And though, under the blessing of Providence, we had not had in the late war to deplore such a disaster as that which befel the British troops in the Khyber Pass and at Jellalabad, we might well do what those great statesmen did in 1842 without loss of dignity either to the Crown or the country. He would first approach the military question; and on this point he would say that we should, in the first place, consider exactly what was meant by holding Candahar and the dependent territory. If he was not mistaken, his noble and gallant Friend under-estimated the extent of the territory which would be comprised supposing, in the words of the Motion—

> "Candahar with the dependent territory were constituted into an emporium of trade and commerce under British administration and government."

If their Lordships would refer to what Sir Donald Stewart said in his definition of the dependent territory, they would find it extended very much further than his noble Friend seemed to suppose. In the Blue Book, page 10, Sir Donald Stewart thus defined it—

> "The minimum boundaries of the State over which the independent authority of the Sirdar is to be acknowledged have already been practically fixed and include the province of Candahar proper, excluding the assigned districts of Sibi and Pishin, with possibly that part of Afghan Seistan watered only by the Helmand; the district of Khelat-i-Ghilzai, separated from Candahar in 1855; the districts of Pusht-i-Rud and Zamindawar, separated about nine years ago; and the district of Farah, originally belonging to Herat, but which has formed a separate province since the capture of that city by the Ameer of Cabul in 1863 . . . Supposing Kharan and the adjacent desert to remain attached to Candahar, the State thus formed would be shown in the map by an irregular figure, not far removed from an equilateral triangle, with sides nearly 400 miles in length, and covering about 70,000 square miles. A very small portion of this is cultivated or even cultivable. The number of inhabitants I am inclined to place somewhere between half a million and a million."

Upon that he would venture to assert that his noble and gallant Friend was very sanguine if he thought that one brigade there and one in the Passes would be sufficient. Now, with regard to the commercial aspect of the question. It was not very easy to arrive at any very definite information with regard to what had been the commerce of Afghanistan or Candahar of late years. The best information on that point would be found in Colonel Macgregor's *Gazetteer of Afghanistan,* which had been compiled from the inquiries of such able men as Sir A. Burnes, Dr. Bellew, Sir R. H. Davies, Major Leech, Sir H. Lumsden, Major D'Arcy Todd, Lieutenant Postans, &c. Perhaps some few extracts might be now quoted—

> "The Hindoos are the most numerous and wealthiest merchants. They trade with Bombay *viâ* Shikarpur and Kurrachee. They import British produce, such as silk, calicoes, woollen cloths, and Indian produce, such as indigo and spices; they export productions of Afghanistan to India, such as madder, assafoetida, wool, preserved fruits, tobacco, felts, raw silk, &c., besides Persian produce."
>
> "Until 1841 trade was considerable. In 1843 the return of Kohendil Khan drove away principal merchants by his spoliation and tyranny at Candahar. On Dost Mahommed's getting possession of the city, trade recovered."

In the same book, Dr. Bellew gave an interesting account of the agriculture of that province, and Sir H. Lumsden's statements respecting the horse trade were worth reading. The routes followed by the trade were (between Candahar and British India) the Ghawaibra, the Thull-Chotiali, and the Bolan Pass routes. The value of caravans passing through the Bolan from April 1 of 1876 to December 31, amounted to 20,68,772 rupees. In 1877, owing to the disturbances in Khelat, trade diminished. In the latter part of the year it revived, owing to the good arrangements made by Sir Robert Sandeman. In the first six months of 1878 the traffic amounted to 15,57,049 rupees. The Powindahs, or the great soldier-traders of Afghanistan, ought also to be mentioned. Mr. Andrew, in his interesting book, *Our Scientific Frontier*, gave an account of them full of valuable information with regard to the trade of Afghanistan. Mr. Andrew said, "As a rule, the Powindah clans have been on friendly terms with the British." From other books and reports on this subject, he thought he was justified in saying that our previous relations with the various Tribes in Afghan territory had never interfered in any way with the fair development of trade and commerce both into India and from India. He might also quote another authority, who was not very sanguine as to the probable result of the retention of Candahar, from a commercial point of view, and whose knowledge was derived from recent residence in Southern Afghanistan. In a lecture lately delivered in London, Lieutenant Colonel James Browne, of the Royal Engineers, had said—

> "The idea that by retaining Candahar, by developing its agricultural and trade resources, we could make it pay its expenses is another illusion, as under British administration it would not pay a tithe of the cost of its occupation. Let anyone who knows both Peshawur and Candahar, and their relative trade, agriculture, and distance from the Indus, consider the fact that after 32 years of English administration the revenues of the Peshawur district are entirely inadequate, in time of peace, to pay for its garrison. In face of such a fact can it be gravely argued that Candahar might be made

to pay for the expenses of a garrison on a war footing?"

Further on, Colonel Browne said—

> "It is sometimes supposed that by occupying Candahar we might develope to our advantage a great Central Asian trade, and remove the vexatious dues which have hindered its expansion. This is a pretty theory founded on European ideas of civilized trade. As a matter of fact, the dues on Central Asian trade are levied at Herat and Maimaneh and Balkh, and will not be in the least degree affected by our holding Candahar."

And further on, Colonel Browne said—

> "The Englishman, as a caravan merchant, has nothing to teach the Afghan, who is quite able to take care of himself, without our fussy attempts at protection."

He now approached the military aspect of the question, and, in doing so, he wished to assure the House that no one would speak of military authorities with greater respect than himself; but it might be said of them that they sometimes left out of sight the financial and political considerations that entered into the questions on which they pronounced. The chief military consideration was the number of men that would be required for the occupation of Candahar, and he believed that his noble and gallant Friend had given too low an estimate of the force that would be necessary. Authorities said that to occupy the city and the adjacent territory 20,000 men would be required, and they, perhaps, might be forthcoming; but another question arose as to the composition of the force. Would the climate of Candahar suit Europeans all the year round, and would not Native troops so dislike prolonged absence from home as seriously to affect the recruiting of the Indian Army? Then, again, it was said that the campaign was not directed against the Sirdars and people of Afghanistan, but against Shere Ali for receiving a Russian and rejecting a British Embassy, and with the object, subsequently, of avenging the murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari and his companions. That being so, why should the Candaharis suffer vicariously for acts committed by the Ruler and people of Cabul? The chief argument, however, for the retention of Candahar, was the alleged fear of Russian intrigue and invasion, and it was argued that if Russia moved upou Merv we must send an army to Herat, and if she moved in another direction that we must occupy Cabul. But, in either case, it would probably be better, in a strategical sense, to await her nearer our base, nearer our supplies, our reserves, and our communications. An Artillery officer of distinction, in discussing the question some time ago, had used the following words:—

> "Suppose that Russia is bent on an invasion of India and has assembled a great army for that purpose. Suppose that such an army is being transported over the sterile steppes of Central Asia, and that we in England are informed, as we must be, of her march and its intended object. Not to confuse the subject, we will neglect all idea of acting on the flank of her advance, and imagine that it is intended to meet the invasion with a simple check in front. At what point ought the battle-field to be selected? Is there a single reasonable being who will deliberately say that we ought to resign all our advantages of nearness to our base, fulness of supplies, and easy communication with home, for the childish pleasure of going forward to meet an enemy? If the Afghans are our friends, they will act as an advanced guard; if they are hostile, surely it is better that they should be in front of us rather than behind us."

And even that gallant and distinguished General, Sir Frederick Roberts, while advocating the retention of Candahar from a military point of view, had said—

> "It may not be very flattering to our *amour propre*, but I feel sure I am right when I say that the less the Afghans see of us the less they will dislike us. Should Russia, in future years, attempt to conquer Afghanistan, or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime. The military occupation of Candahar is, as I have before stated, of vital importance; even there we should make our presence but little felt, merely controlling the foreign policy of the Ruler of that province."

He ventured to ask whether it would not be almost impossible to occupy a city in a military fashion, controlling at the same time the foreign policy of the Ruler of the province, and yet "making our presence but little felt?" However, the chief objection to the suggested policy was that we should be holding Candahar contrary to the wishes of the people, contrary to previous assertions that we did not contemplate further territorial acquisitions, and, while we had no quarrel with the Afghans, because we feared the possible advance some day or other of another people, with whom at present we were on terms of friendship, and who, to do us any injury, would have to advance many hundred miles from their base through a country which, in all human probability, would not receive them with open arms either as their allies or their deliverers. One other point was this—that, speaking, of course, on the authority of competent military authorities, the entire cost of the occupation of Candahar and the adjacent territory would not be less, in all probability, than £1,400,000 per annum, while the amount of revenue might be calculated at 20½ lakhs a-year. He now came to the political considerations, the chief of which were, in the first place, that we should continually be mixed up in local quarrels, and that our interference would be both unpopular and dangerous. Next, there would always be the danger of an explosion of fanatical rage against us, which might compel us to take up arms openly against the people of Afghanistan. Thirdly, the occupation might only be the prelude to the further demands from the "advanced policy" Party. In his despatch of the 11th of November, the Marquess of Hartington said on this point—

"But they cannot believe that the measure which is now advocated would really satisfy the demands of those who propose it. They are inclined rather to believe that it would only be the first step towards still more extensive enterprise. In the despatch of your predecessor's Government of the 7th of July, 1879, they said, in discussing the question of the retention of Candahar, 'The local experience recently acquired by our expedition into Western Afghanistan, has fully confirmed our previous impression that the stragetic value of Candahar exists only in connection with a system of frontier defence, much more extensive than any we now require or have ever contemplated. Whether this be an accurate statement of the strategic value of Candahar or not, it cannot, I think, be doubted that its acquisition as a permanent military post would quickly be followed by fresh apprehensions as to its security, and further demands for the completion of a system of defence of which it would be represented to constitute only a part."

Lastly, the injustice of any annexation or permanent military occupation in Afghanistan had to be considered. The wisest and clearest heads on Indian matters deprecated our adding to our territory and to our responsibilities, and we might well rest content with our former acquisitions, such as Sinde, the Punjab, Oude, Sattarah, Jansi, Nagpore, and Pegu. The policy of Her Majesty's Government on this question was quite clear. There had been no "scuttling out of Afghanistan;" but at the conclusion of the despatch of the 11th of November, the Secretary of State for India had used the following words of no ambiguous meaning:—

"Her Majesty's Government consider it essential that, as in the case of Cabul, having assisted in the establishment of that form of government which appears to offer the best prospects of permanence, and to be most in conformity with the wishes of the people, the Government of India should make it clearly understood that the future Ruler should be left to rely on his own resources, and that it is not their intention to interfere further in the internal affairs of Afghanistan in a manner which would involve the employment of Her Majesty's forces beyond the frontier."

He would not venture to quote the authority of many soldier-statesmen and statesmen-soldiers in defence of our keeping within our own borders; but the words of Sir Stafford Northcote in the year 1877 seemed to harmonize with the opinions of the present Secretary of State for India. On the 9th of August, 1877, in answer to Mr. Grant Duff, Sir Stafford Northcote spoke thus—

"My hon. Friend the Member for the Elgin Burghs, speaking with that knowledge and clearness which he always shows in treating these subjects, spoke of two schools which may be recognized in regard to the question of our frontier policy in India. He spoke of the school which advocates what may be called a forward policy, and of the opposite school, which is rather for looking back, and not committing us to advancing beyond our frontiers. I have myself, as my hon. Friend reminded us, leant to the policy of the second of those schools. I have always demurred to the idea which has been put forward by some, that the best way to meet danger is to advance beyond our frontier; and have always held that the true lines we ought to lay down for ourselves are those—to strengthen ourselves within our frontiers, and to do so by a combination of measures moral and material."—[3 *Hansard* ccxxxvi. 718.]

He also hoped that by a combination of such measures, guarding what we already held, but abstaining from what a great statesman once called "the eternal law of extension and detached Empire," we might again prove to the people of India that the principles upon which our Government rested were those of justice, of moderation, and of fair dealing.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE said, he hoped the noble Lord would not press his Motion to a division, because, if he did so, he should be compelled to vote against him. In regard to the retention of Candahar, Her Majesty's Government had had to choose between two courses, either of which was attended with great disadvantages. On the one hand, it was open to them to abandon a position acquired as the result of two or three arduous campaigns, by a lavish expenditure of public money and of valuable lives. Those campaigns had involved a strain upon our military resources which was better appreciated in India than in this country. On the other hand, they might adopt a policy which they had constantly condemned, and which would lead to a violation of the pledges given by the Predecessors of the present Government, but binding upon themselves. The difficulty had been inherited, not created, by the present Administration; and it was the duty of noble Lords on that side of the House not to increase that difficulty. It was impossible for them to shut their eyes to the many advantages which we should derive from remaining at Candahar. It was a position of dominating strength, commanding the principal military and commercial avenues to our Indian possessions, and its retention would add greatly to the estimation in which the power of this country was held in India. Again, the climate of the country was not unfavourable to Europeans, and the city itself was well-watered and well-circumstanced in regard to supplies. Moreover, its population had commercial proclivities, and were easily amenable to European influences. We should further bear in mind that one of the consequences of our abandoning our hold upon the place would, in all probability, be to give it over to anarchy—a result not only disastrous to the population, but very prejudicial to ourselves in the not improbable event of our having to re-occupy the district. Of course, it might be contended on the other side that in rendering ourselves responsible for the government of Candahar we should also be making ourselves responsible for the government of the neighbouring territories, and that thereby we should render ourselves liable to become entangled in every embroilment that occurred there, at great cost to this country. In any case the expense involved would be considerable, although if it were necessary to spend money with a prospect of adding materially to our strength in India, he did not doubt that it would be willingly granted. The greatest difficulty of all lay in the length of the line of communication which it would be necessary to keep open between Candahar and our own Frontier, and in the fact that during five months of the year that line would be closed and our only base for military operations removed to Kurrachee, which would be 800 miles off. In these circumstances, in the absence of more complete information, the House was not in a position to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion. If he had been disposed to criticize, his criticism would have been that Her Majesty's Government had been a little too precipitate in announcing to the world their intention to withdraw from Candahar. He ventured to hope that the House of Lords would not follow the example of the Government in this respect, and would not pass a final judgment without the full materials for forming one. Before the House could come to any definite conclusion on the subject they should have fuller information with regard to the new Ameer of Cabul, of whom the late Government knew little or nothing when they disinterred him from the fastnesses of Northern Turkestan, and summoned him hurriedly to assume the government of his country. Abdur Rahman was the straw at which the late Viceroy caught when every plank of his Afghan policy had fallen asunder beneath him. All they knew for certain of the new Ameer even now was that he had been for years a pensioner of Russia, and that he had entered Afghanistan with the object of driving us out of it. They had yet to learn whether Abdur Rahman would prove to have power and capacity to rule at Cabul. Even if he should succeed so far, it would not follow of necessity that he would be successful in consolidating his Empire and in assuming the Sovereignty of provinces which had never been united except under the government of men of conspicuous ability and strength. Should he be unequal to the government of Candahar, in addition to that of Cabul, was there any one to whom the former province could be safely entrusted? Did Her Majesty's Government consider that Ayoob Khan, the conqueror of Maiwand, could be allowed to re-occupy it? All these were questions which required consideration before a judgment could be passed upon the proposal of the noble Lord. But there was another question, certainly not less important, which closely affected that which they were discussing. What were, in the future, to be our relations with Russia upon the Afghan Frontier? What was the attitude of each country to be in regard to the Central Asian question? He owned that he should rejoice if advantage were taken of the present opportunity in order to arrive at a definite settlement with Russia upon these subjects. We had lived too long in the region of vague understandings, which no two people understood in the same sense. We had had the understanding of Lord Clarendon with Prince Gortschakoff in 1869, and the understanding of Lord Derby with Count Schouvaloff in 1875. Each of these understandings were based upon the assumption that English influence was to preponderate in Afghanistan, and Russian influence in the Khanates; and that each Power was to have complete liberty of action within the limits assigned to it. But as soon as either party availed itself of that liberty of action, we became involved in a course of lecturings, suspicions, and recriminations, anything but conducive to neighbourly and mutually beneficial relations. Why should we not endeavour to settle these questions once and for all upon an intelligible basis? The occasion was a good one. We were in occupation of Candahar, and, holding it, were in a position from which we could negotiate with advantage. The Russians on their side had, within the last few days, inflicted signal chastisement on the warlike Tribes, whose depredations had been the justification of their forward movements so persistently followed up in Central Asia. Both parties were in a position from which they could negotiate without forfeiture of self-respect in their own eyes, or in the eyes of the Native races by whom their conduct was narrowly watched. He trusted Her Majesty's Government would not allow the opportunity to slip by. They had endeavoured consistently and successfully to maintain the European concert in Europe; let them create an European concert in Asia. It would be for the advantage of each, and for that of the people with whom they were brought into contact. If such a settlement were to be arrived at, he had no doubt that the time might come when it would be possible for Her Majesty's Government to retire, without loss of dignity or peril to the safety of our Eastern possessions, from the strong position which the fortune of war had placed in our hands.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN said, that whether the method of dealing with Candahar now proposed was or was not the best method, and whether the House gave any definite opinion on the subject or not, it was to be hoped that Her Majesty's Government would at least give their reasons for advising the evacuation of Candahar and the adjoining territory, and would mention the authorities whom they had consulted and who had reported in favour of that course. He did not agree with the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lansdowne) who had said that the subject had been thoroughly discussed in the House. It had been frequently, but by no means thoroughly, discussed. The discussions which had hitherto taken place in that House concerning Afghan affairs had been chiefly devoted to endeavouring to solve the question of who was responsible for that war, and to arguments concerning the general policy of the present, and the late, and of preceding Governments. It mattered comparatively little what ought to have or might have been done. It was much more important to decide what was to be done now, looking at things from the standpoint of what was and not of what might have been. As to the past, he believed circumstances at the time fully justified the late Government in taking the course which they pursued up to the time of the unfortunate Mission to Cabul which resulted in the massacre of Sir Louis Cavagnari and his escort. He believed they committed a very grave blunder in forcing a White Envoy upon a population intensely unwilling to receive one. They acted with almost childish petulance in insisting that an English Envoy should be received for no better reason than because a Russian Envoy had been received. He held the late Government responsible for all that had taken place since the death of Cavagnari. He was aware that, in saying so, he was bringing a very grave accusation against the late Government; and he could not help thinking they must have had some inkling of his intention to make that charge, and have felt uneasy as to their power of rebutting it, seeing that the Front Opposition Bench had not been graced by the presence of a single Member of that Government during the evening. He felt strongly on the subject, and would like to speak strongly;

but abstained from fear of obliterating the whole Conservative Party as represented by the three noble Lords opposite. If he could have spoken a short time ago, he would have freely spoken his mind, for although the Tory Party was then represented by one Member of it, that noble Lord was wrapped in such profound slumber that no remarks of his could have had any effect upon him or his Party. The Liberal Party disapproved of the Mission to Cabul ; but because they disapproved of the action which led to the prolongation of the war, or even of the whole war and the general policy that led to it, that was no reason whatever why they should deliberately throw away advantages which had been gained through that war. They had to consider what the effect of giving Candahar up would be upon the estimation in which Her Majesty's Government were held by the Natives of British India, and upon their capability of fulfilling engagements with those Tribes in Afghanistan who had befriended us, and also what effect it would have upon our prestige in Afghanistan and the neighbouring countries. If they now left their friends in the lurch, they would never be able to count upon the co-operation of the Natives in any future campaign. He believed it to be the opinion of Lord Napier of Magdala that if England entirely evacuated the country, she would be unable to carry out her engagements. Many other men eminently qualified to judge asserted that as soon as our backs were turned our friends would be left to the tender mercies of the neighbouring Tribes hostile to them. If such a thing took place a deep disgrace would fall upon the fair name of England, and she would never again be trusted—at any rate, by Native Tribes. These considerations ought to be sufficient cause for retaining such a foothold in Afghanistan as would enable us to make British authority respected throughout that country, unless Her Majesty's Government could absolutely prove that England would be able effectually to protect her friends in the event of withdrawing entirely from the country. Next they had to consider the importance of Candahar in the event of an invasion. Although not unreasonably alarmed at Russian designs upon India, he considered it absurd to deny the possibility of an invasion. Russia had been advancing with gigantic strides towards our Frontier. Recent events showed that she was steadily pursuing her way towards Merv, and once at Merv she would be at no great distance from Herat, where she would be in a position to rest and prepare at leisure for an invasion of India at any time that seemed suitable to her. It had been said that the country to be traversed before reaching Merv was a desert, and offered insurmountable difficulties to an invading army. But they knew that it supported a force of some 40,000 or 50,000 Tekke Turkomans. It was absurd to suppose that a country which supported an army of 50,000 men and horses was a desert. It had been said that the Afghans would oppose Russia with the same determination as they had opposed us; but that was not likely to be the case. The Afghans were always ready for an opportunity to loot India, and would be only too glad to join and to give any assistance to an army of Russians or of any other people advancing with that object in view. Whether the conquest of India was the ultimate end and object of the constant wars and the vast expenditure of men and money on the part of Russia was a question needless to discuss; but it was certain that if Russia were in a position to attack us at our weakest point she would very naturally and properly do so if Great Britain and Russia should, unfortunately, be brought into collision. History showed that an invasion of India was easy from Herat, passing through Candahar, and was easy from that direction only. Candahar, therefore, blocked the way to India, and of its advantages as a defence for India there was scarcely a dissentient voice among military men. The advocates of retention included Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir William Palliser, Sir Richard Temple, Sir Edmund Hamley, Sir George Lawrence, Sir Michael Biddulph, Professor Vambery, Lord Strathnairn, Sir Robert Egerton, Sir Henry Green, Sir Charles Reid, Sir G. Malcolm, General Massey, Lord Napier of Magdala, Sir Frederick Roberts, Sir Frederick Haines, and Sir Donald Stewart. Such a list of authorities afforded an all but absolute proof of the wisdom of the policy they recommended. In the Afghan Correspondence, recently issued, General Sir Frederick

Roberts, a man whose opinion ought to have considerable weight with the country, said, in speaking of Candahar, that on that position our grasp should never be loosened. Sir Frederick Haines and General Sir Donald Stewart expressed similar views. The former said—

> "I should, with Sir Frederick Roberts, wish to assert that my view of the withdrawal from Cabul and Gandamak is based on the supposition that Candahar should be held in force. This is the keystone of the whole military situation as modified by our withdrawal from Cabul. To insure an effective advance from the southward against an enemy in the interior of the country, as contemplated in this despatch, the retention of Candahar is a necessity. Furthermore, it appears to me that to insure the acquisition of some knowledge of the Ameer's foreign relations, over which we have so recently asserted some power of control, and to give us some power of influence, we must hold Candahar."

It was impossible to conceive of stronger language than that. A military man in the responsible position of Commander-in-Chief in India stated that it was his opinion that, in order to successfully repel invasion, and in order to exercise a proper influence over the foreign relations of the Ameer, the retention of Candahar was an absolute necessity. Now, no man of any authority whatever denied or doubted that we ought to be in a position to deal with a possible invasion, and that it was essential that England should have some voice in the foreign relationships of the Ruler of Afghanistan. Sir Donald Stewart said—

> "The question of the location of a force above the Passes is not one for full discussion in this letter; but I am of opinion that it would be advisable to continue the location of the main cantonment in or about Candahar instead of shifting it to Pishin."

So far as he was aware, very few competent and well-informed military men had, up to the present, expressed opinions adverse to the policy of retention. The only opponents whose views had apparently been made public were General Adie, Lieutenant Colonel Browne, and Lieutenant General Davies. Lieutenant Colonel Browne recommended occupation of the Pishin Valley only, mainly for the sake of economy; while Lieutenant General Davies said simply that he did not concur in the general consensus of opinion as to the retention. There was reason to believe, on the other hand, that Lord Napier of Magdala was strongly in favour of retention. But in this particular case it was not necessary to rely entirely upon the opinions of military men. It was a case in which the uneducated eye of a mere civilian could see at a glance the enormous advantages offered by the occupation of Candahar. It blocked the road to India, and must be taken before an advance could be made from Herat. It commanded the whole country, flanked the mountains, and from it the flank of any army advancing from the North could be turned. No army could possibly advance on India by any route without destroying or capturing the army at Candahar, or masking it, which would require a very large force. Candahar was very peculiarly situated. It was far advanced in what might become an enemy's country; it was pushed out a long way in front of our boundary, and completely commanded and flanked it; and yet it was no further from our base than many points on the Frontier, and many important positions in British India. No enemy would dare to pass a British force shut up in or near Candahar, because it could be relieved by troops from home in a month or five weeks, and from our Mediterranean Stations in only 18 days. It was impossible to conceive of a position affording greater advantages, seeing that it was comparatively close to our base, the sea, and yet completely dominated a country which might prove troublesome to us in many ways. And this unique position—these extraordinary advantages—we were asked to abandon because they had been obtained by a war of which we disapproved. He was aware that it had been said that it was useless to consider any means for checking a Russian advance from Herat, because we should never allow Russia to occupy Herat; that if she did so, or even attempted to do so, we should go to war with her all over the world. That might be very true; but it was no reason why we should not take all precautions to strengthen, as much as possible, our weakest point—which was India. It was more than probable that the occupation of Candahar might, in such a case, avert the terrible alternative of a general war. But, apart from any considerations of an invasion of India, no one could have the smallest doubt that, in the event of any quarrel, Russia could most seriously harass and annoy us by intrigue in Afghanistan. Past experience had taught us a salutary lesson in that respect. When affairs were in a critical condition between the two countries, Russia was busy in Afghanistan, and succeeded in her efforts to annoy us to the extent of costing us hundreds of lives and £17,000,000. With Candahar in our possession, we should be in a position to neutralize the influence of Russia completely. Without it, we should be at her mercy; and should she ever feel disposed to annoy us again in those regions, we should be forced to undertake, for the third time, the arduous task of an Afghan War. We must also consider the effect of withdrawal upon the Natives of Afghanistan and upon our own subjects and allies and tributaries in India. It was absolutely necessary for us to retain something, unless we wished the inhabitants of India and Afghanistan to believe that we left the country because we were afraid to remain. Since the massacre of Cavagnari the war had been conducted for the purpose of vindicating their honour and re-establishing their prestige. If they now entirely evacuated the country, every penny spent for that purpose would be utterly thrown away. We have vindicated our honour in our own eyes, and in the eyes of civilized nations; but we have utterly failed in the eyes of the only people it was necessary to impress—namely, Orientals. A highly-civilized and Western nation laboured under a great disadvantage when engaged in war with a less civilized and Oriental people whose code of morals in war were very different from theirs. If we could have avenged massacre by massacre, if we could have marched through the country, pillaging and destroying all before us, we might have left the country completely rehabilitated in the estimation of the people. We should have acted as they would have acted, and in the way they expected us to do. We could not deal with them in that fashion, and it therefore became essential that we should retain some portion of territory as evidence of our conquest. If not, the memory of our disasters would long outlive the recollection of our victories. We must show something in return for our expenditure in men and money, or they would never believe that we had not been frightened out of the country. Therefore, it appeared to him that to guarantee us in the best, and consequently in the cheapest, manner against invasion, and to enable us to counteract intrigue in the surest manner and, consequently, at the least cost, and to maintain that moral supremacy which frequently did away with the necessity of employing physical force, and to sustain our reputation for courage, power, and fair-dealing with the Natives—in other words, to enable us to administer India in the most economical manner, and to defend and assure the integrity of the Empire at the least cost and in the most efficacious way—it was necessary to hold Candahar or some position in the immediate neighbourhood, and to connect it by rail with Kurrachee. And yet Her Majesty had been advised to abandon this position, the only reasons for doing so being that we had no right to interfere in the affairs of united Afghanistan, and that it would be an expensive thing to retain Candahar. As to united Afghanistan, that was all nonsense. There was no such thing, and never had been, except during very brief intervals. It was only under the despotic rule of a conqueror that Candahar had ever been united to Cabul. He did not think there could be any doubt that the inhabitants of Candahar would prefer to be under British rule than under the sway of the Ameer of Cabul. As to the cost. To let go our hold on Candahar on that account would be a very penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. The cost of keeping it would be as nothing compared with the cost of re-conquering it, or of fighting an open enemy at a disadvantage, or of combating more or less open intrigue in Afghanistan. Since the Indus had been our Frontier, we have undertaken about 20 expeditions against the Hill Tribes, at a cost of about £20,000,000. The occupation of Candahar would, in a short time, save us the cost of any further expeditions of that kind. Nothing frightened men so much as the fear of being attacked in war and cut off from their mountain-fastnesses. The Hill Tribes would soon learn to leave us alone if we held Candahar. The expense was calculated by Lord Northbrook at £1,500,000 a-year. Many good judges asserted that the development of trade which would take place would so enrich the country that, in a very few years, not only would the revenues pay for the occupation, but that Candahar would become a source of wealth to India. Nothing could be more difficult than to form a correct estimate of the present extent of Central Asian trade, and of its capacities for development. But, in the opinion of such men as Professor Vambery, Sir Douglas Forsyth, and Dr. Bellew, the commerce of this region was capable of great expansion, and was eminently worthy of the most careful attention of this country. In any case, there could be no doubt that an enormous extent of country would be opened out if Candahar were connected with the sea by rail, and that a considerable trade would arise, greatly to the benefit of the inhabitants of Afghanistan, India, and Central Asia, and of our own manufacturers. It seemed to him that the Party which was especially opposed to artificial encouragement of trade at home ought to take particular pains to see that their trade could avail itself of all legitimate means of development abroad. If a comparatively small expense would open up an Asian trade to them, the Liberal Party might well undertake to do so. Therefore, on the ground that the retention of Candahar was necessary to enable us to carry out engagements to which we were bound in honour, and by our own material interests also; that it would greatly benefit that city and the surrounding country and all Central Asia; that it would open up new and very valuable fields for trade; that if not essential to, it was at any rate very advisable for, the maintenance of our rule and the safeguarding of our Indian possessions and of the whole Empire; and that it was necessary to enable us to protect the Empire and our East Indian Dominions in the most secure and the most economical manner, he trusted that if the Government disapproved of the Resolution before the House, they would, at any rate, give some assurance that a position of such importance, which had fallen to them through the fortunes of war, should not be lightly abandoned, and that advantages which had cost so much blood and treasure should not be recklessly thrown away.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL: My Lords, in reply to my noble Friend who has just sat down, and who has asked for some further information and some further arguments against the retention of Candahar, I shall be quite satisfied to rest the defence of the course which the Government has announced upon the despatch of the Marquess of Hartington, who argues the question with considerable fulness, and upon the admirable speech made by my noble Friend (Viscount Enfield), who went through the arguments from every point of view, commercial, financial, and political. But there are one or two observations made by my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Dunraven), especially with reference to the question of comparative authority, on which I should like to say a few words. My noble Friend did not speak with very great confidence as to the weight he would attach to the opinions of military men on questions of this sort, which are to a large extent political. He said that every man of common sense would understand the value of Candahar, and he gave a long list of the names of distinguished officers in favour of the retention of Candahar. I would like for a moment to direct attention to the circumstances in which many of these distinguished men have come to their opinions. I concur with my noble Friend that even those who disapprove the conduct of the late Government ought to be in favour of keeping Candahar, in spite of their disapproval, if they think that on its merits it ought to be occupied. But we do not think that upon its own merits we ought to keep it. If we go back a few years we shall find that all those men whom my noble Friend has named, with one exception, but including Lord Napier, have concurred in the general opinion of statesmen that we ought not to attempt to take Afghanistan, or to take or occupy any part of it. That was the universally accepted doctrine from the days of Lord Auckland down to those of the late Viceroy, and it was concurred in by all military and political men, with the single exception of Sir Henry Rawlinson. I am not sure that during the whole of that period he was in favour of our taking possession of any part of Afghanistan. In what circumstances have all the eminent men named changed their opinions? Under the anti-Russian excitement of the late War. We do not think that was a legitimate ground for the change of opinion; we do not think anything has occurred during recent years which ought to make us review in any sense the policy adopted by so many Viceroys and successive Secretaries of State for India. The noble Lord urged that Russia had made great advances during the last few years. As a matter of fact, it is not true that such advance has been made. The great advance of Russia towards our Indian Frontier had been made in 1868 and 1869, when Russia conquered Bokhara, and so made her frontier conterminous with our Afghan Frontier. There has been no advance to be compared with that advance which was completed in 1868 and 1869. Therefore, we continue to hold the opinion held by all these distinguished men during the last 30 years, and we do not see any change of circumstances that ought to induce us to reverse the policy adopted by so many previous Governments. The noble Lord treated with contempt the question of expense. I cannot agree with him; to take £1,500,000 a year out of the revenues of India to keep possession of a place, if it be useless, would be a most illegitimate expenditure of those revenues. It is all very well for the noble Lord to say that he does not care about it; but the question is, whether the people of India would care about it, and ought to care about it? We must remember that in all these wars we are playing with the revenues of the people of India. The questions raised to-night by the noble Lord who introduced the subject (Lord Waveney), do not rest so much upon military as upon commercial considerations. I must say I think the answer of my noble Friend (Viscount Enfield) on those points was complete. In the richest year that could be named, the total value of the commerce of Afghanistan did not exceed £220,000, and there is no prospect of that amount being increased for many years to come. If the noble Lord wants commerce to be developed, he ought to be desirous for the success of Russia in putting down the Tekke Turkomans; they are the great bandits of Central Asia, and for the last 60 or 70 years they have been known as the great barriers to intercourse, continually interrupting the thoroughfares of commerce, and holding a great number of Russian subjects in captivity. The noble Lord ought to rejoice in the success of the Russians in the campaign against the Tekke Turkomans. If they should be put down and peace should be maintained in that country, and if the Afghans should be allowed to establish a Government of their own, there will be no difficulty in re-establishing any trade which may be possible between these countries. But I confess I have no great faith in a rich trade being established in those cities; they are extremely barren, with distant oases inhabited by comparatively few people; and I cannot believe that there is any prospect that for generations the trade will be worth more than a small fraction of that, say, of any part of Bengal. It is of no use going further into the question at present, as no one would wish a division to be taken on so important a matter in the present unsatisfactory state of the House. With regard to the authority of Lord Napier, I believe that during the 50 years of Lord Napier's services in India he was aconstant and a consistent opponent of any policy looking in the direction of the conquest or invasion of Afghanistan. When we quote the opinions of soldiers, we must remember it is natural that they, knowing the blood that has been shed in a conquest, should wish to retain it; but we must look at the matter also from other points of view. I must ask my noble Friend whether he believes that in the present progress of Russia from the Caspian towards Herat there is any prospect of a Russian invasion of India? It is said that the fear is not so much of Russian invasion as of Russian intrigue; but Russian intrigue can go on as well at Cabul as at Candahar. I do not believe the presence of an English force at Candahar will interfere with Russian intrigue. Experience has proved that our resident officers in Afghanistan are absolutely ignorant of what is going on under their eyes, because the intrigues of Russia are carried on through Native agents. It seems to me a matter of common sense that if we set the Afghan people against us and make them hate us, by occupying their country when they wish to live in independence, they will be much more disposed to second the intrigues of Russia than they would if we left them to themselves. They are quite as hostile to the advance of Russia as to that of England. There is good reason to believe they were so jealous of that unfortunate Russian Mission to Cabul which was sent to distract our attention at the time of another crisis, that the Ameer took very good care that the members of the Mission were never allowed to walk about in Cabul without a guard. That shows the knowledge the Ameer had of the disposition of the Afghans towards the Russian Mission, and that they were quite as jealous of the Russians as of the English. The best way of meeting the intrigue of Russia is to give the Afghans assurance that we desire now, as for 40 years we have desired, their welfare and their independence; that we desire to see them set up a successful Government of their own; that we will do everything we can to help them in doing so; that we do not wish to interfere with their independence or to set up a Ruler over them; and that we do not wish to annex any portion of their territory. It is said that we should not leave to the vengeance of new Rulers those who may have shown favour to the British Government. That argument was used with regard to the occupation of Cabul; it was said that the English had derived important information from a good many Sirdars and Natives, and that, if we did not make arrangements for their safety, these men would have their throats cut; but nothing of the sort happened. The Ruler of Afghanistan knows very well that what was done was done merely in submission to superior force; and I do not see why the same reply should not hold good for Candahar. The alleged prospect of anarchy and chaos has weighed much with the Government, and I believe if it were not for that argument we should now have been out of Candahar. We do desire to see an orderly Government established in that part of Afghanistan, and that is one of the reasons why we have remained. I am not prepared to say, looking at the enormous expense entailed on India by that occupation, that we are to stay there until we see someone able to take possession of and govern Candahar; but I believe that by the process of natural selection—it may be by the usual contests which go on in those countries—some Ruler will establish himself in Candahar, and, whatever hold he may have on the population, he will be more successful than any British Ruler can be.

LORD WAVENEY, in reply, said, he thought that the evacuation of Candahar might be deferred until the Greek Kalends.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—THE ORDER IN COUNCIL—THE BAR—OFFICES OF THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON.

PETITION PRESENTED.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR presented a

"Petition praying that the Order in Council for abolishing the offices of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Chief Baron may not come into operation; of Members of the Bar of England present at a Meeting of the Bar held in the Inner Temple Hall on Thursday the 27th of January 1881, and called by the Attorney-General Sir Henry James in compliance with a requisition from Members of the Bar."

He (the Lord Chancellor) hoped their Lordships would not agree to the prayer of the Petitioners.

Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 28th January, 1881.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—John M'Laren, Lord Advocate of Scotland, *for* Edinburgh City.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—£2,500,000, Exchequer Bonds.

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—£2,500,000, Consolidated Fund.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Leave*—Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—*Third Night, debate adjourned.*

Ordered—First Reading—Small Debts (Limitation of Actions) * [78].

Third Reading—Judicial Committee * [67], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

* * *

STATE OF IRELAND — ANTI - LAND LEAGUE—PLACARD AT GLASGOW.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a large green placard posted in Glasgow headed "Cure for Land Leaguers," and purporting to issue from "Anti-Land League Association, Dublin," but without signature or printer's name; and, whether the Glasgow police have found out or are trying to find out who posted the bill; and, if they do find out the poster of the bill, will the Procurator Fiscal prosecute the offender?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have received a communication from the Procurator Fiscal of Glasgow on this subject. He is of opinion that the placard in question would not form the foundation of a criminal proceeding, though it might of a civil action. Of course, under these circumstances, he cannot undertake the prosecution of the offenders.

ARMY—ISSUE OF BUCKSHOT.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether buckshot has been served out to the forces serving in England or Scotland; and, if not, if he would explain why?

Mr. CHILDERS: In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that buckshot has not been issued to the troops in any part of the United Kingdom.

INLAND REVENUE — ILLICIT DISTILLATION (IRELAND).

Sir HENRY TYLER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there has been any, and, if so, what increase in the illicit distillation of whisky in Ireland during the last three months; and, whether any loss to the Revenue may be expected on that account?

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH: I have been requested by my right hon. Friend to answer this Question, and in reply to the hon. Baronet I have to say that, according to the Reports received from the Inspector General, the detections of illicit distillation of whisky in Ireland numbered 197 in the last three months, as compared with 175 in the corresponding quarter last year—an increase of 22, or about 12 per cent. This would, of course, in a degree, affect the Revenue; but the loss would probably be inappreciable.

Mr. Biggar

STATE OF IRELAND — THE LAND LEAGUE—COMPULSORY SUBSCRIPTION.

Sir HENRY TYLER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is able to give information as to the numbers of people who have been compelled against their wills to subscribe to the Land League?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I have no information of the kind indicated in the Question to supply; and I think if the hon. Baronet will consider the terms of his own Question, he will see the impossibility of my giving such details as he asks for.

ARMY — SEPARATION OF MILITARY PRISONERS IN CIVIL PRISONS.

Colonel COLTHURST asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What steps have been taken to carry out the promised separation of military prisoners from others?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said that a portion of Millbank Prison and of two other prisons had been set apart for soldiers. He hoped that before long more extensive arrangements would be made for the same purpose.

INDIA — RAILWAY TO QUETTA AND CANDAHAR.

Mr. E. STANHOPE asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether it is a fact that the construction of the Railway in the direction of Quetta and Candahar has been suspended; whether that step has been taken by the advice or with the consent of the Government of India; and, whether it is now proposed to take up that portion of the Railway which has been already constructed?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I believe that the railway referred to is practically finished as far as the foot of the Bolan Pass. The further works in the direction of Quetta have not been suspended; but, after communication with the Government of India, it has been decided not to press them forward pending a final decision as to what posts will be permanently occupied by the British forces. There is no intention, so far as I am aware, of taking up any portion of the railway which has already been completed.

POST OFFICE—COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS, &c.

MR. BRYCE asked the Postmaster General, When the promised competitive examinations for posts in the Telegraphic Department of the Post Office, and for the clerkships which have been thrown open to women in the Savings Bank and other Departments of the Post Office, will begin?

MR. FAWCETT: In reply to my hon. Friend, I beg to state that a public competition for 32 male telegraphists, London, will be held on the 28th of next month. As regards throwing open for competition the situation of female telegraphists in the Metropolitan offices, and that of male telegraphists in Edinburgh and Dublin, that course will be adopted so soon as the list of candidates who have already been promised nominations is exhausted, and so far as I am able to judge, the present list will be exhausted about the end of the present year. With regard to the female clerkships in the Savings Bank and other departments of the Post Office, I may say that a large number of those who have been promised nominations have recently had an opportunity of competing for appointments. The list is not yet exhausted, and I am not able to fix the precise time when it will be; but I do not think it will be before the end of the present year. With the object, however, of bringing a system of open competition into operation as soon as possible, I have for some time refused all applications for nomination. Ample notice will be given in the public journals of the time when the system of open competition will be brought into operation, and of the regulations under which it will be held.

MR. BRYCE asked, further, Whether the Postmaster General will cause some apparatus to be affixed to pillar letter-boxes, for the purpose of indicating when they have been last cleared?

MR. FAWCETT: I am extremely desirous that such indicators should be affixed to all pillar-boxes in the United Kingdom. There are some difficulties in the way; but I hope they will be removed, and that there will be no unnecessary delay.

MADAGASCAR — CONFLICTING INTERESTS OF FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

MR. H. LEE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to articles in English and French papers imputing to the English Government the intention of seizing the Port of Mojanga (commonly called Majunga), on the north-west coast of Madagascar, in order to occupy it as a naval station; also accusing English officials and traders in Madagascar of acts by which the native government is (alleged to be) induced to favour English commerce at the expense of French interests; and whether the Government is in possession of any information to justify such statements being made; and, further, to inquire whether there is any reason to suppose that the French Government has any intention to disturb the friendly understanding entered into some years ago by the Government of Her Majesty and the French Government at the time when the late Earl of Clarendon was Foreign Secretary, by which it was agreed that each nation should preserve inviolate the independence of Madagascar?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Her Majesty's Government are not in possession of any information to justify the newspaper statements to which my hon. Friend refers; and they have no reason to suppose that the French Government will disturb the friendly understanding which exists with regard to the relations of this country and France with Madagascar.

AFGHANISTAN (SOUTHERN) — REPORTED FAMINE.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for India, If it be true, as stated in a letter from Sibi, published in the "Times of India" of the 1st of this month, that many deaths have recently occurred in Thull and Chotiali, in Southern Afghanistan, from want of food, and that the garrisons of those two places are in danger of being starved out for want of provisions?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: My attention has been called by the Question of my hon. and gallant Friend to the statement in *The Times of India* to which he refers. Having made inquiries, I find we have no information at the

India Office on the subject bearing on the statement therein made.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) AMENDMENT ACT, 1879—OUT-DOOR RELIEF.

Mr. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to a description in the "Observer" of December 23, of the distress and misery exhibited at the Kanturk Union Workhouse; if he will inform the House of the names of the unions where the administration of out-door relief has been authorised; whether one of the conditions of the administration of such out-door relief was correctly stated by the clerk of the Kanturk Union, that

> "Out-door relief could not be administered to able-bodied labourers; but that, if they came into the house, their families could be relieved outside;"

whether any portion of the grant allocated by the Relief of Distress (Ireland) Amendment Act of last Session has been given to any Poor Law Union, and how much; and, whether he proposes to adopt any other means for the relief of distress in Ireland than the authorisation of extra presentment Sessions and of out-door relief under the restrictions mentioned in the Poor Law Circular issued by the late Government?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had communicated with the President of the Local Government Board. One of the Inspectors had been sent down, and he had not yet received a Report. The authorization of out-door relief was now in force in 58 Unions. He did not at present see that it was necessary to take any other means at present except those which were covered by their present powers.

In reply to Mr. T. P. O'Connor,

Mr. W. E. FORSTER added that crime had diminished; but he had no information as to the connection between the diminution of crime and the districts in which out-door relief was granted.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT, 1880—LONDON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BROADHURST (for Mr. Macdonald) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has received information to the effect that the Directors of the London and North-Western Railway Company are using coercion and intimidation to force certain of their servants to sign a document which would partially or wholly pledge them to contract themselves out of the Employers' Liability Act, and would force them to continue paying weekly contributions into an Insurance Society, under the control of the Directors, which has just been pronounced an illegal society by a criminal court; whether he is aware that the said Directors have dismissed, and are continuing to dismiss, their servants in Liverpool who have refused to sign the document in question; whether it is true that the stipendiary magistrate of Liverpool has granted summonses for intimidation against the general goods manager and other officials of the Company; and, if Her Majesty's Government is prepared to restrain the action of the said Railway Company?

Mr. DODSON: I have received no official information to the effect that the Directors of the London and North-Western Railway Company are using coercion and intimidation to force any of their servants to sign a document which would wholly or partially contract them out of the Employers' Liability Act. I am not aware of any instance of compulsion being employed to make any such servants contribute to any insurance society, nor am I aware of any society connected with the Company which has been pronounced illegal by a Criminal Court. I may add that I have been assured, on the part of the Company, that they have made inquiries to trace the origin of these statements, and that they cannot discover them. I learn, however, from a cutting from *The Liverpool Daily Post*, of January 22, that Erwin Flynn recently was indicted for embezzling £8, the moneys of the London and North-Western Railway Locomotive Insurance Society. Counsel for the defence contended that the Society in question had not been registered, and that the prosecution had not shown in whom the property in question vested, and that the prisoner was entitled to be discharged on that ground. The prisoner, it was stated, had collected certain moneys; but after it had passed into his hands there was no evidence to show in whom the property vested, or from whom it was stolen. The Bench took this view of the matter, and the prisoner was acquitted. This case probably gave rise to the report. I am not aware that the Directors have dismissed, or are dismissing, any of their servants at Liverpool or elsewhere, who refused to sign the alleged document; but I have been informed by the Company, and also learn from a Liverpool newspaper, that two summonses have been granted, and are to be heard in Liverpool by the stipendiary magistrate on Tuesday next.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIAN ADVANCES.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether, in view of the grave events now taking place in Central Asia, of the destruction of the Turcoman tribes by a Russian invasion, and of the consequent removal of the last barriers between the Russian armies and Afghanistan, Her Majesty's Government will reconsider their intention of abandoning the great strategic and commercial position of Kandahar; whether his intention has been called to the rapid advance of the Russian Railway from the Caspian towards Afghanistan, and whether, in view of this fact, Her Majesty's Government will direct the immediate completion of the British Railway to Kandadar, in order to secure the trade of Afghanistan, Northern Persia, and of Central Asia; and, whether he can give any further information as to General Skobeleff's victory, and as to the reported advance of General Kaufmann with a large army from the Oxus toward Merv?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I might, perhaps, have been tempted to take exception to the somewhat argumentative, not to say rhetorical, form in which the Question of the hon. Member has been placed upon the Paper; but I am quite able to make allowance for the disappointment of the hon. Member, and, no doubt, of the House also, at the unavoidable postponement of his Motion on the subject of Candahar, and therefore I am not disposed to be too critical, otherwise I might object to the terms employed—

> "Of the destruction of the Turcoman tribes by a Russian invasion, and of the consequent removal of the last barriers between the Russian armies and Afghanistan;"

and I might, perhaps, think that the description of Candahar as "the great strategic and commercial position" is somewhat exaggerated. But, in reply to the Question itself, I have only to say that the decision of Her Majesty's Government not permanently to occupy Candahar was taken with full knowledge of the probability of the success of the present Russian expedition against the Turcoman tribes, and that the result which has become known during the last few days has not in any degree modified their intentions. In that view I trust that we shall have the support of Her Majesty's late Advisers, when I recollect that the unsuccessful expedition against the Turcoman tribes was undertaken in the autumn of 1879, at which time Her Majesty's late Government had formed the intention of not occuping Candahar. I cannot imagine that there could have been any expectation whatever that the present expedition of the Russian Government would fail. With regard to the second part of the Question, the information I possess as to the Russian railway from the Caspian towards Afghanistan is as follows:—Up to October last, the railway from Michaeloff Bay to Bami, a distance of about 185 miles, had been completed up to 20 miles from Michaeloff Bay. It is believed that some progress has been made since that date, but we have no information on that point. However, I can hardly consider that as a rapid progress from the Caspian towards Afghanistan, considering that from Kizil Arvat to Merv and Herat is a distance of about 500 miles. With regard to the last part of the hon. Member's Question, we have no further information as to General Skobeleff's victory than has appeared in the public newspapers. We have no information of any advance of General Kaufmann with a large army towards Merv. It is reported from St. Petersburg by Lord Dufferin that a very small force under General Krapotkine has joined General Skobeleff's force from Tashkend.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether 150 miles of the railway had not been completed already?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he had no information beyond that which he had given the hon. Member.

COAL MINES—RIOTS IN LANCASHIRE.

MR. DALY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true that during the current week a fatal riot occurred at Clydesley, near Bolton; whether it is true that several thousand miners assembled and proceeded to the Wharton Hall Company's pit, and demanded that the men at work should be brought out; whether the crowd refused to disperse when required by the police, who were present in large numbers; whether the crowd hurled stones, bricks, and coal at the police, who were forced to retreat; whether it is true that one man named Findly was killed, and several colliers had their legs and arms broken, and that all the police were injured; and, whether, in vindication of law and order, he will deem it his duty to advise Her Majesty's Government to bring in some special remedial measures?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he had not had time to make inquiry into the matter, and he requested that the Question should be postponed.

Mr. PARNELL gave Notice that he should ask the Home Secretary whether the police who were employed in opposing the mobs were supplied with buckshot?

BURIAL ACTS—CLOSE OF CHURCHYARDS.

Mr. WOODALL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, before Churchyards are visited by Inspectors to inquire into their condition with a view to ascertain if they should be closed, he will cause notice of such inspection to be given to the inhabitants generally, as well as to the incumbent and churchwardens?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, his attention had been called to the unsatisfactory nature of the notice to the public in these matters. He had received several complaints that the public had no opportunity of making their wishes known; and he had given instructions some time ago that the overseers of the poor should be informed as well as the incumbents and churchwardens.

STATE OF IRELAND—REFUSAL TO PAY POOR RATES AND PUBLIC CESS.

Mr. DALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that the landlords in the district of Swineford, county Mayo, have refused to pay poor rates and public cess until the land question is settled?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I have a telegram from a Local Government Inspector stating that he has no information that landlords in this district have refused to pay rates or cess until the Land Question is settled.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—MEMBERS' SMOKING ROOM.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he has been able to come to any definite conclusion on the subject of providing a more suitable smoking-room for Members of the House of Commons?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I am now in a position to make a proposal to the House with reference to better smoking-room accommodation, which everyone must admit is at present insufficient and unsatisfactory. I propose that the existing tea-room should be appropriated as a smoking-room exclusively for the use of Members of this House, leaving the old smoking-room for those who wish to take strangers there. By erecting another pair of swing doors between the new smoking-room and the serving-room all chance of the smell of smoke finding its way into the House will be obviated, and the serving-room will be convenient both for the supply of tea and coffee to the smoking-room, and for the new tea-room which I propose should take the place of the existing newspaper-room. The question then arises, what should be done with the newspapers? I was at first of opinion that they should be placed in one of the Libraries; but I found that exception was taken to this course by many Members and by high authority. I propose, then, that the room now used by Members for receiving deputations should revert to its former use as a newspaper-room. By better ventilation it may, I think, be improved; and the pressure on it may be lessened by taking in duplicates of morning and evening papers for the smoking-room and tea-room. I propose, also, that Committee Room No. 10, which is the first room at the top of the main staircase, and which is seldom used as a Committee Room, should be appropriated for Members to receive deputations and for conferences. The arrangement I now propose is not, I admit, a perfect one; but I think it is the best our present resources offer to us. It would be possible greatly to improve it if we could obtain from the Lords the loan or concession of one of their Committee Rooms on the ground floor; and I may mention here that the total space appropriated to the House of Lords for official work on the main floor is considerably larger than that for this House. It is 82,000 square feet as compared with 76,000 feet. If we could obtain from the Lords some assistance, many of our present difficulties might be obviated. I have only to add that the proposal will be subject to the approval of the House. I propose to submit a Supplementary Estimate for £400, which will cover the expense of making the necessary alterations and of fittings; and, if the House approves, the arrangement can be carried into effect at Easter.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE: In consequence of the answer of my hon. Friend, I beg to give Notice that I shall ask him on Monday whether he is aware that the newspaper-room was transferred from the deputation-room to the present room with the approbation and consent of the whole House of Commons?

DR. LYONS asked if the right hon. Gentleman could make it convenient to allow the newspapers to be seen for a certain number of hours on the Saturday?

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked, whether, seeing that there was daily increasing evidence of the utter inadequacy of the accommodation of the House of Commons, the First Commissioner of Works would not take into his serious consideration the desirability of making a radical change in the arrangements; also, whether he was not aware that unless the subject was dealt with at the beginning of the Session such a change could not possibly be carried out during the Recess?

MR. BROADHURST asked if there was any objection to supplying the smoking-room with newspapers?

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked whether his hon. Friend was prepared to furnish accommodation for the reporters upstairs, as their retiring room was just a den?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was now considering the question of the accommodation of the reporters. In reference to the newspapers there would be no objection to supplying the smoking-room with newspapers.

COMPANIES ACT, 1867—TRINITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been called to an advertisement in the "Times" of the 26th January announcing that an application has been sent to the Board of Trade for a licence directing an Association under the name of Trinity College, London, to be registered with limited liability without the addition of the word "Limited" to its name, the advertisement declaring that one of the objects for which it is proposed to establish such Association is

> "The holding of public examinations and the granting of diplomas, and giving notice that objection to the grant of such licence may be made by letter addressed to the Assistant Secretary, Railway Department, Board of Trade;"

whether the Railway Department would be that in which such an application would be considered and dealt with; and, whether a licence has ever been granted by the Board of Trade under the Companies Acts to a private Association authorising the diplomas by such Association?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, that an application had been made to the Board of Trade as stated in the Question of the hon. and learned Member. Objections were required to be addressed to the Railway Department of the Board of Trade, because that was the Department in charge of all that concerned the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies. The application was to dispense with the word "limited." Applications of that kind had been previously granted in the case of Associations formed for public or *quasi*-public purposes, and not for private gain. The licence did not authorize the granting of diplomas, but merely to dispense with the word "limited." If, on consideration, the Board came to the conclusion that the application ought to be refused, the only difference would be that the Society would do what it proposed to do only attaching the word "limited" to its name. The present Association was not a new one, but was the re-formation of a similar Association which had received the licence some years ago.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL (MILITARY OPERATIONS)—REPULSE OF A BRITISH FORCE.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, in prosecuting the Transvaal War, Her Majesty's Government will recognise the belligerent rights of the Boers, or treat them as rebels?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I should also wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has received any further information as to the advance of Sir George Colley into the Transvaal?

Mr. CHILDERS: With the permission of the House I will answer the Question of the noble Lord instead of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Grant Duff), as it was my intention to state to the House after the Questions the news which had been received not more than an hour ago. The news so received at the War Office is in these words—

(*From Sir George Colley to the Secretary of State for War.*)

"28th January.—Attack on Pass repulsed. Casualties heavy; not yet known. I hold the camp, three miles from the Neck, until arrival of reinforcements."

Mr. GRANT DUFF: There is nothing in the information just given to the House which leads me to alter the words which I used in reply to a similar Question some time ago—that, namely, no information has reached Her Majesty's Government which requires or entitles us to consider the question of belligerent rights between the Crown and the Boers.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: Sir, I am assured by those with whom I consulted before putting the Question that no such Question had been put to the House, or had been answered.

Mr. RITCHIE: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is an attack by the Boers upon the British Forces that has been repulsed, or whether it is an attack by the British Forces upon the Boers?

Mr. CHILDERS: I have read the words as they have been telegraphed. I believe they mean that an attack by us on the Boers was repulsed.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is in a position to state what reinforcements are expected to arrive at Durban on certain dates, and the time when they may be expected to arrive at the front?

Mr. CHILDERS: I have no objection to state in general terms what troops have been sent to Durban; but I certainly do not think it right to state what reinforcements are going up the country, and when they may be expected to reach the front. I am sure the hon. and gallant Gentleman will not wish me to do so. I speak from memory when I say that the state of things is this. Two steamers are conveying three regiments of Infantry, one of Cavalry, and a battery of Field Artillery sent from Bombay to Durban. One arrived two days ago, and the other is expected to arrive very shortly. A steam transport has left Gibraltar for the Cape with the 97th Regiment, and was last heard of at St. Vincent on or about the 5th of this month. It is expected to arrive at the Cape shortly, to land some families there, and to proceed with the regiment at once to Durban. Three or four steamers, I think, conveying a regiment of Cavalry and a battery of Artillery, are on their way from this country to Durban; but I am not at this moment in a position to state exactly the time at which these steamers are expected to arrive. They are contract steamers, and, without the Papers before me, I could not say when each may be considered due.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN: It is to be hoped that the right hon. Gentleman will be expected to give some detailed information to the House; and I am sure he has no desire to withhold from the House any information which it is desirable to give.

Mr. CHILDERS: I must adhere to what I have just said as to the impolicy of stating when any troops are likely to reach the front; and I cannot but believe that my hon. and gallant Friend would be the last to wish me to do otherwise. The only question on which I have not given exact information is the precise speed of the hired transports; but I do not think that is a very material matter.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: In reference to the Question I put to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies just now, I wish to ask whether it will not be desirable, the moment the first prisoner is taken, to decide whether the Boers are to be considered as belligerents, or whether they are to be treated as rebels and subjected to punishment as such?

Mr. GRANT DUFF: If my hon. Friend asks me a Question of International Law, perhaps he will be good enough to give me Notice of his Question.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I beg to ask in a straightforward manner the Secretary of State for War to tell us whether the army he is sending out is being sent out against rebels, or against belligerents?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I think it is right that I should take upon myself the full responsibility of the answer given by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Grant Duff). My right hon. Friend stated what was quite distinct with regard to the question of recognizing the Boers as belligerents. With regard to treating them as rebels, my right hon. Friend has made no statement at all; and if it is desired to ask any Question on that subject, it is quite evident that the Question should be stated in clear and distinct terms, so that the answer may not be open to the very serious objection of being liable to be misunderstood.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I beg most respectfully to call the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the final part of my printed Question, where I distinctly asked the right hon. Gentleman, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to consider the Boers as rebels. I gave Notice of that Question.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I would at once say that the answer of my right hon. Friend was simply directed, I think, to the first part of the Question; and although I know not whether the latter part escaped his attention, yet I would say that, as my right hon. Friend has not answered that part of the Question, and desires that Notice should be given, I think everyone will feel the prudence of that course.

Mr. GILL: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, If by International Law he means that the Boers are still a distinct nation?

Mr. PARNELL: May I ask the Secretary of State for War, or the Prime Minister, Whether he is in a position to state to the House what instructions have been given to the officers in Her Majesty's Forces with regard to the treatment of prisoners in the case of any Boers who may be taken with arms in their hands?

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I beg to give Notice that I will repeat my Question on Monday.

Mr. PARNELL: I beg to give Notice that I shall put my Question on Monday.

Mr. GILL: I beg to give Notice that I shall put my Question on Monday.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I wish to ask one more Question, and it is, Whether it would not be right and proper that the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies should inform the House what is the object with which the war is being carried on in the Transvaal?

IRELAND—AGRARIAN CRIME.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will precisely state to the House how soon the further Returns respecting Agrarian Crimes in Ireland will be placed in the hands of Members?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: No Notice was given of this Question, and I, therefore cannot answer it definitely. The November Returns will be ready in a day or two, and the other will be prepared as quickly as can be.

PRIVATE BILLS—RIVER THAMES BILL.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether the River Thames Bill, dealing with the Navigation of the Thames, and which has been introduced as a Private Bill, is promoted by the Board of Trade; and, whether, looking to the nature of its proposals, it would not be more in accordance with the usual practice to introduce it as a Public Bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, that the Bill was not, technically speaking, promoted by the Board of Trade, but by the Conservators of the Thames. It had been introduced on their petition, and was provided at their expense. It, was, however, concurred in and approved by the Board of Trade. He was informed that it was in accordance with usual practice such a Bill should be introduced as a Private Bill; and it had already been submitted to the Examiners, who had certified that it was strictly in accordance with the Standing Orders. After the second reading of the Bill, he intended to move that it should be referred to a Select Committee; and as some of the opponents of the Bill complained that, as they were poor, this course would entail a hardship upon them, he would take care that the parties should be entitled to appear either personally or by counsel.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE REPORT.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL wished to know whether the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland had any idea when the Report of the Irish Land Commissioners would be in the hands of hon. Members?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I have no information on the matter.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873—OFFICES OF THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS AND LORD CHIEF BARON—STATEMENT.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I think the House will be desirous of having some foreknowledge of the course of Public Business during next week, seeing that we are reaching the close of the week; and I have also thought it would be time to advert to a subject which was raised, first by the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), and also by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), in the shape of a Notice of Motion. The subject is altogether of a peculiar and exceptional character; and, if it were not, I think it would be most objectionable, after the general Motion which was passed in this House two days ago, to give it exceptional treatment. It is a subject of an Order in Council which was lately passed, subject to the condition of lying upon the Table of the House for 30 days. Power was also given to raise a debate in either House of Parliament by any Member who thought fit to take objection to that Order in Council. That was under the provisions of the Act of Parliament. The Order in Council was laid by Her Majesty's Government upon the Table of the House immediately upon the meeting of Parliament, and the 30 days would expire on Friday next, consequently the case stands thus—that either some time would require to be found before next Friday for hon. Gentlemen to offer remarks upon the Order, or else they would be debarred from the power which the intention of the Legislature has expressed in the statute to give them. On that very definite ground, although very unwilling that we should seem to make any single exception from the scope of the Rule which has been granted to us, I think it is our duty to make some proposal, and I have no doubt that those Gentlemen who take an interest in the Order will not be too exacting in their remarks. Now, I have understood, as far as it can be gathered from conversation with hon. Members, that there is a disposition to bring to a close this evening the debate with which we are now engaged. [*Home Rule cries of* "No, no!"] That is what I understood, and I am glad to observe that the murmurs of dissent from two or three Gentlemen are by no means so emphatic as those which sometimes proceed from that quarter; consequently I would cherish that hope. It would certainly be a convenient course, and it could not imply that the Government had any intention of unduly stinting the opportunity for discussion; but it is desirable that a Bill, which is at present known to the House only through the citations and descriptions of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland, should be placed as an authentic document in the hands of hon. Members. That, of course, cannot be done until the Motion for its introduction is carried. If we finish the debate to-night that object will be gained to-morrow morning. We should propose to proceed with the second reading on Monday; but on Monday, at a convenient hour, between 9 and 10, we would ask for an adjournment of the debate, as that debate we could not possibly expect to close on Monday night. We would ask for the adjournment of the debate, in order to give hon. Members who desire to avail themselves of it an opportunity, to which they would be fairly entitled, of making their comments, and even their proposals, if so inclined, with respect to the Orders in Council on the subject of judicial establishments.

MR. PARNELL said, it appeared to him the Prime Minister had proposed an arrangement contingent upon the debate on the first Order of the Day closing that night. If he remained silent it must not be taken as a concurrence in the Motion just made. What he wished to say was this—that there were many Irish Members who had taken the trouble to go into the Returns which were laid on the Table only two or three days ago in reference to the state of Ireland, and they desired to address the House at the present stage of the Bill. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that there was no desire to unduly protract the debate on the first reading; but the Irish Members felt that they would not have a fair opportunity of representing the feelings of their constituents if the debate were closed that night. He had taken this subject into consideration, and he made that intimation in order that no misunderstanding or inconvenience might arise with regard to the Motion of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) on Monday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [24th January],

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

And which Amendment was,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard,"—(*Dr. Lyons,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. R. POWER said, it was not his intention to detain the House for any very great length of time upon this occasion. He had not, up to the present, interfered in these debates; but the time had come when it was the duty of every Irish Representative to raise his voice against the system of tyranny and coercion which the Government now sought to establish in Ireland. He must acknowledge that he was in no way disappointed with the course the Government proposed to take, for they were about to do exactly what he expected they would. Indeed, he should have been greatly surprised if they had decided to do anything else. His hon. Friend the Member for the County of Cork (Mr. Shaw) had, during the Recess, more than once told his countrymen to expect full and ample justice from Her Majesty's Government; and in doing so he had raised false hopes, for he must now plainly see that a giant measure of coercion came first on the Ministerial programme, and then a pigmy measure of Land Reform. If the Government had really good and sound proposals to make upon this question they would not hesitate to let them know their intentions, if they had any intentions at all. He admitted the difficulties with which the Government had to contend, and he always feared that Whig influences would be too strong in the present Cabinet, and once they got their way this miserable agrarian dispute would be left unsettled, and would continue to perpetuate discord and disunion in their unfortunate country. This vital question could never be settled by compromising statesmen and namby-pamby legislators; and he thought they would find that when their Bill was brought forward it would be weak in its conception and worthless in its operation. He had no desire to underrate the grave position of affairs in Ireland; but he maintained that the state of affairs was brought about by the cupidity of the English Government, and by its refusal to listen to the representations too often made by the Representatives of Ireland in the House. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had made statements, which it was impossible to pass unnoticed, that he intended to strike terror into the people of Ireland. He (Mr. Power) was afraid the right hon. Gentleman had hardly sufficiently weighed the importance of those words. Was that "the message of peace" which the right hon. Gentleman was sending over to Ireland? But the Chief Secretary for Ireland had gone even further, and used language most likely to provoke in Ireland a spirit of resistance. He had called the people of Ireland a nation of perjurers and dissolute blackguards. ["No!"] At all events, the right hon. Gentleman, when charged last night with using such language, did not deny it. *The Times* reported the right hon. Gentleman as saying that "the most powerful man in a particular district" was frequently "a contemptible, dissolute ruffian and blackguard." [Mr. MITCHELL HENRY: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member for Galway said "Hear, hear!" He would ask that hon. Member who was the most influential man in particular districts in Ireland? It was the parish priest. The hon. Member could go to any district in Ireland and assure himself of the fact.

MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that he ought to address himself to the Chair.

MR. R. POWER, continuing, said, the Prime Minister had with frankness acknowledged that, in bringing forward his proposals for coercion, he felt himself in a most humiliating position and he (Mr. Power) could well believe that the right hon. Gentleman was sincere in the avowal. It was a humiliating fact for English statesmen that after 700 years of a so-called Union with their country they found themselves unable to govern the country by the ordinary laws, and without suspending the rights and privileges of their much boasted British Constitution. The evil spirit created in their country by former laws was rising up against them to-day; and they would find that their miserable Coercion Bill would utterly fail to remedy the present state of affairs in Ireland. The late Government boasted of their spirited foreign policy, and they could soon boast of a spirited home policy. What were they going to do when they carried their Coercion Bill? The whole Irish people were connected with this movement. They could not incarcerate a whole nation. Hon. Members seemed surprised that so grave a state of affairs should have arisen in Ireland; but his only surprise was that the people in the country had endured their miserable condition so long. When the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) said that until the Land League was founded the best relations existed between landlord and tenant, he (Mr. Power) thought he must have forgotten the history of his own country. Did he not know that in 1849 50,000 persons were driven from their homes, houseless and penniless upon the world, and that the Crowbar Brigade levelled to the ground 27,000 houses that once gave shelter to an honest and industrious peasantry? The right hon. and learned Gentleman might have forgotten these facts; but the recollection of that evil deed had sunk deep into the hearts of the Irish people, and when last year they saw famine and distress at their very doors, it was no wonder that they organized in order to prevent a recurrence of such frightful scenes. But the saddest feature in the history of their country was the lesson they themselves had taught to the people of Ireland. They had taught them no longer to supplicate, but to demand. They had granted little to their supplications, but they had given much to their demands; and whenever the Irish people required any great reform in their country they were obliged to bring her almost to the brink of revolution. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said he was horrified with the state of affairs at present existing in Ireland; but he begged to draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that it was one of these outrages that first directed his attention to Irish affairs. Speaking in 1849 the right hon. Gentleman remarked—

> "There is a war between landlord and tenant—a war as fierce as those carried on by force of arms."

Such was the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman in 1849, and the very same state of things existed in 1881. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke in pathetic terms of his conversation with Mr. Martin, he could not help thinking of a conversation which he himself held with that honest and distinguished gentleman. On his asking him why he had such confidence in the right hon. Gentleman and so appreciated his character, Mr. Martin replied—

> "The reason I have such confidence in him is this—that he has never voted for, but has always opposed, coercion."

The only thing of which the right hon. Gentleman had convinced him was that a Radical, when the Conservatives were in power, was a Radical, and that a Radical when the Liberals were in power was quite a different person. The Irish landlords would doubtless be delighted when they found they had an ally in the person of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham; and the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), who was the author of a letter to the right hon. Gentleman, would have reason to be proud of the conversion he had made. As a great deal had been said about threatening letters, he might mention that a letter had been addressed to the junior Member for Northampton, the writer of which informed him that bullets had been cast for the purpose of shooting him. [Mr. BRADLAUGH said, he had never received any such letter.] He was glad the hon. Member had not received the letter; but, at all events, it appeared in the newspapers. It ought to be borne in mind that the laws of Ireland were not made by the Representatives of the Irish people, and that they were too often administered by a class against the nation. That was one of the greatest evils of Ireland; and what had been done up to the present time to conciliate the people of Ireland? It was true that the landlords had been made a garrison for that country. They had, in his opinion, very foolishly accepted the responsibility; but the time had now come when that garrison had totally broken down, and when the Government proposed to substitute for that garrison the cowardly spy and the miserable informer; and these wretched men, if he could call them men, would steal into their secret chamber at Dublin Castle; they would whisper away the liberties and, perhaps, the lives of many an honest man; and they would have more influence in the government of the country than all the representations made by the Irish Members—the Representatives of the people. That would be the time when private pique, personal animosity, miserable revenge would be triumphant; justice would be banished, and a reign of terror established; and when they had succeeded in crushing for the moment the movement that was destined to live until its mission was accomplished, did they think they would have increased the loyalty of the Irish people, or strengthened the bond of union between the two countries? Did they not know that a temporary peace founded upon such a basis had, in reality, no real security? When they withdrew the restraints they had imposed upon the liberties of the people, had not past experience taught them that the spirit of the people would be invigorated by their coercion, and strengthened by their high-handed policy? Coercion could never compete with justice. The Prime Minister once stated, with reference to Italian unity, that the real independence of a nation depended on the exclusion of foreign influence from its civil affairs; and that where the spirit of freedom ever so faintly breathed, the intrusion of such influence was resented as dangerous and disgraceful. Would the right hon. Gentleman repeat these words now? They talked of conspiracy and of organization as if such things were never in their own country. They forgot the time when William IV. dared not dine with the Lord Mayor of London, because there was a conspiracy to assassinate him; and they forgot the time when another man of the same name had to seek shelter in a doctor's shop to escape the fury of a London mob. They might force a peace upon the country, and call it a permanent tranquillity; but let them not be deluded by the belief that by such means they had made secure their power over the Irish people. Why, if coercion were an effectual remedy for disloyalty the Irish people ought to be the most loyal people in the world, for British rule and coercion had become synonymous words. And what had been the result of their coercion? Why, it had created more rebels than all the agitators that ever spoke to an excited people. Depend upon it that the safety and integrity of their Empire must depend upon the loyalty and affections of the people, and not upon the terrors produced by their coercive legislation. If coercion were an effective remedy, their conquest of Ireland would have been accomplished many a year ago. They had not proved to them that the existing laws were inadequate to maintain their authority in Ireland; for, at the present moment, they were arresting the people, prohibiting meetings, refusing bail, and carrying out their laws in a somewhat grotesque but most high-handed manner. He was at a loss to know what additional powers they required. Let them remember that for every right they took from the people they gave them a wrong. Every wrong strengthened the power of the agitator and the demagogue. If necessity arose to suspend the Constitution in this country, would they do so upon secret information, and upon the stories of policemen and interested parties? Did they do so in 1817, when they moved for the suspension of the Constitution in this country? No; they first appointed a Select Committee to inquire into the stories and the rumours that bewildered them; and the evidence given before that Committee clearly proved how easy it was to create a panic among English Ministers. They had no Select Committee upon this occasion, and they must trust to anonymous correspondence and frightened Police Reports for their information on this subject. In what a false position did they place the men who had been preaching the doctrine of Constitutional agitation to the people. They sent them back to Ireland with a strong Coercion Bill, worthy of any despot in Europe, and a Land Bill that very likely would not be worth the paper on which it was printed. They might say he was wrong in judging a Bill before he saw it—that they intended to do great things; but they must remember that place, like another place, might be paved with good intentions. They were naturally a suspicious people, their system of government had made the people of Ireland a suspicious race, for they had too often seen in their country the laws administered for a class and not for a people. The Government might crush down the people by coercion for a moment. ["No, no!" *from the Home Rulers.*] He hoped he was wrong, and if it pleased his hon. Friends near him, he would withdraw the expression, and say that the Government might disestablish the Land League; but if they did they would disestablish the only organization in Ireland that could now keep the people within the bounds of the Constitution. They defeated O'Connell; but O'Connell had not Ireland organized. Let them pass what laws they liked, imprison the men they thought most dangerous to their rule in Ireland, trample under foot every liberty appertaining to their British Constitution; but let them not delude themselves with the pleasing hope that by such means they could ever establish permanent peace or tranquillity in Ireland. They, the Representatives of the people, had their duty to perform towards them, to raise their voices against this mock Liberalism of the present day, for it was a Liberalism that had now assumed the cloak of despotism, and they could see no reason why the liberties of a whole people should be frittered away because one-half of the Cabinet was in a panic and the other half had not the courage of their convictions. There was a time when the advocates of Free Trade did not fear to raise their voices on behalf of oppressed nationalities; but time, and the influences of Cabinet Councils, worked changes in the minds of men, and when they had secured honours and high places they were apt to forget the teachings and opinions of their earlier days. The eloquence that was used on behalf of Neapolitan prisoners, and in condemnation of the tyranny of the Turk, was unheard when they proposed to suspend the rights and liberties of the Irish people. It was easy to be patriotic when they were not the rulers of the oppressed. Power and ambition often thwarted the best intentions of men, and, to some minds, it was a great exertion to sacrifice Party prospects for the sake of humanity and justice. The people of Ireland did look to the present Government for a final measure of Land Reform, and they had hoped that there was one man in England who would rise and become equal to the occasion—a man who would leave behind him a name honoured by Irishmen and revered by every lover of freedom; but that hope had now passed away, and they saw that they could no longer expect from an English Parliament those rights and liberties which were the just inheritance of a free people.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON) said, the discussion appeared to have wandered into some side issues which he did not intend to pursue. The arguments which had been presented against the proposal of the Government resolved themselves mainly into two, which were these—the one, that the condition of Ireland did not call for special legislation; and the other that, according to the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons), remedial measures should precede the introduction of this Bill. He submitted to the House that neither of those propositions rested upon any solid foundation. Taking the first of those propositions—apart altogether from official Reports, and from that knowledge which he supposed every Member of the House possessed, of what was taking place in Ireland, the House heard the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), who always had the courage of his convictions, state that in the county of Tipperary the law of the Land League reigned supreme, which meant that the authority of the Queen and the law of the Realm had been superseded by an irresponsible authority with which the ordinary law could not now cope. That was the question with which the House was now face to face. Was that state of things to continue, or was it to be subdued? Was responsible Government to be vindicated, and was irresponsible government to be repressed? That appeared to be not an unfair way of putting the broad issue that House had to determine. It was no idle boast of the hon. Member for the County of Tipperary when he uttered that remarkable statement. The hon. Member took credit to himself for it. The chief organizers of the Association which had brought about that state of things, on the 10th of October, when referring to the county which the hon. Member represented, said that if a tenant were put out of his holding the Land League would put him in again, and would do so again and again—

> "And let them, if they dare, see the man that will come there and touch a blade of grass upon your land."

That was not all. He told them very plainly how the law of the Land League was stronger than the law of the Queen. This was his language—

> "We will show you how we will settle the Land Question. Already a dozen of model farms exist in the County Tipperary. They are model farms, because they are standing there a living witness that the landlord dare not till the land, and cannot get a living man to strike a spade or plough in it, and he dare not, he is too cowardly to go there and till it himself. What has brought about this condition of things? Intelligent organization."

This is the state of things described as "intelligent organization." On the 21st November, in Mayo, the hon. Member for Tipperary advised the tenants on each estate to meet and agree amongst themselves

> "What they are able to afford to pay this year, or what is fair for them to pay, and that will differ according to the different circumstances of the case."

Then they are to

> "Pledge themselves to each other that no man will go behind his neighbour and break away from the agreement."

Then follows this advice—

> "Let them, then, go in as a body and offer to the landlord or to the agent the rent on which they have agreed, and tell him that they require for that sum a full and clear receipt for the year's rent. If he refuses to give that full and clear receipt, take home the money and pay nothing, and wait until he becomes more reasonable. The question then arises as to what the landlord will do, or the agent, when this offer is made to him. He may serve you with notice of eviction, and if he does you must then put down your foot and have it out with him. You must hold the rent, and keep that for your own use."

Was that the teaching of the Anti-Corn Law League, which had been referred to—was that the teaching of the Church which had been invoked by hon. Members at the opposite side of the House, who said the Catholic clergy had been found leading the movement? Were those the principles inculcated by the Catholic Church, the Episcopalian Church, the Presbyterian Church, or any Nonconformist Church in Ireland? Would not the clergy of any one of these denominations have shrunk with horror and loathing from the blasphemous *Lays of the Land League* that he formerly had occasion to refer to? Would they not have shrunk with horror from Pandeen O'Rafferty's travesty of the Ten Commandments and of the Apostles' Creed, which he would not pollute the ears of the House by reading. It appeared to him that the clergy were swept away by this movement, which religion could not arrest. It appeared to him that they had no alternative but to take the course they had taken. They were not free agents. If ever they expected in the future to regain their legitimate influence over their flocks, they had nothing to do for it now but join the movement. They were utterly incapable of stemming the torrent, and they were carried away by it, hoping that the day would come when religion and reason should once more resume their sway. [Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN: Shame! shame!] He was not ashamed. He was ashamed of any institution which travestied religion and mocked the creed which they all hoped one day to be saved by. The result of all that teaching was, as they had been told, that £5,000,000, some of which, at least, belonged to other people, was retained by tenants against what he ventured to say were the precepts of the religion which had been inculcated by the clergy. The first step which hon. Members opposite took was boldly to deny that there was any outrage at all in Ireland. ["No!"] If hon. Members did not deny that there was outrage, they ridiculed outrage.

MR. M'COAN: That has not been done from these Benches.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), in an exceedingly good-humoured and vigorous speech, ridiculed the outrage Returns, and an entry in those Returns of a broken pane of glass. Now, those Returns had been presented to Parliament in the very same form as they had uniformly been presented year by year, and every care had been taken that they should give fair and straightforward information. Most unfounded imputations had been cast upon the Constabulary, and it had been implied that their expectations of promotion gave them a motive to exaggerate or even to invent crime. Was it to be asserted that because men looked for fair promotion—as he himself or anyone might do in his own Profession—therefore any information coming from them came from a tainted source? He had known the Royal Irish Constabulary for a long period. They had preserved the peace in times of danger with great fidelity and much forbearance; and he could bear his testimony that a more upright, more correct, or more courageous body of men he had never known. The Returns before the House had been compiled in the usual manner, so as to give true and reliable information. The hon. Member for Northampton had ridiculed the entry about an old cabin that was knocked down. Was that too insignificant a fact to be noticed? These were "the short and simple annals of the poor." Were the Constabulary to exercise their own discretion and to suppress such circumstances as they thought fit? If so, the next time the suppression might be more important. The Constabulary were not the masters, but the servants of the public, and had to do their duty as the country required. The hon. Member for Northampton criticized the entry that 10 sheep were missing, and supposed to have been maliciously destroyed by being driven over the cliff into the sea. Now, he would appeal to that entry as a test of the truthfulness of the Constabulary. They had honestly put down the suggestion which was reported to them. [*Laughter from the Home Rulers.*] Was it not a crime if the sheep had been driven into the sea? [An hon. MEMBER: There might have been a storm.] What proof was there of a storm? Assertion was not argument, and the word of an irresponsible person was not to be taken against that of the responsible Constabulary. Another case in which there was an assault endangering life had been ridiculed. He did not envy the moral tone of those who could ridicule it. In the Return there was an entry that 14 of one Doran's sheep were maliciously thrown into the sea because he had taken a farm from which another tenant had been evicted. The hon. Member for Northampton had referred to carding. Did hon. Members know what carding was? It might be represented by a currying brush with the bristles taken out and iron wire substituted. In one case a party of armed men entered a house, pulled the man out of bed, cautioned him to give up a farm he had taken—and here was a Christian country and a peaceable agitation—carded his thighs, knocked him down, kicked him on the ribs, and after firing a shot went away. Was there anyone who would permit the meanest person in his employ to be treated in this manner? Of course not; everyone must condemn it. The Returns were made up in the usual way, not prepared for the present occasion, and neither their effect or the total would be diminished by anything pointed out in connection with the Returns. One hon. Member had congratulated himself upon never having taken any part in the agitation of the Land League; but he now openly expressed his contrition for not having done so, having seen their published official rules, and he said after that he would have no compromise with what he was pleased to call coercion, but which he (the Solicitor General for Ireland) would submit was an effort on the part of the Government to restore peace and order and the supremacy of the Queen in Ireland. It must be recollected that the people amongst whom the published rules of the Land League were circulated were keen, or what was known in Ireland as 'cute enough to read between the lines, and they were able to carry out the unwritten code, which, they were told by the hon. Member for Cork, no man dare transgress. Now, what was the kind of intimidation and offence which was being carried on? Let hon. Members turn to the Return, and they would find under the date 28th June, 1880, the following:—

> "At about half-past 11 o'clock p.m. two men came to the house of Hessian, and demanded admittance. After getting in they dragged him out of bed and beat him severely, breaking three of his ribs, and held him on the fire until a part of his back, about 30 inches in circumference, was severely burned. They demanded why he paid his rent, which he had done two days previously."

Here was the sole motive for this outrage. He had paid his rent; and that was in a Christian country.

MR. DAWSON: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman read the next entry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Solicitor General for Ireland is in possession of the House.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. W. M. JOHNSON) said, he had no objection to read the next entry. He had no desire to be unfair. It was this—

> "Same party broke open Hessian's boxes and robbed him of £15, which they found in one of his boxes."

[*Home Rule cries*: It was burglary and robbery only.] Well, then, it was not enough that they should break the man's three ribs and burn his back, because he had paid his rent; but they must also rob him of his money. There was a case in the county of Kerry. On the 5th of September last a threatening notice was sent to Mr. C. W. Staughton, warning him to give 25 per cent reduction in his rent; and on the 10th September, about 9 p.m., a shot was fired through his drawing-room window. He and his daughter were in the room at the time, but received no injury, the shot merely striking the shutter. Mr. Staughton would not grant an abatement of rent, and the tenants did not pay the March gale. It was not a question of landlords only; it might be the landlords' case to-day, and his own or anyone's to-morrow. It was a matter purely of debtor and creditor; and it might be anybody's case. There was no grade too high or too low for this mischievous outrage system, which he did not by any means saddle entirely on the Land League. When the law was in abeyance there would be found plenty of rowdy people ready to join in committing crime. Another case, which came officially before him, and to which he would refer, occurred in Sligo. A man had taken a farm from which the tenant had removed owing to embarrassed circumstances. On the night of the 6th of November one of the workmen of the new tenant was visited by a large party, who kicked and beat him; they burnt him on the back with a red hot iron, and went off firing shots. The same party visited another labourer of the same tenant, dragged him outside his house, knocked down, and ill-treated him. Both these men were cautioned not to work for the new tenant. The former man stuck to his employment, and got police protection; but after a little he asked the police to leave him. Why? Because he said he felt quite safe, having become a member of the Land League and subscribed to the Parnell Defence Fund. Whose authority was supreme in Ireland? The Land League, or the law of the Realm? He next took a case in Kerry, which came officially before him. A man named O'Donoghue was in bed with his family, when six men, disguised with women's cloaks and their faces covered with veils, came armed with guns and forced open the door. They dragged him out of bed, and, holding him down, they partly severed his ear, which was afterwards plastered up. His mother, almost naked, escaped from the house and ran to a neighbour for help. A sister, 19 years old, was dragged by her hair from her bed and nearly throttled by one of these armed men, because she screamed for mercy for her brother, whom she thought was being murdered. The younger brothers and sisters escaped, and hid in the turf clamps in the bog till daylight. His crime was connected with a purchase of land by another person; because he preferred to be tenant to the purchaser of the estate, who was a landlord obnoxious to the Land League, and had spoken disrespectfully of "Rory of the Hills." Could it be said, then, that the Queen's authority was still in force in Ireland. Were they reduced to such a condition that people could not live without danger of those midnight visits? The tyranny now established in Ireland was perfectly intolerable; and the House was face to face with the question whether the Land League was to remain supreme under the cover of the irresponsible authority of the men who committed these outrages, or whether the supremacy of the Queen was to be once more upheld? The instances he had given were part of the 1,401 persons not made amenable. One of this party was supposed to have been identified, and was brought to trial at the Cork Assizes and duly acquitted. He would give another instance of the reign of terror with which the law could not grapple, and which had also come before him officially. A lady had received a threatening letter, which was followed by the mutilation of a cow belonging to her, to prevent her letting a farm. He did not believe his countrymen were cruel. Indeed, it had been more than once pointed out that the Act (Martin's Act) for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was the work of an Irishman; but the object of these cruelties was to strike terror, and to make people feel that there was a power greater than the law. It had been said that no importance was to be attached to threatening letters; but he could give instances which proved that the writers of threatening letters had long memories. In one instance the threatening letter was received on the 6th of November 1879, and the person who received it was warned that he must comply with its demand to quit a farm he had taken in 1878 by the 1st of December. November passed, December passed; but on the 5th of January—this present month—three armed men came after nightfall with bayonets fixed. One of the men had also a revolver. The victim was asked why he had taken the farm which he held? In the end he had to promise to pay £50 to the former tenant; and to keep his obligation in his mind these midnight visitors then took down his gun, fired at him, and lodged 17 grains of small shot in his leg. He would not, or could not, identify anyone. But such deeds were not confined to midnight. That intelligent organization carried on its operations by daylight as well as at midnight. On the 8th of January, in the county of Mayo, three herdsmen, who were fixing up sheep nets, were ordered to stop their work by two strangers, and on their refusal were beaten with a stick—one of the strangers, drawing out a revolver and threatening to shoot the herds, ordered them to leave working for their employer. They could identify no one. Now, he would refer to a well-known outrage which took place in one of the principal thoroughfares of Cork. Two constables, about half-past 1, saw a group of young men standing in the street, and said to them it was not a seasonable hour for them to be out. The men accordingly walked on, and turned into a lane, followed by the constables, when one who seemed the leader cried out—"Draw your revolvers, and fire with effect." Instantly about a dozen shots were fired at the police, shooting one of them through the thigh. The second constable drew his revolver and fired two shots at the supposed leader. Well, the following morning a man was admitted to the infirmary, and it was supposed that he was the man whom the constable had shot at; he died and disclosed nothing—such was the perfection of the organization. They had all heard Lord Granard mentioned in that House as a model landlord. In Longford, on his Lordship's estate, ejectment processes were to be served on tenants. The police, with some troops, were protecting the process-server serving the processes, when the parish priest requested a parley with them. After speaking with the police, the priest went away and shortly returned and brought back several armsful of weapons. The magistrate then received information that behind a bank which the police and troops would have to cross there were 50 young men armed with rifles and revolvers ready to fire upon them as they passed. It had been said that the Queen's writ did not run in Munster. Certainly the Queen's authority did not exist in parts of Ireland. Were Her Majesty's subjects entitled to pursue their peaceful occupations, and obtain the payment of debts honestly due to them by means of the law, which, up to the present time, they had always imagined existed for their protection? Now, there was a remarkable case in the county of Cork. In January, 1880, near Bantry, a landlord evicted a tenant for the non-payment of rent, and afterwards stocked the farm with cattle, letting it to a dairyman. Well, in December, 1880, the dairyman received a threatening letter telling him to leave, as there were a good many bad members knocking about, who cared no more for a man's life than they did for a fly's. About 3 in the morning on January 11—this present month—16 men, disguised with blackened faces, went to the place where the threatened man was, humiliated him by making him put his own furniture out of the place, and then turned him and his wife and children out of the place. They then made him swear on the Prayer Book not to return, and reinstated the former tenant in possession. It had been supposed that someone would be made amenable in that case, as one of the men left the Prayer Book behind him; but even that circumstance failed to lead to a successful prosecution. He would not weary the House with a repetition of these cases. Intimidation existed in every form; terrorism existed in every way, and pervaded every class from the highest to the lowest, from mild treatment to savage brutality, the object in every instance being to strike terror, and the blow was administered apparently according to the sensitiveness of the person aimed at. What, he asked, was the use of comparing the amount of crime in Ireland with the amount of crime in England? The real points to consider were the objects of the crimes, and whether they were committed with the intention of making an irresponsible power superior to the power of the Queen and Parliament. He rejoiced that, thanks to the religious education of the people, social crime was a matter comparatively small in Ireland, and that when it occurred the first to give information and to assert the law were the people of the country. But in regard to agrarian crime all this was altered. The people became changed, and ceased to be the Irish nation as he and others had known them. He had not touched more than the very outside of the fringe of the question; but he did not wish to weary the House by citing further instances of the intolerable tyranny that had many parts of Ireland in its clutch. Now, the second proposition that was urged against the Government was that remedial measures should have preceded what certain hon. Members were pleased to call coercion; but what he preferred to call a Bill to restore freedom of action and extend protection to Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland. What advantage would have been gained if remedial measures had been proposed first? In his opinion none; for a Land Bill must follow the Bill, before the House, and a tenant, if threatened with eviction before the passing of a Land Bill, would be able to redeem his holding when the Bill became law. It was his conviction that no Land Bill that could be presented to Parliament framed in accordance with the principles of honesty and justice would satisfy the members of the Land League. He might be wrong, he hoped he was; but he had adduced some proof that the land movement was but the fulcrum on which the lever was worked, or was to be worked, for the disintegration of the Empire. If the people of Ireland were to remain in the state in which they now were until the passing of remedial measures, what was to become meantime of the Queen's subjects who now had a right to look to the Government for personal security and for security for their property? Was that right to be suspended while the House discussed a Land Bill? He impressed upon the House the importance of assisting the Government to speed the Bill which they were now discussing. He was sure that no one need fear the execution of the measure in Ireland but those who were guilty. There were many in the House who had known the Chief Secretary longer than he had; and he was sure they would feel that in intrusting him with these powers they would not be applied unnecessarily. Everything would have to pass through the hands of the Chief Secretary. Did hon. Members believe that the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with the statements of the spy, the informer, or the schemer? He was sure that whatever measures were adopted they would not be applied in a tyrannical manner; and he believed that the result would be that those who were now going about the country committing crimes and spreading treason would disappear from the scene, and that instead of the gaols being full there probably would not be a single prisoner detained. When the law of the Queen and the Realm should have asserted its supremacy over the unwritten code of this irresponsible body every honest person in Ireland would at once rally to the standard of order; a clear line would be marked between those who approved peaceful institutions and those who derided them, and peace and happiness, truth and justice, would once more prevail in the now unhappy and distracted Ireland.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, the speech which they had just listened to from the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) must commend itself to the minds of every man, and it had certainly proved conclusively the state of lawlessness which prevailed in Ireland, and that crime went undetected and unpunished there. The case of the hon. and learned Gentleman was also supported by the fact that many of them had received from Ireland letters showing the existence of unprecedented misery and crime. He listened attentively to the speech, because it had been stated that the Blue Books which contained the statistics of crime were inaccurate. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) last night spoke of the Returns being exaggerated; but what they had to consider was, whether the statements which had been now clearly made by the Solicitor General, and also in a former speech by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, could be disproved by the Home Rule Members. If it could not be shown that lawlessness did not exist—and he ventured to assert that it did largely prevail, and that the amount of crime had never been so great as it was now—then he said the Government had established their case. He wished to say here that the hon. Member for Northampton need hardly have told them that he was a Radical; but he doubted if even his Colleague would support every view which he expressed in his speech. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) did not believe that the hon. Gentleman's Colleague (Mr. Bradlaugh) would subscribe to the doctrine that there were millions of people in England who thought that no repressive measures were necessary for Ireland. The hon. Member told the House that he was prepared to support what was now going on in Ireland, and he added that he and his Colleague were the only two Radicals in the House who were prepared to get up and say so. [Mr. BRADLAUGH: I do not think that was stated.] That was very nearly if not the exact words that were stated, and he did not think the Colleague of the hon. Member would altogether endorse the statement. Then the hon. Member said that there were fictitious reports, and that the whole of Ireland sympathized with the Land League; but, for his own part, he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) was convinced that if a vote by ballot could be taken on the question, 90 per cent of the Irish people would declare themselves against the tyranny which that body exercised over them. A similar state of things, as he knew by his personal experience, existed in Ireland at the time of the great Famine. He remembered well what took place in that country between the years 1843 and 1848, when he was there with his regiment. It was the most unhappy period of his military life—at least, that portion of it between 1845 and 1848—for a state of terror was rife throughout the country, and they were continually harassed by outbreaks and disturbances in all parts. But the disaffection then prevailing did not originate with the poor famine-stricken population, with whom he sympathized from the bottom of his heart, but with a small body of disreputable agitators, who exaggerated everything, and instigated their dupes not only to rebellion, but to murder. Blood-money was spent for murdering men, and it appeared to him that much the same state of affairs, and even a much worse state of affairs, existed now. They knew at the time many of these people; but the difficulty was to get at them. The Government had, however, the courage to take extreme measures, and the result was that they were able ultimately to suppress the lawlessness of that day; and several of the agitators—at any rate, the instruments of those agitators—paid for their misdeeds with their lives. Did not the same necessity present itself for coercion now? He maintained that it did, and he hoped the House would pass these Bills, however much it might be against their inclination and the desire of the country. If they looked at the history of Ireland they would find that during the past 50 years successive Governments had been repeatedly obliged, generally about every 10 years, much against their will, to resort to coercive legislation. Once again law and order in Ireland were set at defiance. He did not wish to cast unfair aspersions upon any Member of that House; but he could not help thinking that if the leaders of the Land agitation in that House had held in Ireland the same cautious and discouraging language as they held in that House, the state of things in that country would not have been so bad as it was. If it were necessary to assure hon. Gentlemen who sat below the Gangway that the Government had most reluctantly come to their present conclusion, the very impressive speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) would suffice. The right hon. Gentleman and his Colleague (Mr. Chamberlain) had, to the last, so they had been informed, been amongst those who maintained that coercion was not necessary for Ireland; and did hon. Members from Ireland suppose that they would have raised their voices on behalf of coercion if the necessity for it had not been demonstrated to them? The House had to consider, not what a few hon. Gentlemen who sat among them said, but what the great body of the people required; and he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) believed, with all his heart, that never was a case for coercive legislation more clearly made out than that presented by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. It was well known that the Government were prepared to bring in a just and reasonable measure of Land Reform, and such a measure would receive the impartial consideration of every Member of the House; but to leave Ireland in its present state, to do nothing to mitigate the horrors and evils which now existed, would be a disgrace to any Administration. He was only thankful to see that the Government had at last awakened to a sense of the situation, and that they were determined to do their duty.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE thought that the Irish people had a just cause for dissatisfaction at the way in which the whole matter had been introduced to the House. If the Government thought proper to take into consideration the sad condition of Ireland, they ought to have assembled Parliament in November, instead of which they allowed Ireland to drift headlong into discontent and get almost into a state of rebellion; and he must say the Irish people had reason to do so, considering the shocking state of the Land Laws. What the Government ought to have done was to call Parliament together in November, for the purpose of considering an Irish Land Bill, and then there would have been no necessity for this coercive measure being thought of. Instead of any such course as that having been adopted, only a very meagre and bare statement of the subject had appeared in the Queen's Speech, and the country was completely in the dark as to the kind of Land Bill the Government was going to introduce. Had such a course been adopted there would have been little of the agitation which had since taken place. With regard to the Land League, he sympathized with its objects as at first set forth, and with its central management; but he very much regretted the manner in which the local work had been carried on, and he altogether deprecated the instruments frequently employed by the different branches of the Association. He had nothing to say against the central organization, and he knew a good deal about it. The objects sought by it were laudable, and able politicians were connected with it. The people of Ireland owed to this central management a great debt of gratitude for its influence in decreasing the number of evictions all over the country. But the central organization, which he had no doubt was properly worked itself, had unfortunately neglected to ascertain that they had proper instruments at their disposal to work the branch organizations. Some of these branch organizations were worked well; but the result was that in his own county (Leitrim), and no doubt in others, the League was represented by the greatest scoundrels, who used it as an instrument of terrorism and lawlessness. As a consequence, those scoundrels had brought nothing but disgrace upon the movement. There was not a single person in his county outside the Land League who dared to express his opinions. Not a shred of the freedom of speech or action, in fact, remained. Their conduct had been such, in short, as compelled the Government to take security for order. Therefore, he did complain that hon. Gentlemen in that House had not attempted to direct the operations of the Land League into a proper channel, so as to make the branch organizations do and act properly, for they possessed great influence, and could have effected a great deal in that respect. As the Amendment that had been proposed by the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons) seemed to be the most rational course to take under all circumstances, he should most heartily vote for that; and the course suggested by that Amendment he thought was a reparation due to the Irish people. His special reason for rising was to impress upon the Government the necessity of the Irish people being kept no longer in suspense as to the nature of the Land Bill, of which they had as yet received no indication, and they did not know at all in what way they were to hold the land in the future.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, there was a distinction between the circumstances under which the present measure of coercion was proposed and those under which similar measures had been introduced in past years. One of two things had existed when coercion had been applied to Ireland hitherto. There had either been attempts to sever Ireland from the English connection by plots or open violence, or else certain crimes had been epidemic, and secret societies had existed which had for their object the commission of unlawful and unconstitutional acts. In both these cases the alleged objects against which coercion was applied were not only unconstitutional, but criminal. Now, however, for the first time in the history of Ireland since the Union, coercion was demanded against a movement which sought a Constitutional remedy for acknowledged grievances by means of an Act of Parliament. For his own part, he did not believe the abolition of landlordism was an object possible of attainment, seeing that if it was abolished there was a doubt whether, at the same time, they could also abolish dealings which would create the relations between landlord and tenant. But whether it were wise or not to abolish landlordism, it undoubtedly was perfectly Constitutional to seek to attain that object by means of an Act to be passed by Parliament and ratified by the Queen. He did not, however, allege that the fact that the object sought was theoretically Constitutional disposed of the case. A just and Constitutional object might be sought by unjust means; and he admitted that, under certain circumstances, unjust means might deserve, and would deserve, not merely the severe application of the existing laws, but the enactment of new laws to suppress them. The Land League had recourse to two means in order to secure their object. The first means was the insistance of an abatement of rent; and the second was the creation of a public opinion which would prevent a man taking a farm from which another man had been, according to the rules of justice and equity, unfairly evicted. Assuming that those means were unjust and illegal, he submitted it was quite as unjust and inexpedient to prevent their use in the present circumstances by the adoption of coercion. The adoption by the Irish of the means he had mentioned was the direct and immediate result of the unjust laws of both Houses of Parliament. It was admitted that grievances existed and ought to be remedied; and, therefore, it must be inferred that the refusal of Parliament, during the last seven or eight years, was a gross injustice. All measures of a remedial character introduced into that House were certain of being reduced, in "another place," to something absolutely worthless. The hopes of Ireland had been repeatedly disappointed by Parliament; and it was Parliament, and not the Irish people, that were mostly to blame in this matter. Let them cease to act unjustly towards Ireland, and they would see that the Irish people would soon cease to act in the way they were now doing. It was both unjust and inexpedient to apply coercion at present. The object of coercion was to put down crime. The Government might put down the measures of the Land League; but still the use of them had saved Ireland from other and graver crimes, for, no doubt, the landlords would have availed themselves of the distress of the people and evicted them in large numbers, as they did in 1848, and when reform was threatened in 1870; and then the peasantry would have retaliated by the agency of secret societies, and by murder. It was absolutely certain that the moment the Coercion Bill was passed, the landlords would set about using the powers of eviction. The Coercive Laws, however powerful they might be to put down the organization of the Land League, would be utterly powerless to prevent individuals from taking vengeance on those who they believed had done them injustice. When the Government abdicated its first function of doing justice to every class of society, the Land League was utterly powerless, although they had condemned them, to prevent such outrages as the Chief Secretary for Ireland had related to the House, and which he had heard with great regret. But even for that he very much blamed the Government, for having allowed the functions of the law to be usurped by the Land League, without attempting to check disorders until the very moment when Parliament was about to assemble. In his own county a professional man was threatened, in the open day, by a crowd of people because he exercised his professional functions on behalf of a client. Many such abuses occurred. He maintained the perfect right of the Land League to insist on an abatement of rent. It was an every day occurrence in this country that men in trade combined to abstain from dealing with certain firms, or to abstain from buying certain articles. If there was a law to prevent such a combination in this country, it was simply a dead-letter. No such law could be enforced in this country, and no such law ought to be enforced in Ireland against voluntary combinations. He quite admitted that if men were to be driven by force or by terror into such a combination it would be illegal, and ought to be put down. There were in Ireland a very large number of tenants from year to year, who were in reality tenants at will. Tenants at will enjoyed, in certain cases, a right to compensation, which, it was admitted now, did not at all cover the damage and loss which they sustained by being evicted. Among these tenants from year to year there were a very large number who paid exorbitant rents for their land. They paid those rents because the landlords would come down upon them—and frequently they did come down upon them—and said, "Unless you pay 5*s*., or 6*s*., or 10*s*. an acre more for the four or five acres you hold, I will evict you." There was also another class of tenants in Ireland who, when they went to their landlords for a renewal of their leases, were told, Unless you submit to a great increase of rent, I will evict you;" and they were obliged then, in order to avoid being turned out of their holdings, to submit to an exorbitant rent. Everybody admitted that these were frequent cases in Ireland. With regard to these tenants, who, in order to prevent their being turned out of their holdings consented to pay exorbitant rents, he regarded them as not free agents, as having contracted under duress. It was universally admitted that that state of things required a remedy; that they ought to be relieved from paying those exorbitant rents; that a machinery should be set up which would enable such men to have their rents reduced. He understood that that was one of the objects of the legislation which they were about to pass. This class of tenants, in consequence of the failure of all Constitutional attempts to obtain a remedy, had recourse to the Land League for an abatement of rent; and he must say that if success could justify anything, success was justifiable in their case, because the course they took had led us to the brink of some settlement. They should be told—he hoped they would be told everywhere—that they ought to submit to a fair settlement of their rent by Parliament, and that they ought not to attempt to measure their own rent. There was another class of tenants in Ireland who had contracted freely with landlords as to the amount of their rent with their eyes open. He thought it was totally unjustifiable to suggest that those who had freely entered into contracts should insist, not merely as a temporary measure, but permanently and generally, on an abatement of rent. He had listened to the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) and to others, and had heard no such suggestion made. The man who laid down such a doctrine might as well preach robbery or any other crime. He (Mr. O'Shaughnessy), however, regarded the present time in Ireland as a time of revolution, not carried on with sword and bullet, but with that instrument—the rent; and, having regard to what was fair in open war, theoretically, he believed it would be perfectly just, if it were advisable, to counsel even that class to suspend the payment of a portion of their rent for the purpose of compelling their landlords into permitting a great public necessity to be met by the settlement of the Land Laws. It was quite evident the House would pass these Coercion Bills; it had the force necessary to do so. They were told, and he believed it, that the House would also pass a just and adequate measure of Land Reform. He trusted those Bills would secure what he knew the Prime Minister had at heart—the peace and prosperity of Ireland. If they passed those Land Laws now, they would produce those excellent effects instantly; whereas he believed that the only effect of prefacing just and remedial laws by coercion, as they now proposed to do, would be to mar the grace of the concessions they were about to make, to generate new crimes, and postpone reconciliation between class and class and between the two nations.

Mr. MARUM said, that it was the duty of Irish Members to show that the sweeping assertions of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, extending to the whole of Ireland, were not sustainable; and in accordance with that duty, he would call attention to the state of the county which he had the honour to represent. About 50 years ago, as had been already stated by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) and other hon. Members of the House, the state of the County Kilkenny was deplorable. He (Mr. Marum) found, from a Report of a Committee of the House of Lords in 1831, that in seven months to the end of the preceding February, 12 homicides and 300 insurrectionary offences had been committed in County Kilkenny, while the convictions were only nine. Let them contrast that with the state of things in 1880, when there were only 31 agrarian offences, of which 20 were threatening letters, and one homicide—that of Mr. Boyd. He (Mr. Marum), in that House, had deprecated that homicide; and at a large meeting at New Ross, near where the crime had been committed, he heard the hon. Member for the City of Cork deprecate it in the most feeling manner. In County Kilkenny there were only five persons under police protection, or watched by them, and that was in connection with that solitary homicide. On the other side, among the provocations to outrage, there were 43 families, comprising 193 individuals, evicted within the 12 months. Therefore, considering the great distress which had existed, he did not think the Chief Secretary for Ireland had proved his case with regard to County Kilkenny. A fair argument had been used by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) to the effect that it was not the number of outrages that was to be regarded, but whether the outrages indicated had sprung from an evil organization. He (Mr. Marum) wished to show what the organization of the Land League in Kilkenny was. After the Fenian rising, Mr. Butt commenced a tenant-right organization. Upon the occasion of the Land Bill of 1870, a National Conference was held, and he was appointed one of those who, between the first and second reading, were to address the Prime Minister on the subject. He then took the liberty of pointing out to the right hon. Gentleman, that any measure merely of a penal nature, and which did not give a stronger incentive to the improvement of the land, would prove abortive. In a short time what he had stated was exactly verified. There was a property in his county comprising over 1,000 acres. Griffith's valuation was £794. In 1871, a middle interest having dropped, the landlord raised the rental to £1,350—in some instances the rents being made three times Griffith's valuation. On an adjoining property, where the valuation was £34, the rent £49, £76 was demanded. In another case, where the valuation was £7 18*s*., the rent £7 19*s*., a rent of £28 was demanded. The tenant entered into a compromise, held on for two or three years, and then gave up and became a wanderer. In the case of three tenants whose valuation was £39, rent £47 15*s*., notice was given that £106 should be given. He was a judge of land, and he knew the land in question; and he could say that it was utterly impossible for them to realize that sum. The case was taken up by the League, and, under the force of public opinion, the landlord did not proceed in the matter. From 1871 or 1872 successive Land Bills were brought in and ably advocated by Mr. Butt. All those Bills were rejected by enormous majorities, and even an inquiry, such as had lately been proceeding, was contemptuously refused. In the meantime, organizations—some of which still existed—sprang up all over the country in consequence of the attitude of Parliament; and in very recent times, the greatest of these associations had a precisely similar origin. In many districts the Land League had been joined and actively supported by the Roman Catholic parish clergy, who necessarily knew the real state of the country with regard to outrages, and who could not be supposed to have lent themselves to "dissolute blackguards and ruffians" in order to carry out the dictates of the unwritten law. He, therefore, could by no means accept the description given by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland either of the Land League or of the reign of terror that he alleged to exist; indeed, he positively denied the truth of the picture that the right hon. Gentleman had drawn. The real object of the League, at any rate in Kilkenny, was to put an end to the competitive letting of land, and also to prevent persons from taking land from which the former tenant had been unjustly evicted. One of the chief principles they advocated as a step towards the settlement of the Land Question was that the result of a tenant's improvements on the land should not enable the landlord to assess rent upon those improvements, or upon the increment occasioned by them. For the tenants he claimed the value both of the public improvements effected by the taxation of the occupier and of the private improvements resulting from industry and capital. By the former the value of estates had been increased at least 25 per cent, by the latter very often as much as 50 per cent, and seldom, if ever, less than 25 per cent. These and like concessions would, he hoped, be made; but Parliament was still tinged with the ideas of feudalism, and had a mistaken feeling that if an Irish Land Bill were passed there would be an agitation for the readjustment of the English land system. He would not detain the House at present as to the nature of Griffith's valuation, further than to deny, in the strongest manner, that it had been recommended throughout Ireland that tenants should not pay beyond Griffith's valuation. No statement, whatever, was made that that was to be the absolute criterion of valuation.

MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member was travelling beyond the Question before the House.

MR. MARUM, resuming, said, the right hon. Gentleman who now sat upon the Treasury Bench (Mr. John Bright) stated, the previous night, that the condition of the Irish farmer was better than it had been for some years. He (Mr. Marum) had a personal acquaintance with most of the Midland counties of Ireland, and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that not only had the three bad years which had passed left the Irish tenant unable to pay his rent, but they had caused arrears to accumulate, and he was forced to give acceptances to the landlord and shopkeeper, which at the present moment remained current in the Irish banking institutions. He denied that one good year was sufficient to rehabilitate the farmer, and he thought that statement had been made by one unacquainted with the condition of the tenantry of the country. The price of cereals in Ireland had been very low, while the diminution of stock revealed by the last official Statistics was of a most startling character, indicating that under the pressure of severe distress the tenants had converted a large amount of their stock into money to meet their liabilities; and as one of the proofs to the contrary, he need only mention that this year there were 35,000 acres of barley less than the previous year, while the price had been 5*s.* a-barrel less. The Statistics of stock showed a diminution in sheep in Ireland for the previous year of 476,000; a diminution in black cattle of 146,000; a diminution in pigs of 200,000; in all, a diminution of 3,200,000 for the year 1879; and it was most important that the House should study those figures in consequence of the circulation of a pamphlet by a Mr. Gordon, tending to prove that in the matter of stock the tenantry were better off than they ever were before. That pamphlet dealt with the Statistics of the County Down to 1879, and ignored the diminution which was apparent in 1880. He thought that Irish Members, while they gave the House whatever information they possessed, ought not to obstruct or delay Business by talking against time. He had intended to refer to the subject of coercion at greater length; but as he understood that on the second reading he could dispute the principle of the Bill, he would defer his further observations till that stage. He might, however, now remark that it was not so much a question of what law they passed as of how the law was administered in Ireland. That was what exasperated the people. He had himself long acted as a magistrate for the county of Kilkenny, and for the Queen's County also. He, therefore, knew something of the administration of local justice, and, without imputing any want of rectitude to his associates on the Bench in those counties, he asserted that the results of sectarian ascendancy had become almost intolerable to the people. In the county he represented (Kilkenny) there were 97 magistrates on the roll, and though 86 per cent of the inhabitants were Roman Catholics, there were only 16 out of the 97 magistrates of the Roman Catholic persuasion. It might be said, with some force, that gentlemen of fortune, intelligence, and social status did not exist in the same proportion amongst the Catholic population as amongst other populations; but as far as Kilkenny was concerned, he was in a position to name at least a dozen gentlemen, who in education, position, and intelligence, were far superior to the appointments that within the last two years had been made in that county. Under those circumstances, the population of the country naturally looked with suspicion upon the administration of the law. In the towns of Castlecomer and Durrow, the lords of the soil were Protestants, and sat upon the Bench. Their agents were Protestants and magistrates; the clerks of petty sessions were Protestants, and in Castlecomer that official was a clerk in the Rent Office. The sub-inspector was a Protestant—and the resident magistrates were often connected by family ties with the ordinary county families. In fact, the whole air was Protestant; and was it not reasonable that the people should regard with suspicion the administration of justice from those considerations? He utterly denied that there was ground for the statement that the outrages sprang from the organization which existed. He had made many speeches in Ireland, and he had been accompanied by Government reporters, but he did not think any of his speeches had been found in the Four Courts. In conclusion, he contended that, as far as the existence of disorder was concerned, the Government had as much right to proclaim Lancashire or any English county as the county of Kilkenny, which he represented.

Mr. W. H. LEATHAM said, that as a new Member rising to address the House for the first time this Parliament, he had to claim the indulgence usually granted on such occasions. He should not, however, detain it for more than a few minutes. He very much regretted that he had not a chance of seeing the Government Land Bill; but after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and that of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, he should, however reluctantly, as regarded the Coercion Bill, support the Government. At the same time, he could bear testimony to the warm expressions of sympathy which existed in South Yorkshire towards the Irish people; but he could not help feeling that the Government had shown great forbearance, for the law must be maintained. In his opinion, the advice given by some of the hon. Members from Ireland sitting on the Opposition Bench, in the agitation instituted by the Land League, given, as he (Mr. W. H. Leatham) was certain with the best intentions, was of a most mischievous character. If they saw they had made a mistake he hoped they would say so before it was too late; because we were all liable to mistakes, and they might wake up to find their occupation gone. The Irish were an excitable people, and they were also a quick-witted people, and he was reminded of a story he had heard many years ago of a gentleman who was travelling in Ireland with a guide. They were both mounted on horseback, and came to a wild heath, where a highway robbery, attended by murder, had been committed. The highwaymen had been convicted and executed for the murder, and their lifeless bodies were still hanging on a gibbet to warn others. The gentleman, in a half joking way, said to his guide, pointing to the gibbet—"Pat, where would you be if every man had his deserts?" The guide replied—"Please your honour, sir, I should be riding alone"—that was, the gentleman would be hanging on the gibbet, and he would be riding alone. Now, he thought it would be better for Pat to be riding alone than in the company of some of his present advisers. He (Mr. W. H. Leatham) had full confidence in the Liberal Government of the day that justice would be done about the Land Laws of Ireland, and he respectfully asked the Irish nation to have confidence also, and that they should trust to the Government now in power to right their intolerable grievances. He hoped, when a good Land Bill was brought in and other measures followed—such as the further cultivation of waste lands, the establishment of manufactures, the establishment of fisheries, and the emigration of some more people where they were too thickly placed together, as had been hinted at by the right hon. and gallant Member for Wigtown (Sir John Hay) in a former debate, whether by Government aid or not—that Ireland would raise up her head and become what she was intended to become to England, and what every one would wish to see her, "a thing of beauty and a joy for ever." He thanked the House for the patient hearing it had accorded him, and would conclude by saying he should heartily vote for the Government measure.

MR. M'COAN said, it was with pleasure that he rose to acknowledge the courtesy with which the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. W. M. Johnson) had laid before the House his supplement to the statement of the Chief Secretary; and he could only say that if a spirit of similar conciliation had been shown to the hon. Gentlemen sitting on these Benches, the progress of the debate up to the present time would probably have been marked by less acrimony than had sometimes characterized it. Now, a great deal of the discussion which had hitherto taken place had, he conceived, been wide of the main issue before the House. As he understood it, the real issue narrowed itself to this. It was proposed by the Government to pass a Coercion Bill for Ireland, and the question for the House and the nation to give their verdict on was—Whether coercion was necessary in the present circumstances of Ireland? He should endeavour to show that it was not. Since the Union there had been 57 coercive measures for Ireland, and 10 of these had been the suspension of the Habeas Corpus. Protracted as might have been the discussion on that Bill, there were analogous cases. When, for instance, the Bill of 1846 was brought before Parliament, though introduced into the House of Lords, it was four months in passing through the House of Commons. Therefore, that showed that the Irish Members were well within the limits of usage in continuing the debate as they had done. The Chief Secretary for Ireland based his right to ask for such exceptional legislation on the present alleged criminal condition of Ireland, and the insufficiency of the ordinary law to meet the situation. He further supported his statement by referring to the official Statistics, which comprised no less than 1,590 alleged agrarian outrages, which had been officially reported in 10 months of last year. Although in the debate on the Address, the right hon. Gentleman made the most of the gross total, he now had the candour to throw over the threatening letters, which amounted to 1,337 out of the whole number. Thus the question remained—Did 1,100 odd agrarian offences demonstrate to the satisfaction of the House that Ireland was in such a state of disturbance, anarchy, and disregard of law that it required coercion? The occasion was one of such extreme importance both to the reputation and dignity of all concerned, that he (Mr. M'Coan) should now join issue with the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the subject of the Returns, and should endeavour to show that the foundation on which he rested was a foundation of sand and nothing more. Many of the alleged outrages were duplicated, many triplicated, and some made to do duty even four times over. In some cases it was as if a man who had been given two black eyes were to reckon that he had been the victim of two assaults. The very first case in the Blue Book to which he should call attention was of a trivial character. It was that where the thatch of a cottage was pulled down, probably for mischief merely, and the perpetrator, when brought before the magistrates, was dismissed. On page 5, there was a case of maliciously injuring some grates and chimney-pieces. Surely that was not a grave agrarian offence. Then there was a case of a family quarrel, in which a woman had, first, thrown stones at someone, then a basin of water, and finally had fired a pistol and missed. He was altogether at a loss to see how this case could be considered an agrarian outrage. On page 8 of the Blue Book an assault by one man upon another, with whom he had been drinking in a public-house, was set down by a police reporter to a bad feeling existing between them about a piece of land. There was absolutely nothing but the gratuitous suggestion of the police reporter to give the case an agrarian colour, and he could assure the House, on his honour, that there were not scores, but hundreds of cases reported of a similar kind. It was hard to speak with patience in respect of those who were responsible for getting up such Returns. The Chief Secretary for Ireland naturally extended his confidence to his subordinates; but he (Mr. M'Coan) could not help thinking that if the right hon. Gentleman had analyzed this Blue Book for himself, his demand for coercion on the strength of it would never have been made. A weaker, more misleading brief was never placed in the hands of counsel. It was really beneath the dignity of Parliament to have to discuss such things. Cases of the smallest possible import were magnified by the language of the Return into agrarian crime. On page 20 of this Return was the case of a woman who took forcible possession of her brother's house. Now, if this woman refused to quit her brother's house, was not the existing law sufficient to meet the case, and was it an outrage? She was taken into custody by the police, and when convicted of the offence was fined 10*s*. He would not permit himself to say all he felt when he saw such cases brought before the House, for he had the greatest possible respect for the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General for Ireland. On page 23 he read, in the same category, the act of some foolish person who had stuck harrow-pins into a field with the intention, it was thought, of breaking a reaping machine. At pages 14, 15, and 20 of the Return there were instances of the duplication and even triplication of cases; and on page 27 a case was mentioned of a man named Christopher Moran, who was evicted from his house and farm on the 16th of August, and who, on the night of the 22nd of August, took forcible possession of the house and land. A breach of the law was committed; but he contended that the ordinary law was quite adequate in dealing with this case and with all the cases enumerated in the Return. He did not justify any of the offences reported; but he did contend that they were not sufficient to justify coercion. It was perfectly astounding that cases of so trivial a nature should be included in the Return, and be taken as a basis for asking Parliament to grant extraordinary powers, when they could be so amply met by the ordinary law. Some of the "outrages" were simply laughable, as, for instance, the case which detailed the circumstances attending the throwing of a stone at a process-server among a crowd of people. It was said a number of persons had assembled in face of a force of 65 police. All that happened in the way of violence was the throwing of this one stone, and the police could have easily taken the delinquent into custody if they had thought fit. He was, however, subsequently arrested, and the case was tried at the Ennis Assizes, when the prisoner was acquitted; and he (Mr. M'Coan) did not wonder, seeing, forsooth, that the country was in such a disorganized and terror-stricken condition, that no jury could be got to find a verdict. Yet this offence, which the police themselves looked upon as trivial, was included in the Return as an agrarian outrage. One of the cases of intimidation was that of Austen M'Keane and Michael Malone, who, on the 19th of October, entered the house of Patrick Hayes, a process-server. Hayes invited them to sit down, and M'Keane answered that he would not sit with a process-server, adding—

> "You stole a march on me the other day when you served a process on my mother for rent; but if I had been there I would have broken your neck, or cut the ears off you as they did others at Mayo."

The victim of this outrage thought so little of it that he declined to prosecute, yet the officials reported it to the Castle, and it appeared in the Blue Book. He supposed, however, hon. Members would say that was owing to a system of terrorism and intimidation. On page 27 of the Return was an instance of taking forcible possession which he (Mr. M'Coan) did not in any way condone; but he certainly thought it could have been adequately dealt with by the ordinary law—as, indeed, it had been, for on going for trial the charge against the man was dismissed. He was obliged to quote a number of instances, for he desired to impress upon the Government the character of the materials upon which they asked for powers of an extraordinary character which aimed a blow at the liberty of the subject. There was another case of an evicted man's wife retaking possession of the house of her husband, after the sheriff, who had executed the decree of ejectment, had turned his back. This was set down as an agrarian outrage, and went to build up the foundation on which the Government based its demand for a suspension of the Habeas Corpus. Again, a sheep was found dead in a drain. There would be nothing in this fact alone; but the policeman appended the note that the owner of the sheep was on bad terms with a man whom he had evicted. It was an outrage on the intelligence of the House to accept such a suggestion in support of this Bill. Under the heading of "Resistance to legal process," a case was put down in which the entrance to a house was blockaded and missiles were thrown from an upper window. Fourteen persons were arrested; some were committed to the Assizes, convicted, and sentenced to fine and imprisonment. The sentences were heavy, and the case showed that the ordinary law was more than enough. Among the cases of duplication, and therefore of substantial falsification, was one in which a man was fired at and wounded in the arm, and this case was put down both under "Firing" and under "Riots and affrays." In another case, 52 yards of a bank, called in Ireland a ditch, was thrown down, and it was stated that there was a lawsuit about the land on which the dike had been built. It was difficult to put the finger on any case which was of a graver character. Could frivolity go further than to describe as "injury to property" the breaking of a single pane of glass in a bedroom window and knocking down the top of a haycock in a field? And yet the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had asked them to impose martial law upon Ireland, because, amongst other things, a single pane of glass in a common window had been broken. These were the cases on which the Government relied to show that a state of anarchy, of lawlessness, and of organized disregard of the law existed in Ireland which could only be met by the suspension of the Habeas Corpus. In another case under this heading, case 7, page 93, a drawing-room window was broken by the throwing of a stone; and the sting of the matter consisted in the allegation of the policeman that the cause for the commission of the offence was that the occupant of a house was about to issue ejectment processes for non-payment of rents. A great deal had been made in the course of the debate of the offence against the person known as "carding;" but he could not, on the most careful examination of the whole list of offences, find that more than one single offence of this kind had been committed. He did not attempt to justify that outrage, which was an atrocious, a cruel, and a vile one; but when the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had dwelt with such emphasis and indignation upon the offence of carding, as if it were one of the most common known to Irish Criminal Law, common candour might have induced him to inform the House that only a single offence of that character had been committed. The last case to which he would refer was triplicate—one, a case where three assaults had been committed by the same party. The instances he had quoted supported his averment that a more monstrous case of official concoction than the Blue Book before him never was issued from the Press. There were, no doubt, cases of crime which he greatly regretted had been committed; but they were, as he had said, crimes with which the ordinary law could quite adequately grapple. It was said that evidence could not be procured and juries would not convict; but how could the suspension of the Habeas Corpus mend that state of things? If it existed, there was a remedy for it; and to that he would invite the attention of the House. What was the average of crime of all kinds in the year 1831? The total was then 16,008. In 1833 the number was 9,000, including 172 cases of murder as against 8 cases of murder in 1880. In 1845 the total was 5,738, including 137 cases of murder; in 1846, 6,689, including 176 cases of murder. After the passing of the Land Bill in 1870, emasculated though it was, the cases of crime of all kinds greatly fell off. That Bill was the sole remedial measure passed, the first act of agrarian justice done to Ireland since the Union, and its effect was immensely to decrease crime. The course which the Government ought now again to take was that which every true friend of theirs would advise — to apply remedies to the patient, not stimulants, which only made the fever worse. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, seeing that his 2,500 outrages lessened by 1,100 threatening letters would not support his case, said that it was justified by other information in the possession of the Government. But had not the House a right to know what that other information was? For he held that there was not sufficient evidence in the Blue Book to justify the conviction of a pickpocket. It was intended by this Bill to hand over the whole power of government to a particular class in Ireland, and practically to place the entire population under martial law. Was it fair, humane, or just to place such a power in the hands of a hostile class? At any rate, before the Government Bill became law, it would be necessary to get rid of its odious feature of retrospection, which was intended to strike terror into the breasts of those who had stood up for their country's rights, and who had yet kept themselves strictly within the four corners of the existing law. By an easy form of abuse the action of the Irish Members had been characterized as obstruction, and thus the feelings and the sympathies of hon. Members and of Englishmen out-of-doors had been turned against them. The conduct of the Irish Members on the present occasion, however, was not without respectable precedent. He gave the Government warning that from the present moment he should offer every opposition to the passing of this Bill that the Forms of the House would permit. Irish Members objected to the measure because it proposed to outrage the liberties of the Irish people. It was an historical fact that during the 80 years that elapsed since the Union they had continued coercion in Ireland without intermission. Scarcely a year had passed in which the ordinary law was not supplemented by some arbitrary measure; but the result of that policy had been a miserable failure to produce prosperity or contentment in Ireland. Should not that suggest to the Government the necessity of trying a change; and even if they only brought on a moderate Land Bill, far short of the Land League programme, he should have advised its acceptance, trusting to the generosity of Parliament to develope its provisions at a future time. He would conclude by asking the attention of hon. Members to statements in *The Belfast Morning News*, *The Londonderry Standard*, and *The Cork Examiner*, which showed that even Orange journals denounced the Coercion Bill. The first of those papers, *The Belfast Morning News*, directly contradicted the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, and said that Ireland was at that present moment in a perfectly tranquil state. The Irish Members had been charged with alienating the sympathies of their English friends. He could only say he had expected a more generous display of kindly feeling. Party spirit would excuse much; but he did not think justice had been done to them. It was because he so highly respected the House that he had taken so much trouble thoroughly to analyze the Returns in the Blue Book, and the result was so striking that even from him he believed the facts would tell. He congratulated himself that he had been enabled, probably for the first time, to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the real facts of the case, and would conclude by apologizing to the House for the protracted speech he had thought it his duty to make.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I rise, Sir, to plead, very respectfully, the advantage of our bringing this debate to a close. Permit me to say that, after having closely attended to the arguments that have been employed, having heard the elaborate discussion of the tables placed before the House, I find nothing in those arguments, or in that discussion, to render it useful for the public advantage—but much to suggest the contrary conclusion—that we should carry this discussion upon this preliminary stage of the measure into the coming week. I will venture to say that it would be a great advantage to hon. Gentlemen themselves who are the opponents of this Bill, that they should have in their hands the measure itself. I am sure, after listening to much that has been said, they have little idea of its scope and bearing. If they will permit us to divide, to-morrow morning they will have the Bill in their hands, and they will then know exactly what they have to expect. I know not whether it is possible to produce an effect upon their minds. They look, I know, for a large and liberal hearing from this House; but if they are to have that large and liberal hearing which they ought to have, it is incumbent upon them also to accommodate themselves to reason. I do put it to them in a case of this kind, where so much depends upon the exact effect of a small number of carefully-chosen words, where the subject-matter is of the highest delicacy and importance concerning the personal freedom of the subjects of Her Majesty, it is really much better that, instead of vague, and I will say most inaccurate, statements as to the purport and probable effects of this Bill, they should allow themselves to be placed at length in possession of the authentic text. Sir, I know it may be said that we have only debated the introduction of this Bill for three nights, and that, on a former occasion, a Bill of a wider and more varied scope was debated, I think, for five. But, on the other hand, hon. Gentlemen achieved an extraordinary feat on the Adress to the Throne. They will find that in that debate they far surpassed all former performances, and that a little concession to the general feeling of the House at this particular stage would still enable them to say that they have spent many more days and hours of the time of Parliament in opposing the measures of the Government up to the present stage than has ever been so consumed in any Parliament and by any Representatives before. I will not dwell upon some questions, especially at this advanced hour, which, perhaps, I should like to have touched at greater length. But there is one subject upon which I will only say a very few words, because some hon. Gentlemen have attached to it greater importance, at this stage, than I think it deserves. It has been said that we ought to have given precedence to remedial over coercive, or what we call protective, legislation. And here I come upon the inaccurate conception of the Bill that has been formed by many hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. They have spoken as if we were legislating against the agitation of the Land Question in Ireland, or as if we were legislating against popular discontent in any part of Ireland. Were it so, I would at once admit that it were far better to proceed, in the first instance, with our remedial measures. But we are legislating, as was said by my right hon. Friend, against the abettors and perpetrators of outrage, on whose fears we desire to operate, as we do not know any other mode of acting upon their minds, or influencing their conduct. These abettors and perpetrators of outrage are, in certain parts and certain cases in Ireland, the suffering population; they are the Whiteboys and the ex-Whiteboys. They are the remains of the Fenian agitation. They are the persons, unfortunately, to be found in every community, who may not unfitly be called its dangerous classes, and who might be described, not unjustly, by harsher terms. These men are not the men to be converted by remedial legislation. What they fear is personal consequences; and it is for the power of administering these personal consequences that we plead; and, whether we have a sufficient case or whether we have not, it is idle to speak of governing the minds and conduct of such men by what is termed remedial legislation. If there be hon. Gentlemen outside and beyond the circle around the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), who are in doubt as to the vote they may think right to give, or the definite judgment they may think it right to pronounce on this question, I trust these hon. Gentlemen will accept from me the suggestion, how much safer will be the ground on which they tread when they see the very measure and the terms of the proposal of my right hon. Friend, than when they take from the mouths of objectors a description of the measure, the accuracy of which we challenge, and the accuracy of which the text will refute. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. M'Coan) addressed himself during the first hour of his speech to a task which did not pretend to entertain, but which was legitimate, and might be useful. He challenged the tables laid before the House by my right hon. Friend. He appeared, however, to lie under the misapprehension, common to many of his Friends, that my right hon. Friend had produced special information upon which he founded his application to the House;

whereas these tables are tables which are usually and regularly produced; but which, on this occasion, for the convenience of the House, my right hon. Friend desired to expedite as much as he could. But now I do not deny that, though they do not form the foundation of my right hon. Friend's request, they contain important matter. The hon. Gentleman has gone through a number of those cases. It would be impossible for me to follow him point by point; but he kindly acquitted me of responsibility for the contents of this particular Blue Book. I cannot say that I have any particular acquaintance with it; but, at the same time, I welcome all criticism upon it; and I say we consider that the man does a service who can show that there is less to be said on the subject of agrarian crime than is alleged by the Government. But I will say, with confidence, however, that, having followed the hon. Member point after point through his selected cases, I am prepared to affirm that there is no foundation for his charge; and on my own part, and also on the part of my right hon. Friends near me, to say that all the objections that have been taken to these Returns from the Irish Constabulary only confirm our confidence in their accuracy. Without troubling the House in detail, I will take a single instance. The hon. Member, as he went through the Blue Book, took out a great number of the most trivial cases and then said—"Is it upon such a case as this that you come to demand coercive legislation against Ireland?" Most certainly not, Sir. So far as we rest on the Blue Book, we rest on the graver and not on the more trivial cases. It is upon the aggregate of those cases and the circumstances connected with them; it is upon the source from which those offences spring, upon the combinations by which they are supported; it is upon the total failure of the administration of justice in the attempts to detect and punish crime that we rest, and not upon those selected items and units from the tables which the hon. Member paraded one by one as totally insufficient to sustain our very grave allegation. I will take one example. It is a case of a man named John Tunby. John Tunby is charged with an assault. He is recited here as having been charged with an assault upon a process-server. "An assault upon a process-server!" says the hon. Member. "A character so odious as a process-server!" He seems to thing it ridiculous that we should be regarding a process-server as invested with any of the rights of humanity. This process-server was under charge of the police. Aware of the dangers that he incurred in the regular performance of his duty, he had obtained the assistance of the police. The police were escorting him when he was passing over a bridge. A man named John Tunby threw a stone at the process-server which knocked him down, and the stone, which was sufficient to lay this unfortunate process-server prostrate, the hon. Member regards as if it had been a pebble tossed by a schooboy, and treated a thing of this kind as totally unworthy of notice in a list of agrarian offences. But what is the case? This is not paraded in a Blue Book before you as an offence of the most serious order. It is simply described as "an assault upon a process-server." Well, I submit it is an assault upon a process-server. If the hon. Member, or any one of us, were subjected to a similar operation in passing over a bridge, we should not be at all surprised that some notice were taken of it. But the hon. Member found his great occasion for triumph in this—"This case was tried at the Ennis Spring Assizes on the 2nd of March, 1880, and acquitted;" and then, in the remarkable words of the hon. Member, he said—

> "It is no wonder that he was acquitted, for in the disorganised and terror-stricken condition of the country no jury could be found to find a verdict against him."

MR. M'COAN: I spoke those words in a feeling of sarcasm, and nothing else.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am very sorry for the deficiency of faculty which prevented me from distinguishing between the sarcastic and serious portions of the hon. Gentleman's speech. The hon. Member has attained such a faculty for its practice, that it is difficult for me to do so. I assure him that I was extremely struck by the warmth and the force and the effect of that declaration; and if I am now told that that portion of his speech was sarcastic, I should like to know what other portions of his speech were also sarcastic. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) was far more astute than the hon. Member for Wicklow.

He was satisfied with the selection of three or four cases, and then he left the rest alone. My hon. Friend the Member for Northampton, if I may be permitted to call him so, said that some of these outrages were non-agrarian, which had found their way into the agrarian list. It is quite evident that that cannot be extensively the case, and for this reason—the strength of our case as to agrarian outrages is the want of convictions; whereas everybody knows that in non-agrarian outrages convictions in Ireland are as sure as everywhere else. Then it is said that in certain cases one outrage is made into two or three. [A VOICE: Five!] Actually five; a case of five. I followed those instances, and will be prepared to contest them. I say there are a great many cases in this Blue Book where there is stated under one head—that is, as one outrage—what might very fairly be stated as three, five, six, or ten. I will take a few cases. Two houses are fired into, two distinct dwellings of different persons. That is put down as one outrage. I say there were two. Three cabins are destroyed. That is put down as one outrage. It would be at least as reasonable to put down three. Eight threatening notices are placed on the separate doors of eight separate people. There would be nothing irrational in treating each of those as separate outrages. Twenty-one persons were charged out of a large crowd who assaulted the police. Their cases were various, and were dealt with variously. Some were detained only for a short time, some went before the magistrates, some to the Assizes. The whole of that is put down as one outrage. I repeat the words of my right hon. Friend, who said—

> "The greatest pains and care had been taken to act upon those rules of classification,"

—and this is the main point—

> "which the Constabulary have uniformly observed for a series of years, so that for the purpose of comparison these tables are perfectly good. While there is over-statement alleged and under-statement alleged, it is under-statement and not over-statement in which I believe."

Well, so much for the Blue Book, and the allegations of the hon. Member as regards their number and their character. It is greatly complained that we are infringing liberty in Ireland; and, although I hope we shall infringe the liberty of no single individual among the peaceful and law-loving subjects of the Crown, yet I admit we must show cause for what we are doing, and enable you to understand the extent of what we are doing. It was said, I think, by the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Dillon), that if we were aiming only at outrage he was with us; but he believed we were aiming at the Land League, and therefore he was against us. Well, I say this without fear of contradiction to those hon. Gentlemen who think with him. When once they consent to look at the Bill they will, I believe, find themselves to be of my opinion, that neither the Land League nor any other person or body of persons in Ireland can be touched by the Bill except as far as they fall within its very stringent definition, according to which no one can be arrested, except upon reasonable suspicion—and the reasonableness of that suspicion may be challenged on the floor of this House—except upon reasonable suspicion that he has been

> "A principal, or an accessory to a crime punishable by law, committed in a prescribed district, being an act of violence or intimidation, or inciting to an act of violence or intimidation,"

—and likewise, and over and above this—

> "tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order."

Now, if you will take these words and weigh them, I say they bear out in the strictest sense the definition of my right hon. Friend, that we aim by this Bill, and aim solely, at the perpetrators and abetters of outrage. If there be a perpetrator or abetter of outrage connected with the Land League, you will hardly claim exemption for him on that account. I stand upon the words of the legislation we propose, and I say that they do not in the slightest degree justify the suspicion that we are interfering with the liberty of discussion. I will go further. We are not attempting to interfere with the license of discussion. There is no interference here with the liberty to propose the most subversive and revolutionary changes. There is no interference here with the right of associating in the furtherance of those changes, provided the furtherance is by peaceful means. There is no interference here with whatever right hon. Gentleman may think they possess to recommend, and to bring about, not only changes of the law, but in certain cases breaches of positive contract. I am not stating these things as a matter of boast; I am stating them as matter of fact. I must say it appears to me that it is a very liberal state of law which permits hon. Gentlemen to meet together to break a contract into which they have entered. And yet, liberal as that state of things is, there is no interference with it whatever by this Bill. Interference is limited to the terms which I have described. But if you say that the arrest of a person upon suspicion of his participation in the commission of acts of violence and intimidation, in crimes punishable by law and tending to disturb the maintenance of law and order, is an interference with private right, I say it is an interference brought about solely by that singular condition of the country to which I will presently refer; but it is no interference with private right. It is an attempt towards the re-establishment of private right. Hon. Gentleman say, "What a dreadful thing it is—it should make you blush—that you should be receiving Conservative support;" and they really seem to think that the simple fact, that that support has been given in speeches, is of itself a condemnation of what we are doing. I may remind hon. Gentlemen that in the short period of the nine months of this Administration, we have been by no means fortunate enough to attract uniform Conservative support. One of the first things that we did was to decline attempting the revival of restrictive legislation for Ireland. The Conservatives censured us for that. The next step we took was to introduce an exceptional measure, a very exceptional measure, but a measure of relief for the distressed tenantry of Ireland—the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. I am not aware that, on that occasion, we received Conservative support. After that we determined, amid whatever difficulties and uncertainties, to resort to the ordinary law, and to trust to that ordinary law until it entirely gave way in our hands. We did not for that proceeding receive Conservative support. And, lastly, we have been censured, and shall without doubt be censured again, on account of the length of time through which we waited, till we had not only a surmise, not only an impression, not only a personal persuasion, but the means, as we thought, of fully and conclusively demonstrating to Parliament the necessity for the course of our restrictive legislation. If we have received Conservative support on this occasion, it is no fault of ours. Nor is it any fault of theirs. As far as I know, there always has been, I trust there always will be, in the midst of the selfish and sometimes wide divisions of Parties in this country some common stock of common regard for the maintenance of the principles of law on one side and for British liberty on the other. And sad, indeed, will be the day when the mere reproach of receiving Conservative support can for one moment shake a Liberal Government in giving effect to its deliberate convictions. Now, Sir, the Land League has assumed a remarkable prominence in these discussions. I shall carefully abstain from all attempts to define its character. It must be read in senses different and even contradictory, according as you estimate that institution by the few regulations which it has promulgated to the world at large, or as you estimate it by the unwritten laws which are the favourite code of its leader, and its inspiring spirit. But this I must say—that I not only do not admit, but I resent, the parallels which have been attempted to be established between the Land League such as we have seen it during the last six months, and other institutions of this country. It has been attempted to compare it with the League against the Corn Laws; but on that I will not say one word after the demolition of that miserable comparison by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright). It has been attempted also to compare it with the trades' unions in this country. Sir, the trades' unions of this country, I do not hesitate to say, marked an onward step in the intelligence and in the love of law and order among the working classes of this country. The trades' unions of this country—I set aside now that which I believe to be their primary and most noble purpose—namely, that of maintaining the independence of the working order, and preventing its members from becoming a burden to the community—the trades' unions of this country, when entering into the competition between labour and capital, have never for one moment tainted themselves either by a word or by an act which could bring them into suspicion in connection with outrage or the maintenance of law. [An hon. MEMBER: Sheffield and Broadhead.] Sheffield! do you call Sheffield an instance of the trades' unions? It was never owned by the trades' unions; was never supported by the trades' unions, who were utterly distinct from it in their temper and in their aims. What a poverty, then, of case there is. It is attempted to be shown that the reproaches now made against the Irish Members, the leaders of the agitation in Ireland, had their parallel in former times. And what was the parallel which was produced last night by one of the ablest of those Members (Mr. O'Connor Power)? He said that Sir Robert Peel reproached Mr. Cobden with promoting assassination. Well, Sir, it is perfectly true that Sir Robert Peel, under an unfortunate momentary misapprehension of an expression which fell from Mr. Cobden, let fall hasty words which might have been understood, when carried to their extreme, to convey a charge of that kind. [" Oh!"] The hon. Gentleman who jeers at me is evidently totally unacquainted with the history of the circumstances of that time. If he knew anything at all of the history of that great struggle, he would know that Sir Robert Peel in his place in Parliament expressed, in the most unequivocal terms, his deep regret that he should have been supposed to cast that charge upon Mr. Cobden, and he stated that which, indeed, was known to all the world, that there was no man less capable of so wild and so dark and base a proceeding. Then, again, to show that the leaders of the Land League are the martyrs of today, and that they are only undergoing martyrdom like those of other times, we are told by the same ingenious speaker, that Mr. O'Connell was persecuted by a Liberal Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and with great triumph the hon. Member produced the name of the man whom that Liberal Lord Lieutenant (Lord Clarendon) had employed in that persecution. Unfortunately, the hon. Member was ignorant that Mr. O'Connell was in his grave long before Lord Clarendon was ever Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: I rise to explain. Will the right hon. Gentleman permit me to acknowledge, in the frankest terms, that I was wrong when I said that Lord Clarendon employed that scribe to vilify Mr. O'Connell. It will be remembered, however, that I mentioned the Young Ireland Party in the same breath. In the heat of the moment I said that he was employed to vilify O'Connell. That was incorrect; but I was correct in saying that he was employed to vilify the Young Ireland Party, who were just as honourable as O'Connell.

MR. GLADSTONE: Far be it from me to say a word impugning the honour of the Young Ireland Party, or of any other party whatever. But I am not prepared to say of the Young Ireland Party, so far as I recollect and understand of their history, that which I think ought to be said of Mr. O'Connell—that upon every occasion in his lifelong agitation, so far as his intentions and his best efforts were concerned, he ever set himself to avoid anything whatever that might lead to a breach of law and order. Sir, we have now got before us a state of crime widely extended in Ireland. The fact is hardly to be denied; but the cause is made a matter of controversy. Hon. Gentlemen would have us suppose, sometimes, that this crime is owing to distress in Ireland; sometimes, that it is owing to evictions in Ireland. It is evident, by the testimony afforded by facts, that it is owing neither to the one nor to the other. [" Oh, oh!"] Well, Sir, the distress of Ireland in the first six months of last year was very great and bitter in many portions of the country. But those six months contributed only one-fourth instead of one-half to the agrarian outrages of the year. In the last six months of last year that distress was wonderfully mitigated, and in many districts of the country entirely removed. But the agrarian outrages rose to threefold the figure they had reached in the first half of the year. It is not easy, then, to fix the crime upon the distress. Can you fix it upon evictions? Let us see how they stand. In the first quarter of the year 1880 the crime was small, and the evictions were very large. There were in that quarter 490 evictions. In the next—the second quarter—there were 622 evictions, or about 1,100 for the half-year; and that half-year was not marked by any considerable, scarcely any perceptible, increase of crime. We come to the third quarter. There was still a large number of evictions, about the same as in the second quarter—629. Crime, I admit, increased in that quarter; but the evictions have not materially increased. We pass on to the fourth quarter, when evictions almost disappear. They sunk to 152; but while the evictions sink from 629 to 152, the crime rises from about 600 to 1,300 cases. It seems to me that if we wish to ascertain whence this crime really comes, we must watch its movements, and we must see what are the concomitants of this crime. That which diminishes while the crime increases is not likely to be the immediate and direct cause of that crime; but that which increases with the crime and the movements of which correspond with it with wonderful exactness, then it is that the judicious inquirer will begin to believe that he is getting nearer to the true cause and incentive to the crime. Now, Sir, let us see what is the real relation of the operations of the Land League to the crime of Ireland. I do not speak of these operations as a whole, because I am persuaded that there are many persons who have connected themselves with it who would not tolerate or excuse crime, or willingly contribute to it in the slighteet degree, however indirectly. But, at the same time, we must look to the words that have been used, and we must look to the consequences that have followed from the use of them. The hon. Gentleman says—"Why had you not the courage to withdraw the ticket-of-leave from Mr. Davitt?" Well, Sir, it appears to me that if we have to deal with anyone whose words and actions are to be called in question, there is no safer, no more upright course, than to challenge some Member of this House. I will take the speech delivered by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) on the 19th of September at Ennis. The hon. Gentleman gave us in this House a most attractive account of the operations and objects of the Land League. Nothing could be smoother than his language, nothing could be more moderate than its purposes, as he described them. But let us see what is the language he holds on the other side of the water. "Now, what are you to do," he asks, "for the tenant who bids for a farm from which his neighbour has been evicted?" He then describes, as I will read by-and-bye, the punishment that is to be inflicted. But I wish to observe, before going on to the punishment, what the hon. Gentleman's definition is of the offence. We are told in this House that the object of the Land League is to prevent persons from taking farms from which others have been unfairly evicted, harshly evicted, tyrannically evicted—evicted for the non-payment of unfair rents. All these limitations, with which we in this House can perfectly well dispense, are prodigally showered upon us here; but they disappear from the speech of the hon. Gentleman in Ireland. [Mr. PARNELL dissented.] Well, I will read the words of the hon. Gentleman, and a shake of the head will be in vain—

> "Now, what are you to do with a man who bids for a farm from which his neighbour has been evicted?"

MR. PARNELL: Unjustly evicted.

MR. GLADSTONE: I read the words as they have been reported accurately upon what I believe to be authentic evidence.

MR. HEALY: Jeremiah Stringer. ["Order!"]

MR. PARNELL: I rise to Order. In all the speeches that I have made in Ireland, in which I have referred to tenants being evicted, I cannot recollect a single occasion upon which I omitted the word "unjustly."

MR. GLADSTONE: All I can say is, that the memory of the hon. Gentleman seems to be fallible. At any rate, I am not quoting from any haphazard and unauthentic report, but from a report prepared by a shorthand writer of the highest credit and eminence, and sworn and proved in a Court of Justice. Such, Sir, is the crime. It matters not whether the landlord has been tyrannical and harsh, or whether he has been kind, indulgent, considerate, and forbearing. The crime is of occupying a farm from which, even in the last extremity—even to meet his own personal wants and those of his family—a landlord has felt it necessary to remove a tenant. That is the crime. What is the punishment? "When a man takes a farm from which another has been evicted"——

MR. PARNELL: Unjustly evicted.

MR. GLADSTONE: It is a pity these odd words so constantly drop out.

["Shame!"] Such, Sir, is the crime. What is the punishment? "When a man takes a farm from which another has been evicted"——

MR. PARNELL. Unjustly. ["Order!"]

MR. GLADSTONE: I shall read on, Sir, from the sworn testimony which I have in my hand—"You must show him on the roadside—["Shun him!"]—when you meet him; you must show him in the streets of the town—["Shun him!"]—you must show him at the fair and market-place, and even"—["Shun him!"]——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman is entitled to be heard without interruption.

MR. GLADSTONE:

> "You must show him at the fair and market-place, and even in the House of Worship, by leaving him severely alone, by sending him to a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his kind as if he were the leper of old; you must show him your detestation of the crime he has committed, and you may depend upon it if the counties of Ireland carried out this doctrine, that no man, no matter how full of avarice, how lost to shame, will transgress"—

What? The regulations of the Land League? No. "Your unwritten code." Does the hon. Gentleman believe, or does the House believe, that words like these are calculated to promote the observance of the law? The words sworn in Court are these—

> "That if a man occupies a farm from which any man has been evicted, from whatever cause"—

MR. PARNELL: Unjustly evicted.

MR. GLADSTONE: These are the words sworn to in Court; they were not shaken in Court, and if there had been an attempt to shake them those who attempted to shake them would have been subjected to cross-examination. These are the words which are so declared to have been used, and irrespective of the cause, the circumstances, and the character, of the proceeding, it is characterized as a detestable crime deserving of complete isolation from all human kind, for any man to enter upon a farm from which another man, for whatever reason, has been evicted. And here is another passage from a speech of the hon. Gentleman, spoken, I believe, at Galway—

> "Let no man take a farm, no matter what has been the cause—let no man take a farm from which a man has been evicted; let him be looked upon as a leper whenever you meet him in the street. In this way landlords cannot stock your land"—

MR. PARNELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman—["Order!"]—state from what he is now reading? Is he now reading from the shorthand writers' notes?

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is in possession of the House, and is entitled to proceed without interruption. If the hon. Member for the City of Cork desires to make any explanation at the termination of the right hon. Gentleman's address, it will be open for him to do so.

MR. PARNELL: It was simply to deny that, that I rose. I have no explanation to make.

MR. GLADSTONE: In a matter of this kind I should be liable to severe censure if I had attempted to disguise the quarter from which I have derived what I have been citing, or if I had taken it from any secondary source. All I can say is that I am citing these speeches in the hearing of my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Ireland and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and I am speaking from the evidence sworn in Court on the Dublin Trial.

MR. PARNELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the date? ["Order!"]

MR. GLADSTONE: I believe I ought to have mentioned that the date is the 24th of October last. That which I speak of is not the intention, it is not the motive, which are entirely beyond my cognizance; but the tendency of the language, and the tendency of such language coming from a Gentleman in the position of the hon. Member, especially when taken in conjunction with the rapid growth of agrarian crime, much of which has been associated in a most direct manner with this very business of eviction, with which I have to deal. It is not uncharitable or rash to assume a connection between the words of the speaker and the acts which followed. I will now read one other passage, not from a speech of the hon. Member, but from a speech of one of his leading Friends—who I hope is in his place—the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). These are the words of the hon. Member for Cavan, spoken at Kinlock, in the county of Leitrim, on the 31st of October, 1880. "It is your duty"—he was recommending, of course, the cause of the Land League—

> "It is your duty, and it is your interest, to give your assistance in such a manner as I will now point out to you. We do not recommend shooting landlords—that is an extreme measure, and certainly we do not recommend it, and, besides, it is held undesirable for the interests of the cause that it should be done, and for this reason—that when such a thing takes place it is blazoned forth in all the English newspapers, and prejudice is excited in English minds against the Irish tenant farmer, which is calculated to interfere to a material extent with the advocacy of my hon. Friend Mr. Parnell and others on behalf of the tenant-farmer."

["Hear, hear!"] The hon. Member appears to approve of this language. I cannot understand that cheer otherwise. If he does approve of it, I would advise him to repeat the cheer, and then we shall know that there are two, and not one only, among the leaders of the people of Ireland who consider that such language as I have just now read is within the limits of just and legitimate popular agitation. I will not trouble the House with other citations. Now, let us look to the facts, these being the words that are used. The Irish people are naturally, and from long tradition, a susceptible people, and the relations that exist between them and their landlords ought to impose special care in dealing with these subjects. It is for the House to judge—I would even say it is for the Members who have made these unhappy speeches to judge—whether their own consciences can acquit them from having used language which, whatever the intention, must necessarily tend, when addressed to less educated persons, under stronger temptations and with fewer restraints towards breaches of the law? Now, Sir, what has been the relation of the movement of crime to the movements of the Land League? In 1879 the meetings of the League were comparatively few, and yet even in that year as the meetings of the Land League moved upwards in number, so did the number of agrarian crimes——

Mr. HEALY: And also the evictions?

Mr. DALY: What description of crimes?

Mr. GLADSTONE: In the third quarter of 1879 there were 50 meetings of the Land League. I do not quote the quarter before this, because although the League was in existence it was in its infancy. In the third quarter of 1879 there were 50 meetings of the Land League, and 155 agrarian outrages. In the fourth quarter the 50 meetings grew to 106, and the 155 agrarian outrages rose to 462. We then come to 1880. In the first quarter of 1880 there were 42 meetings of the Land League, and there were 293 agrarian outrages——

Mr. HEALY: How many evictions?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I shall allude to the evictions presently. I am not quoting this as a case of great increase. On the contrary, 42 is not a very large number of meetings of the Land League, and, compared with the number in some previous years, 293 was not a very excessive or extravagant amount of agrarian outrages. But this quarter is my starting point. In the second quarter of 1880 the meetings of the Land League, for what reason I know not, fell to 31; and sure enough the agrarian outrages went down with the meetings to 247. But in the third quarter of 1880 the meetings of the Land League became very frequent indeed; they rose to 137, and the agrarian outrages rose to 354. In the fourth quarter of 1880 the meetings of the Land League were more than double—nearly treble. They rose from 137 to 392, and the agrarian offences rose from 354 to 1,671, the evictions in the meantime having enormously diminished, and having been in that quarter only about one-fourth of what they had been before. I will carry this one step further. I have hitherto spoken of Ireland as a whole. Perhaps it may be thought there were fitful movements in different directions, and that one of these movements may have neutralized the other. Now, I will compare the four Provinces of Ireland; not for the quarters, but for the years 1879 and 1880. In 1879 Leinster had 22 meetings, and 147 agrarian crimes. In 1880 these meetings rose to 117, and the crimes to 351——

Mr. HEALY: Nearly all of them threatening letters.

Mr. GLADSTONE: In Ulster in 1879 there were 44 meetings, and 109 crimes. In 1880 the meetings rose to 83, and the agrarian crimes to 259. In Connaught in 1879 the meetings were 71, and the crimes 471. In 1880 the meetings rose to 213, and the crimes to 961. In Munster in 1879 the meetings were 26, and the crimes 136—both very low numbers; but in 1880 the meetings rose to 160, and the agrarian crimes to 990.

So that with fatal and painful precision the steps of crime dogged the steps of the Land League, and it is not possible to get rid by any ingenuity of facts such as I have stated by vague and general complaints, by imputations against parties, imputations against England, imputations against Governments. You must meet them and confute them if you can. None will more rejoice than myself if you can attain such an end. But in the meantime they stand, and they stand uncontradicted in the face of the British House of Commons. ["No!"] They will tend to show how wide of the truth are the vague and general statements that hon. Members laid before us as to the innocence of the intentions of the Land League, and the purity of, at least, its written laws. But we have never said that the amount of this crime, taken by itself, was the basis of our propositions. That is not the case. You must consider the amount of crime in conjunction with its source, with its character, with what it indicates, and what it means. Nothing can be more idle than to confound this agrarian crime of Ireland with the ordinary crime of England, and the agrarian crime of Ireland with the ordinary crime of Ireland. What we have founded ourselves upon has been, above all things, the failure of the administration of justice. It is the administration of justice which constitutes the safety of the private individual, and which is the true guarantee both of rights and liberties. It is the failure of the administration of justice, with regard to which there has not been one single effort made, however trivial, in the course of this debate to establish a case against the statement of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland. ["Oh!"] I have heard more of the debate, I think, than the hon. Member has, and I can recollect no argument or statement of that kind to show that the administration of justice has not failed in Ireland. On the contrary, there has been a practice pursued which, in my opinion, is, to say the least of it, an inconvenient and an unfortunate practice—namely, that of mixing up together the case of agrarian crime and the case of ordinary crime. No doubt, if you do that, you so perplex and confuse the whole facts that it is impossible to arrive at any just conclusion whatever. We have nothing to do on this occasion with the condition of ordinary crime. The state of Ireland, happily, with regard to ordinary crime, is comparatively satisfactory; and in the midst of all the deep unhappiness of these proceedings to-night, do not let us lose sight of the future of Ireland, or fail to take note of circumstances which show that, however bad her present condition, Ireland has made great advances. Her population are better clothed, are better fed, and better housed. The hon. Member for Mayo said last night, and I believe he was justified in saying it, that there were still hundreds of thousands of Irishmen who live more or less on the brink of want and starvation. It is painfully true. But had the hon. Member been speaking 40 years back, he would have been entitled to tell us, not that hundreds of thousands were in that condition, but millions. Together with the improved condition of the people, as shown by the fact already mentioned in the course of this debate, that the rate of wages in Ireland have doubled or more than doubled, there has been a great diminution of crime. Unhappily for Ireland, I do not think she would compare favourably with the limited portion of this country with which I have the happiness to be connected—namely, the Principality of Wales, which stands, I believe, at the head, so far as the absence of serious crime is concerned, of all the divisions of the United Kingdom. But Ireland, with regard to general crime, holds a high and honourable place; and not only so, but the administration of justice is thoroughly efficient so far as general crime is concerned, and the arrests and convictions will bear comparison—perhaps even favourable comparison—with this and other portions of the Kingdom. But what is the case with agrarian crime. We must carefully sever this class of crime from ordinary crime. It is fatal to all true investigation of the case if we allow ourselves to mix them. What is ordinary crime? Ordinary crime is due sometimes to momentary passion; often to weakness and inability to resist temptation, and sometimes to hardened depravity. But in all cases where it occurs it is at once recognized as the foe of society, and society arms itself by a natural instinct to discountenance it and to put it down. An ordinary crime means the thing that it is, and means nothing more; but when you come to agrarian crime how different it is! Agrarian crime is the expression of the will, tendency, and determination not of one, but of many. It is not only a single occurrence; it is a symbol, and a reproduction of that occurrence in every similar case, where a similar provocation exists, and that provocation may consist either in the exercise of private rights or in the discharge of private duties. Agrarian crime is, above all things, important in its character as a symbol; in its character as a menace, and in the indications that it gives, and, unhappily, in the support that it receives. Whether it is or is not true that the administration of justice has broken down in Ireland with respect to agrarian crime, there are, no doubt, some who think how alien it is to the spirit of Liberal policy to propose restrictions. I am much obliged to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wexford (Mr. Healy), who, after a few weeks in this House, has already given indications which promise for him considerable prominence; but, as he may have occasion to plead against the policy of interruption himself, I would advise him to show a little tolerance — [Mr. HEALY: We have got none.]—in the permission of a free expression of opinions by others. [Mr. HEALY: We have got none.] If he will take a little friendly recommendation from me, I will say that his demeanour is not the best way to get it. The case of the two kinds of crime in Ireland is most extraordinary. What I was saying when the hon. Member casually interrupted me was that, no doubt, every man in this House must feel, and undoubtedly that those associated with the Liberal policy must feel most, the extremely painful nature of the duty we have to perform; at the same time, if it is our duty we must look it in the face, and must not allow the least emotion, recollection, or any secondary consideration to stand in the way of the performance of our solemn Parliamentary obligations. How does the case stand with regard to agrarian and non-agrarian crime in Ireland? In the year 1880, there were 3,084 non-agrarian crimes recorded. Out of these 1,269, or 42 per cent led to arrests, and out of the 1,269 arrests there were 694 convictions. Upon the gross total of offences returned, there were 42 per cent of arrests and 22 per cent of convictions. I have referred to the English Returns, and I find, as far as I can make out, that this percentage is quite as high, perhaps a little higher, than in England; so that as regards criminal inclinations generally the people of Ireland stand in an eminent and honourable degree acquitted; and, as regards the administration of justice, they gave as efficient co-operation to that administration as is given in any other portion of the United Kingdom. Now, let us turn to agrarian crime. In the case of agrarian crime the offences recorded are 2,590, the number of arrests 295, and the number of convictions 83. So that, instead of having 42 per cent of arrests, we have 12 per cent of arrests; and instead of having 22 per cent of convictions, we have 3 per cent. When 33 persons are guilty, one is brought to punishment and 32 walk abroad with impunity. I ask the House whether that is or is not a breaking down of the administration of justice; whether we, whatever be our Party designation, are to allow our fellow-subjects to live under a *régime* of unwritten law, the effect of which, whatever be its intention, is that as regards this description of crime, which bears directly upon the relations of life and impedes its action, 33 persons are guilty, one is punished, and 32 enjoy perfect and absolute impunity? No attempt has been made to meet this case. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), in his able speech, made no attempt to meet it. He mixed up the two kinds of crime, ignoring altogether the fact that if you do mix them you make it absolutely impossible to get at the truth. I now, however, point out to him that the state of things which we seek to correct, and which he will not yet agree to give us his co-operation in correcting, is one in which impunity is given to 32 offenders for every one offender brought to justice. This is the first stage of a measure which Her Majesty's Government have, with pain, resolved to propose to the House. They think that their first duty is, without being drawn aside by any other object, so far as depends on their free will, to apply an efficient remedy to this state of things. The hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue), in his speech last night, said he would offer the strongest opposition to this measure of the Government, and that in doing so he hoped to have the support of the feelings and the sympathy of the people of England and Scotland. Well, Sir, I think we are in a position to judge somewhat of the feelings, opinions, and sympathies, of the people of England and Scotland on this question by the course taken in regard to it by hon. Members in this House. We, at all events, know something of the feelings and of the opinions of the people of England and Scotland. It is true, they are divided into political Parties. One great political Party which, at times, returns a majority to this House is the Conservative Party. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Tralee hopes to obtain much support from that portion of the people of England who wear those colours. With respect to the Liberal Party, my position places me in intimate, immediate, and constant relations with all Liberal Bodies, Organizations, and Associations throughout the country; and I must say that since Parliament met, since the announcement in the Queen's Speech and since the powerful statement of my right hon. Friend near me, not one single day has passed without Her Majesty's Government having received from the Associations and Bodies qualified to speak and accustomed to speak the sense of the Liberal Party throughout the country, without the slightest evasion, constant assurances of approval and support in the policy we have pursued with regard to Ireland. It will not do for hon. Gentlemen opposite to deal in generalities. They must grapple with the facts which are established. They must by some statement of fact give, if they can, a different colour to the relations that exist between the Land League and agrarian crime in Ireland; and they must, by some statement of fact, if they can achieve the impossible, meet that which I think I have demonstrated to the House by a few figures of the breaking down of the administration of justice in Ireland. What does the breaking down of the administration of justice mean? That breaking down means the destruction of peace and all that makes life worth having; it means the placing in abeyance of the most sacred duties and most cherished rights; it means the establishment of the servitude of good men and the supremacy and impunity of bad men. We were unwilling to move in such a state of things without demonstrative evidence to support us. That demonstrative evidence has been unhappily accumulated upon us, and that evidence it has been our painful duty to present to the House. As to our convictions, I can assure the House that the pain and the amount of deliberation with which we have arrived at them is the measure of their present strength and solidity. We shall not cease to press our proposals on the British Parliament, and we feel confident that we shall have a truly national assent and support to this assurance, that our effort is an honest effort to restore to Ireland the first condition of Christian and civilized existence.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Charles Lewis,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

EXCHEQUER BONDS.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That a sum, not exceeding £2,500,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to pay off and discharge Exchequer Bonds that will become due and payable during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1881.

MR. CALLAN said, he rose to call attention to the fact that the hon. Member for Wexford had challenged the Vote.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that no challenge had reached him or the Clerk at the Table; and he had, therefore, declared the Vote carried.

MR. MONK asked when the Estimates would be in the hands of hon. Members?

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH believed they would be presented in the course of a fortnight.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next;

Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March

1881, the sum of £2,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next; Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

SMALL DEBTS (LIMITATION OF ACTIONS) BILL.

On Motion of Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, Bill for the Limitation of Actions for the recovery of Small Debts in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, Mr. ARTHUR BALFOUR, Sir HENRY WOLFF, and Mr. GORST.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 78.]

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 31*st January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Second Reading*—Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention (15).

AFGHANISTAN—RETENTION OF CANDAHAR—MEMORANDUM OF LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA.

LORD WAVENEY said, that, seeing the noble Viscount the Under Secretary of State for India (Viscount Enfield) in his place, he desired to draw his attention to the publication in *The Times*, though not from an official source, of the despatch of Lord Napier of Magdala, alluded to in their Lordships' House a few evenings since. It appeared to him of the utmost importance that they should have all the information which they could possibly obtain on this subject. There was one passage in particular in the Memorandum alluded to which was deserving of special attention, and that was that if Candahar were given up the Afghans would claim to have driven us out by their victory over General Burrows, and also to have successfully established Ayoob Khan as Ruler of the place. He thought it very desirable that a remark of that kind should find its way to the public; and he therefore gave Notice that on Friday, the 11th of February, he should move for the production of further Papers relating to the retention or the abandonment of Candahar which had been communicated for the information of the Home or Indian Government by civil or military officers.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—MILITARY OPERATIONS.

EARL CADOGAN asked the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any further information had been received with reference to the operations of the British troops in the Transvaal?

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, in reply, said, that the Government were not in possession of any despatches beyond those which had already been published in the newspapers.

RIVERS CONSERVANCY AND FLOODS PREVENTION BILL.—(No. 15.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

EARL SPENCER, in rising to move that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it related to the important subject of the conservancy of rivers and the prevention of the floods which had prevailed so much of late years. Their Lordships had taken a deep interest in this question for some years past. In 1877 a Committee of that House considered the subject; and in 1879 the noble Duke, whom he did not see in his place, the late Lord President of the Council (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon), introduced a measure founded upon the recommendations of that Committee. The House was, therefore, well aware of the history of the law upon this subject, and he should not enter upon it at any great length. He should, however, be neglecting his duty were he to refrain altogether from referring to the Common Law and the various measures dealing with this important subject which Parliament had passed from time to time. It would be seen on looking back to the history of the past that our forefathers were well aware of the importance of the prevention of floods. There would be found in *Coke's Reports*, Part X., p. 141, the following words:—

> "And it is to be known, that by the common law, before the Statute of 6 Henry VI., cap. 5, the King ought of right to save and defend his realm, as well against the sea as against the enemies, that it should not be drowned or wasted, and also to provide that his subjects have their passage through the realm by bridges and highways in safety. And, therefore, if the sea-walls be broken, or the sewers or gutters are not scoured, that the fresh waters cannot have their direct course, the King ought to grant a commission to inquire, and to hear and determine these defaults."

That extract showed what the ancient view of the law on this subject was. Several statutes dealing with the question were passed in the Reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV., and Henry VIII., which gave very extensive powers to local bodies for the prevention of floods. Had the Crown and the Courts of Law worked together harmoniously, doubtless these powers would have been ample to provide against the evil now sought to be put an end to; but, unfortunately, the Courts of Law chose to place an interpretation upon the law which rendered those powers almost valueless. The greatest blows directed by the decisions of the Courts against these powers were, firstly, when they declared that the Commissioners of Sewers had no power to levy a rate for making new works, or, as they called them, new inventions, but only for maintaining the existing ones; and, secondly, when it was decided that the Commissioners could only deal with navigable rivers or sewers connected therewith or with the sea. Further powers were conveyed in the Reign of William IV., and the Drainage Act of 1861 still further extended them. It could not be said that these Acts had failed in the effect intended; but they certainly had not operated in the manner desired. Only three or four Commissions were issued under the old law, and those issued under more recent Acts were greatly limited in their operation by various provisions, one of which was that three-fourths of the owners were required to give their assent before any operations could be begun. The fact must not be lost sight of that an attempt had been made to deal with the difficulty by passing numerous Local Acts—some 2,000 or 3,000 in number—enabling different bodies to deal with the subject in their different localities; but this had tended rather to confuse than to simplify the law, inasmuch as difficulties were continually arising between conflicting jurisdictions. It not unfrequently happened that the upper districts of a watershed were flooded, in consequence of the action or inaction of the local authority having jurisdiction over the lower districts. In dealing with this point he could scarcely do better than read to their Lordships a few short extracts from the opinions of those who were well qualified to judge of the state of things in the different parts of the Kingdom. Mr. Dawbarn, in a paper read before the Wisbech Chamber of Agriculture on February 7, 1878, said—

> "But when we examine into the jurisdiction over the middle section of this river, between Peterborough and Wisbech, it can only be described as simply chaotic. The North Level Commissioners have control over one portion of the banks, the Middle Level Commissioners over another portion, the Waldersea Commissioners over another, the Court of Sewers, the Wisbech Corporation, and private parties other portions. In addition to these, there are the Nene Navigation Commissioners and the Washland Commissioners: all these several authorities have rights and interests in the river, and yet not one of them can put a spade into the bed of it."

That was a good illustration of the confusion of interests that existed in certain parts of the country. He might remind their Lordships, in proof of the difficulty of dealing with this subject under the present law, that there were in England and Wales 210 rivers varying in length, including tributaries, from 688½ miles to two miles. Of that number, 11 were first-class rivers, having catchment basins of 1,000 square miles and upwards; 14 were second-class rivers, having catchment basins of 500 to 1,000 square miles; 5 were third-class rivers, having catchment basins of 100 to 500 square miles; 24 were fourth-class rivers, having catchment basins of 50 to 100 square miles; and 102 were fifth-class rivers, having catchment basins of from 10 to 50 square miles. In proof of the necessity that existed for legislation on the subject, he would read the following expressions of opinion on the question. On May 3, 1877, Mr. A. Peel, in his evidence before the Committee, said—

> "I have ascertained that in Somersetshire, for instance, in the month of January of this year, there were at one time no less than 100,000 acres under water; and that I believe to be not an exceptional state of things in Somersetshire, for I find that Mr. Grantham, the engineer, in

his Report in 1873, speaking of the floods of the preceding autumn and winter, says—'The extent of the floods during the last autumn and winter in Somersetshire was exceptionally great, the rainfall having been excessive there as well as in other parts of the country. This applies to an area of 69,000 acres, and a population of 70,000. But in most years a considerable extent of flat lands of that county appears to be seriously injured in its productiveness, and the health of the people more or less injuriously affected, by the want of adequate outfall for the flood waters.' What was the case in 1873, I believe, applies *à fortiori* to 1877."

Mr. J. T. Tweed, in his evidence given before the same Committee, said—

"The whole of the lowlands of Billinghay were really under water; persons went about in boats to the different houses; many of them were, I believe, kept in their cottages and farmhouses for weeks, I may say, and all their pigs and different things had to be taken upstairs, and you can scarcely imagine the state of things which prevailed there. If you had gone down by the railway towards Tattershall, a distance of 18 miles, you would suppose you were almost on the Atlantic; you could see nothing but water; you could see here and there houses standing six feet in water; stacks in the same kind of way; you could just see the tops of some willow trees, and nothing but a broad expanse of water for miles, and this within the jurisdiction of the Witham Commission."

Again, Mr. Brundell, speaking of the floods of the River Don, said—

"The flood of 1872, which sent our Commissioners to Parliament, was supposed to have done a damage of £70,000 on 15,000 acres of land. Our district was 15,000 acres, and it was believed that the district suffered to the amount of £70,000 by the flood of July, 1872; that was a summer flood. It destroyed growing crops. It entirely destroyed the hay crop in that valley, and there were wheat fields and fields of barley submerged for days; they were destroyed."

Mr. Tarbotton said—

"I can give you an instance of what took place in the rivers in the basin of the Aire and Calder, in November or October, 1866, when Leeds and Wakefield and Huddersfield and Barnsley, and many of the manufacturing towns in the West Riding, were under water six or eight feet in depth, and where I know the estimate of damage amounted to nearly £1,000,000. That flood I am well acquainted with, because I know the Aire and Calder basin well. I cannot give the area affected; but all the towns were affected from Leeds to Skipton, including Bradford, and from Todmorden down to Wakefield, including Halifax, Huddersfield, and Dewsbury. At Leeds and Wakefield there was water in the streets from four to six feet in depth, and very serious accidents took place; people and cattle were drowned, and boats were destroyed and sunk; in fact, it was such a flood as has never been known in the history of that district."

Other evidence of a similar and interesting character was given by several gentlemen examined before the Commission, and statements in support of their views were to be found in speeches which had from time to time been made by gentlemen closely connected with agriculture in the districts affected by floods. Mr. Coote, of Huntingdon, speaking as one of a deputation in November, 1880, said in regard to the Valley of the Ouse—

"For some years we pressed upon the Executive our tale of the disasters in the Valley of the Ouse, and the time has come to press that question again, for we are in impending ruin. In the last five years in the Valley of the Ouse we have had three years of the entire destruction of the crops of many thousand acres of land, and there has been nothing left to the unfortunate occupiers of those lands as the result of their years' expenses except the legacy of disease to their stock. I may say a word as to the health, and the happiness, and the comfort of the inhabitants of the towns and villages upon the banks of the River Ouse. In the town of Huntingdon alone, I see by the official Returns during the last year the death-rate was nearly double, and during the summer so terrible has been the condition of the towns and villages upon the banks of the Ouse that hundreds of the population have been obliged to take refuge in the upper stories of their houses to keep out of the way of those floods, and they have necessarily been provisioned only by the aid of boats."

He might also call attention to some additional testimony which had been given to him by a very reliable authority, a gentleman largely connected with the management of landed property in the Midlands, and also having acquaintance with various other parts of the country. This gentleman, referring specially to 1,000 acres of rich grass land, which had been let for many years at a rental of £2 10*s.* an acre, said that in the present circumstances he felt sure that for the next three years, at least, this land would not fetch more than £1 an acre. Thus land which formerly let for £2,500 a-year now only produced £1,000. He further stated that in many cases a tenant had not only lost his rent, rates, and taxes, but had also lost the labour expended in mowing and making the hay, and in other cases the labour spent in mowing the hay after it had been flooded, and in carting it into heaps to rot down. There were also hundreds of acres in the Nene Valley that have not been mown or stocked for two years. This had a very material bearing on the subject in one point of view; but it was even more important to look at the matter as it affected the health of large tracts of country, by reason of the spread of fever and ague, which resulted from floods. The causes of the increase of floods in the last few years were several—some of them old, and others new. Among the first class of these reasons was the imperfect or improper construction of dams, weirs, and other appliances, together with a want of attention to dredging and clearing of channels, and making of embankments. Among the more recent causes of extensive floods—and it might, perhaps, seem absurd in him to say so—he regarded the extension of the railway system as one of the chief. The reason of this lay in the fact that railways had in some districts greatly diminished, and in others almost put an end to river navigation, as far as the conveyance of merchandize was concerned; and, as a consequence, those who, in former times, expended large sums of money in keeping the streams in order, were now unable to do so from want of means. The result of this had been that, in many districts, the river beds had been completely choked up with reeds and silt, and other obstructions, the banks had, in many cases, been allowed to fall in, and floods, which in other circumstances would have been preventable, had occurred. Another of the modern causes of floods was to be found in the improved system of agriculture which now prevailed. Sub-soil drainage, which had been so much in vogue during the last 30 or 40 years, had brought down, much more rapidly than was formerly the case, the water from the uplands, which before that time received and, until completely saturated, held the rainfall; and that water, of course, found its way into the streams, which, for the reasons to which he had referred, were less fitted than in former times to carry the flood water away. The question to be dealt with, then, was as to whether these disasters could be prevented, and it was for this purpose that the present Bill had been introduced by Her Majesty's Government, who believed that much could be done by the creation of a judicious arrangement which would, in the first place, put an end to the difficulty which had existed, owing to the variety of conflicting authorities having control of the rivers. Many of the present difficulties were of an engineering character; but these could be overcome by the employment of engineering skill and the construction of new works. This last would, of course, involve the expenditure of money; but he thought it would be seen that the proposals contained in the Bill, as far as this was concerned, would enable the local authorities, or other persons interested, in different parts of the country, to borrow, on just terms, larger sums of money than in former times could be raised on loan for purposes of the kind. The Bill would provide, in the first place, that Conservancy districts should be constituted, and Boards established, by means of Provisional Orders, which was deemed more satisfactory than including the powers in one general Act which could not easily be made to apply to all sorts of varying circumstances. Such Provisional Orders could be applied for by

> "Any 20 or more owners or occupiers of land, of a rateable value in the aggregate of not less than £2,000, and situate in any river basin or contiguous river basins."

Or by

> "Any sanitary or Conservancy authority having jurisdiction within any part of a river basin or contiguous river basins."

Petitions for such Provisional Orders must be sent to the Local Government Board, who, in case they thought a *primâ facie* case had been made out, would send an Inspector to the locality, to take evidence as to all points necessary to be inquired into, before assenting to the Provisional Order being granted. The Bill divided the land to be benefited into lowlands, midlands, and uplands; and it would be for the Inspector to divide the land into three classes, and to recommend the proportion which each in the locality inspected should contribute to the expenses of the Conservancy Board, if formed. It would not, of course, be proposed that the uplands should be rated as heavily as the midlands and lowlands. The rates in the uplands would be on the basis of a sixth of the rate in the pound, which could be levied on lands paying the highest general rate in the district. The purposes of the Bill were four—namely, 1, the protection of land from injury by floods; 2, the arterial drainage of land; 3, the storage of water for drinking and other purposes; and, 4, warping, or the irrigation of land. The storage of water was one of the most important branches of the measure in a sanitary point of view, and it would be dealt with under the Bill, though no special recommendation was made concerning it by the Commission to whose Members the question was referred for inquiry. The powers of the Bill were co-extensive with its purposes, and would give power to the Conservancy Boards to deal efficiently with all watercourses, outfalls for water, walls, dams, weirs, or such other works as might be deemed necessary by the authorities constituted under the provisions of the Bill. As far as the rates to be levied on owners were concerned, provision would be made for settling the proportion equitably as between occupiers and owners. One other provision of the Bill he desired to draw attention to, and it was this—that where land was required for the carrying out of the object in view, and could not be obtained by the assent of the owner, it would be necessary to obtain a Provisional Order for the purpose of having the compensation to which he was entitled measured and awarded. It would further be necessary to obtain a Provisional Order if the works to be carried out by a Board of Conservancy interfered with the works of canal proprietors or the works of the proprietors of other waterways, provided that those proprietors refused to enter into an arrangement on the subject. Then there was a clause which gave power to the Local Government Board, on the application of Conservancy and other like authorities, to invest them with all the powers of a Conservancy Board as provided for in the Bill. That he regarded as a very important clause, and one which, in some districts, might prove of the greatest possible service. With respect to the constitution of the Board, that, too, was left to Provisional Order; but direction was given in the Bill which would have the effect of securing an adequate representation of owners, and of local, urban, sanitary, and Conservancy authorities. He need scarcely say that on the constitution of the Boards would, to a great extent, depend the efficient working of the Act. If there was to be an immense variety of authorities, it would be impossible to regulate the working of such an Act of Parliament, and that was the reason Her Majesty's Government thought it better to give those general directions, and to provide that the constitution of the Board should be settled in each district under a Provisional Order. They might have the case of a river subject to the action of three, four, or five sanitary and Conservancy authorities, and it should be dealt with in a way different from that which would apply to a valley, where the authorities of one large town might be intrusted with power to regulate the whole matter of the drainage. It was therefore thought that it would be a great advantage that the constitution of the Board should be left to be settled by a general order, and should not be dealt with by the Bill. With respect to uplands, the Bill contained another very important provision. It was, he admitted, a new principle to rate uplands for the cost of getting rid of the mischief caused to lowlands by floods. The old law was that only those who were benefited by the abating or averting of that mischief should be taxed for the works necessary to effect the end. But their Lordships would remember that in the year 1879 the question was discussed in that House, and the principle was affirmed that the uplands ought to contribute towards the expense of carrying out any necessary works of that sort. That was a principle which Her Majesty's Government were of opinion ought to be extended in the present instance. It could be shown—as he had before observed—that the uplands by new and improved principles of drainage threw down large quantities of water, thereby causing floods, and also large quantities of matter, which, to a great extent, filled up the beds of the rivers. He would quote here a passage from the evidence of Mr. Peel, as to a small brook near Weedon in Northamptonshire, in which he refers to the opinion of a gentleman, as given in the Report of the Transactions of the Institution of Surveyors for the Session of 1876-7—

> "The reason why I wish to cite his opinion is, that he illustrates how it is that these rivers cease to discharge their natural function, and how they become silted up by the quantity of water that is thrown into them from increased drainage. A survey was held of this particular stream in consequence of the inundations and of the consequent illness that was caused among the population, and damage to the surrounding lands; and in the course of that inquiry by a medical officer evidence was given that the bed of the stream had risen within a definite period

of time, within an appreciably short time, something like 4 or 5 feet; and it strikes that gentleman that the rising of that bed was due to increased drainage having washed down a greater amount of silt; and it was not unreasonable, he thought, to suppose that the same thing had taken place in other parts of the country, for not only did the water"—he was still quoting that gentleman—"run down faster than it used to do, but in much greater quantities also, and it consequently carried down with it a proportionately greater quantity of solid matter which was deposited in the bed of the streams when they reach the lower and flatter part of their course."

Further on Mr. Peel says—

> "If I may pursue that branch of the subject further, Mr. J. Clutton, who is a member of the Institution of Surveyors, and I believe very competent to give an opinion, also alluded, in this same debate to which I refer, to the thousands of acres over which he used, he says, to shoot snipe 'for some days after rain had ceased to fall.' He walked, he says, of late years over the same lands, even while the rain was actually falling, and he found there was no water that remained on it."

He knew it might be said that floods benefited meadow lands; but, on the other hand, summer and very protracted winter were productive of mischief which occasioned great loss and large expenditure of money; and it was only, therefore, a small step in advance to provide that those who were benefited by sending the water down, and thus contributed to the loss and the damage, should also contribute to the expense of forming and maintaining channels and outfalls for the floods, and to the cost of the necessary supervision. He hoped their Lordships would recognize the principle to which he had referred, and would agree to its extension as proposed by the Bill. He believed that as the area of the uplands would be of much greater extent than that of the lowlands subject to be injuriously affected by floods, the tax to be imposed upon the former would be comparatively small. Another important matter dealt with by the Bill was the rating of owners and occupiers. In the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, the works necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill were to be regarded as landlords' improvements. They were permanent improvements, and were not, the major part of them at least, tenants' improvements. In this country almost all permanent improvements were made by the landlords; and it was on that principle, so far as this branch of the question was concerned, that Her Majesty's Government had acted in framing the provision to which he referred. The chief expenditure to be incurred in the construction of the new works would be paid for by the owners; the occupiers would be only charged with a part of the cost of the repairs, and with the establishment charges. It was most desirable, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, that the occupiers should take their part as members of the Boards of Management, and they were only following the usual precedents in imposing upon them a portion of the cost of repairs and of the establishment charges. Their Lordships were aware that there existed an immense deal of agricultural depression, which, no doubt, affected owners as well as occupiers, but to a much greater extent affected the occupiers than the owners; and Her Majesty's Government felt that they should hesitate to impose new rates upon that portion of the population who had been, many of them, brought so near to ruin. His noble Friend the late President of the Council (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon), who was not then in his place, had in the year 1879 introduced a Bill upon this subject, founded, as the present Bill also was, upon the recommendations of the Committee of their Lordships' House which reported in the year 1877. If he might presume to say so, the present Bill was so drafted as to make its provisions clearer than were those of the noble Duke; and there were, he thought, certain other improvements in it. But in two matters only were there really important differences between the two Bills. The first had reference to the constitution of the Boards. In that respect the Bill of his noble Friend was quite different from the present. The noble Duke proposed by his Bill that the Boards should consist of life members and elected members, the life members to be owners of property in the disirict, and to consist of one-third of the whole body; and the elected members were not to be elected directly, but to be filtered through other elected bodies. Her Majesty's Government much preferred the plan which was marked out by the Bill. Then there was the question of the incidences of rating as between owners and occupiers, which, as he had said, threw the greater burden on the owners. He sincerely hoped their Lordships would give a favourable consideration to this Bill, which had been framed with an anxious desire to meet a very pressing necessity throughout the country. The Bill would place at the disposal of the inhabitants of every river basin the power of legislating for their own wants. If they did so the measure would benefit vast classes of the population; it would equally affect the inhabitants of towns and the inhabitants of country villages, and would contribute largely to increase the health as well as the wealth of the community.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

The Duke of SOMERSET observed that, when dealing with a subject of this kind, they ought to pay great attention to the very important subject of taxation. He feared, however, that in this respect the Bill would affect every farm in England and Wales, for there was not one which would not come under the denomination of "upland" or "midland" or "lowland;" and, therefore, every farm might have to contribute to the taxation. But, as if this was not sufficient, it was proposed that all farmers in the basin of the river should come under its operations. But there was no definition of "the basin of a river." A great deal would depend on what was called a basin. He did not see the limit that might be given to the term basin. It seemed to him that the Bill took extraordinary powers for the Local Government Board, which, since 1870, had greatly increased the taxation of the country. The local debts of the country up to 1870 amounted to £23,000,000, and then the Local Government Board was established, and, being very active, the debt, in four years, rose to £64,000,000, and he believed that in five years from the present time it would be doubled. That was the way in which matters went on. When anything was proposed to be done by the Local Government Board they sent down an Inspector to the district. He might be a very good classical scholar, or intimately acquainted with all the poets, from Chaucer downwards, and know the history of the wars of this country; but the first thing he generally did when he got to the district was to ask when he could get back to town. He then saw a few people, went back to town, and produced his Report. The Local Government Board then made a Provisional Order, which came to Parliament; but what could anybody do in resistance to a Provisional Order? It was generally considered too small for discussion in that House; their Lordships would support the Government, who would be guided by the Inspector. In that way legislation was done and taxation to an enormous amount incurred. What was the result of this taxation? In the rural districts of the country the local taxation had increased much faster than the wealth of the district. That fact could not be disputed. They were now going to create another local district. They had already got local districts overlapping and intersecting each other in a most confusing manner. There were the Poor Law taxation, the county taxation, improvement taxation, education taxes, and sanitary taxation—all of which had grown up side by side, but with different areas and districts, and between all these the unfortunate small farmers or occupiers were very much over-taxed. It was, therefore, very desirable that this matter should be narrowly inquired into. The district would take in the whole basin, and might include the whole or parts of several counties. It would apply to towns, and they all knew that a sanitary authority in the town might press forward a scheme which would tax the neighbouring district. Towns were much more able to force their opinions on the Legislature than the country. He thought the Bill ought to be referred to a Select Committee, as it involved many important interests, new rates, and new debts. No doubt, something should be done to prevent the floods; but he should like to see the Government scheme tried in some district in Warwickshire or Leicestershire, or some other county, in order that they might see how it worked before they gave power to tax the whole country.

The Earl of SANDWICH thought this subject was growing in importance and urgency; but year after year it was being neglected and nothing done. The noble Duke seemed to have a great horror of local taxation; but what improvements could be effected without it? Were they to have their crops and their grass lands entirely destroyed? Immense distress was brought about by the floods, and almost every shower of rain resulted in an overflow of a river or a stream. Before land drainage was carried so far as it had now reached the water came into the streams gradually. Talk of the Land League! The River Ouse was worse than any Land League; for, while the Land League might cut off the ears and tails of animals, the River Ouse took them away altogether. The condition of things in consequence of these floods was getting worse and worse every year. Speaking of his own county, he was able to testify as to the quantity of land unlet owing to the floods, and to the fact that, in many instances, land was in a fearful state of swamp. He trusted that some measure or other would be carried to remedy the existing evil, and thanked the Government for attempting to deal with the matter. He could assure their Lordships that a measure of this kind would be more beneficial than a Hares and Rabbits Bill, or even the repeal of the Malt Tax, for it would save thousands of acres of land and much other property from absolute ruin. He hoped the noble Earl would persevere with his Bill.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN had listened with great interest to the statement of the noble Earl (Earl Spencer); but while he was prepared to admit the great importance and urgency of the subject, he was bound to remember, with the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset), that the question of local taxation was a very pressing one, and if they were to lay another rate on the country they ought to take every care that in order to get one shilling they were not paying five, and that the taxation should be laid upon the persons who were to get the benefit of it. He was prepared to admit that there had been a very great increase in floods of late years, and that drainage was one of the causes of it; but there were other causes. The Committee that had inquired into the subject pointed out as among the causes the system of sub-soil drainage, and the deterioration which was constantly going on in the beds of the rivers themselves. That deterioration came not only from drainage, but from the neglect of the local authorities to clear out the river channels. Another thing to be observed was, that whatever they did they could only mitigate floods; they could not get rid of them. His noble Friend (Earl Spencer) and the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Sandwich) spoke as if, by the passing of this Bill, they could prevent floods altogether. He would ask his noble Friends to suggest any measure which could cope with the flood now coming down outside their Lordships' House. Suppose they were to spend the largest possible sum that a Conservancy Board could spend, did they not believe that on many occasions floods would get behind the embankments, with the result of obliging the embankments to be opened in another place to let the floods out? If, therefore, his noble Friend opposite believed that if this Bill passed his harvests would be saved from the inundations of the Ouse, he was likely to find himself very much mistaken. There was one principle only on which they could tax the uplands and midlands, and that was in respect of injury done by their drainage. If they were going to undertake a large number of important works, it ought to be decided by competent authority whether those works were of such a nature that it was fair to tax the uplands and midlands for them, because a variety of sanitary works and embankments might be made to the advantage of private owners, who, under this Bill, would pay nothing beyond the ordinary rate. He heard his noble Friend speak of 2,500 acres of very valuable pasture lands which, for the last two years, had been very much damaged by floods, and the value of which would be greatly increased if an embankment were made. That only showed that a great part of the taxation ought to be paid by the owner of the adjacent land. It was only for a measure of general benefit that they ought to levy a general rate. As to artificial obstructions, if they were to deal with anything approaching justice, they ought to demand that those obstructions be removed at once, or, at all events, that the nuisance be abated; but they proposed not to impose taxation on the owners of dams, but to pay them compensation for removing the dams. Thus they were treating two classes in different ways. The scope of the Bill was very wide, and went far beyond the Report of the Committee and the opinions of experts. The Bill was very much wider in its scope than the measure before their Lordships' House in 1879. The second object of the Bill, arterial drainage, was a very wide question. Suppose the Bedford Level had not been made, it would have been in the power of a Conservancy Board to make the general public pay for making it under that clause. The next head was the storage of water for drinking and other purposes; and a clause provided that the Conservancy Board should be able to take land to store the water and sell it. The result might be that all Conservancy Boards might become Water Companies. The storage of water was, in his opinion, a purpose entirely alien from the purposes of a Conservancy Board; it had never been recommended by the Committee, and all the witnesses whose evidence he had been able to examine said, in the most positive manner, that it was a wholly distinct and separate question. Such was, in effect, the testimony of Mr. Peel, Mr. Abernethy, and Mr. Coote. Then the fourth question, the irrigation of land, had nothing to do with the object of the Bill, and he was surprised how it had crept into it. The Bill would allow the Conservancy Board to make a general rate to apply to everybody. It seemed to him that if works were to be carried out, the proper principle was to make those for whose benefit they were undertaken pay the whole or the major portion of the cost. The Bill gave no power to the Conservancy Board to compel private individuals to pay the cost of particular improvements. If a particular improvement were required the Conservancy Board might make it, conditionally on the owner consenting to bear the expense. If, however, he did not consent, the Board must either abandon the work or carry it out at the expense of the whole district. With regard to the proposed constitution of the Conservancy Board, he thought their Lordships would find themselves in very considerable difficulty indeed, if they adhered to the suggestions in the Bill. It was the opinion of the Committee, who had fully considered the subject three or four years ago, that there should be one Board for each catchment basin, and there were a good many arguments in favour of that recommendation; but, as he understood the Bill, the proposal was that the area was to be determined in each case by the Local Government Board, so that, until their opinion was known in each case, it would be perfectly uncertain how large an area was to be covered by a Board. The question appeared to be one of almost incalculable magnitude. For instance, speaking of the basin of the Trent, the engineer of Nottingham said that he would rate Nottingham, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Leicester, Derby, North Staffordshire, and the Potteries. It was obvious that, for an improvement in the neighbourhood of Nottingham, Birmingham, and the other towns, would object to be rated. Would it be possible to constitute a Board which would represent the towns named and all the intervening country, with the various competing local interests? It was well known there was difficulty in inducing country gentlemen to attend such Boards; and how would it be if the meetings were held at such distances from their residences as such a large area would necessitate in some cases? The result would be that only those would attend whose interests were involved in what was proposed to be done at any meeting. Such a gigantic system of organization and taxation would require the most minute consideration. He wished to deal with fairness as between one part of the country and another; but there were elements of complication and unfairness in the Bill, and he therefore hoped their Lordships would give great attention to it in Committee.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY thought the criticisms of the noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown) applied to the details of the Bill, and not its principle, and that, therefore, while proper enough in Committee, they were somewhat irrelevant on the second reading. What would the noble Earl purpose to do? As he (the Marquess of Huntly) understood the Bill, it dealt with a very large and enormous question, with great interests which were all antagonistic to one another; and the object of the measure was to put the management of the main channel of the river under a new authority. It was understood that it was desirable to make the terms of the Bill as wide and general as possible, so as to allow localities to adopt it if they thought well; and, in his opinion, the Bill was framed on the lines of the Committee's Report in this respect. All the witnesses were unanimous that unless something of this sort was done they would never get localities to join in the necessary co-operation. A great deal must be left to local inquiry and agreement, and the whole question must be thrashed out in the localities themselves. The noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) forgot that many of the local rates of which he complained were charged with the payment of existing debts upon rivers, and that they had been reduced by the possibility of borrowing money through the Local Government Board at low rates of interest. As the question was so fully inquired into four years ago, he trusted their Lordships would not consent to the appointment of another Committee. By placing the management of a watershed under one body, it would be possible to get rid of the present divided arrangement, to improve the existing condition of things, and to facilitate the more rapid carrying away of flood waters. No doubt, railways were one of the causes of the increase of floods. They had superseded, to a large extent, the navigation of rivers for the transport of goods; in many cases the navigation had ceased to pay for itself; there were no means to provide for keeping it open; and the bed of the river was neglected, and silting up was unchecked. There was no power to compel the cleansing out of the bed of the river. Another way in which railways affected rivers was by throwing bridges over them which impeded the navigation. Between Northampton and Peterborough the London and North-Western Railway had 40 or 50 bridges across the Nene, and in many instances the spans were too narrow to admit of the passing of the water, so that the piers of the bridges caused the flooding of the adjacent country. Many of the culverts were also too small for the flow of water. He understoood the clauses of the Bill would give the Board powers to call upon owners to make the necessary improvements in these respects. Some of the Conservancy Boards were hampered by heavy debts, and the discharge of these should be facilitated by power to borrow money at lower rates of interest. As to the definition of the word "basin," it was clearly proved before the Committee that arterial drainage contributed largely to the increase of floods and to the silting of streams, and opinions were unanimous that all lands within a catchment basin should contribute to the rate of the Watershed Board. If, however, the uplands were taxed, it would only be fair that the Board should be charged with the maintenance and cleansing of the brooks and smaller streams. He concurred with his noble Friend who had just spoken in thinking that the Bill very rightly dealt with the storage of water, which was a subject evidently of as much importance as the prevention of floods and the means of getting rid of the surplus rainfall; but he dissented from his noble Friend's criticisms of the composition of the proposed Boards. His own belief was that their formation would be equitable and proper, and that in practice no difficulty would be found in securing a good attendance at them. One other point ought to be mentioned—the manner, namely, in which the Bill would affect the Fen country. He would suggest that a clause should be inserted removing the great systems of arterial drainage, like the Fen Level, from the operation of the Bill, where they performed their work efficiently. He apprehended there would be a great decrease of opposition to the Bill from the Fen Level District if it was brought within its operation. In conclusion, he trusted that the noble Earl, while not consenting to delay, would give their Lordships a short interval to consider the whole of the provisions of the measure before they went into Committee upon it.

EARL STANHOPE said, he quite agreed with the principle of the Bill, which had been shown to be urgently required; indeed, anyone travelling through the Midland counties recently would have seen the strongest cause for some such legislation as the Bill proposed. He was of opinion, however, that certain of the details of the measure might advantageously be considered by a Joint Committee of the two Houses, in order to expedite its progress in "another place." The 6th, the 15th, and the 18th clauses in particular required consideration. He did not see why it should be provided, as the first of these clauses provided, that all lands should be invariably divided into three classes—uplands, midlands, and lowlands. It was to be doubted, also, whether the best principle of taxation had been adopted, and whether the scheme was not too centralizing, and did not unduly confer benefits on some districts at the expense of others. By Clause 15 all Local Acts might be repealed; and was it fair and right that a district, which had expended a vast sum of money in embankments, should be rated over again very highly for improvements elsewhere? He hoped that more power would be given to the Local Boards. An Inspector sent down to a district by the Local Government Board could not know as much as the people on the spot. He was glad that the Bill considered the storage of water but; saw no reason, except as far as the Trent was concerned, why it should touch the question of warping. He should support the second reading, believing that the measure could be made most valuable.

EARL FORTESCUE also urged that the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee, remarking that from the progress of Business in the other House he did not think any delay would be caused. He thought the scope of the measure was far too wide to have it intrusted to Boards of Guardians to set its machinery in motion. Her Majesty's Government had not, he thought, sufficiently kept in view the necessity of proportion in these matters. The subject was one of extreme complication; and he could not help thinking that great improvement might be made in the details of the Bill if it was referred to a Select Committee for careful examination.

LORD NORTON said, the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) had spoken of the alarm with which he looked on these increases of local taxation. So did they all. But the question was, whether it was necessary to give further power for the conservancy of rivers or not? He thought experience had shown that such a measure was urgently necessary. In that case it was no use opposing the Bill; but they must set themselves to consider its details in Committee. A great deal of this work was now being done all over the country in a bungling manner by several Commissions and by individuals. The objection that had been taken to the expense of a general measure was a mistake. The consolidation of the authorities would lead to great economy, the present expenditure being greatly increased by the multiplicity of authorities and Local Acts. They ought to take also into their serious consideration the losses continually going by floods—losses to property and individuals which, if even to a certain extent preventable, would save much more than the cost incurred. The measure was recommended by the Sanitary Commission, over which he had the honour to preside, 15 years ago. The late Government attempted to deal with the matter; but lost their Bill by failure of time in the other House. He hoped that this Bill, and the Bill on the same subject before the other House, would be referred to a Joint Committee of the two Houses, in order that they might be jointly considered, and that a measure on the subject might be carried in the present Session.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES) hoped the Bill would be referred to a Select Committee, because, he pointed out, it was not a case of referring the question, but the Bill, to Committee, and there was a great difference between the two. He was not, however, very favourable to a Joint Committee. He disputed the theory that the uplands had so much to do as was alleged with causing floods, and objected to the proposal to tax them for what they were not responsible for, and for what would be no benefit to them. He also took objection to the Bill in respect that no power was given to tax navigation and mills, both of which he regarded as more helping to fill up the beds of rivers than the uplands. The whole thing was one of great difficulty, and requiring careful consideration in detail, and the details were best got at by a Select Committee, and not a Committee of the Whole House.

EARL SPENCER, in reply, said, that in regard to much of the criticism that had been passed upon the Bill, it would only be necessary to remind the House that he had stated particularly that he only proposed to attempt to remedy preventable floods. As to the questions of storage, irrigation, and artificial drainage, they were all, no doubt, matters of the greatest importance, and went to show the necessity of investing the Conservancy Boards with the powers he had proposed. The Government were fully aware that this subject was extremely urgent. It was, however, their wish to pay attention to the opinions of their Lordships, who were so well able to form a judgment on matters of this kind. He was not at present disposed to accede to a Select Committee; but he promised that that was a matter which would be carefully considered, together with all the comments which had been made upon the Bill.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 31*st January*, 1881.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Leave—Ordered—First Reading*—Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) [79]—*Fourth Night.*

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—" OBSTRUCTION."

MR. BAXTER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If his attention has been drawn to the strong and angry feeling prevalent in the large constituencies in consequence of the obstruction, in this House, to British and Imperial legislation, and if Her Majesty's Government will make arrangements to ensure some part of the time of the present Session being devoted to Bills for England, Scotland, and Wales?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I believe a sentiment of dissatisfaction does exist in the country at the exclusive application of the time of this House to discussion of matters connected with a particular portion of the United Kingdom, and I own I expect that that dissatisfaction will grow with the lapse of time. At present, all I can venture to say, in reply to my right hon. Friend, is that the subject is by no means escaping our notice, that it is carefully under view, and that we shall be prepared to take whatever steps may, on the whole, seem to be for the best.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—VAUGHAN'S ENDOWED SCHOOL.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that the rector of Drumkeeran, county Fermanagh, ex-officio Governor of Vaughan's Endowed School, sits on the board of this school and votes himself a salary as house clerk and chaplain; whether the salary voted him as chaplain exceeds by £50 a-year the chartered powers of the Governors in that behalf; and, whether, if any illegal sum for chaplain's salary has been voted and drawn for some time past, any measures will be taken to obtain a re-fund thereof?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, he had received information with regard to the subject of the hon. Member's Question, and had to inform the House that the rector of Drumkeeran was an *ex-officio* Governor of Vaughan's Endowed School; but that he had not sat on the board and voted himself a salary. Under the original charter the chaplain was allowed a salary of £50 a-year, with power to the Governors to increase that sum if they thought fit, and it was increased to £100 a-year in 1834, before the time that the present rector succeeded to his incumbency. No illegal sum had, therefore, ever been voted. The chaplain had also a salary of £30 a-year as house clerk, which, however, he had not voted himself.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. R. H. NOTTER.

MR. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any and what reply has been given by the Lord Chancellor to the memorial of the people of Ballydehob, county Cork, for the removal from the magistracy of Mr. R. H. Notter, who is recently reported to have expressed a hope from the bench that " people would soon get powder and ball?"

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, the Lord Chancellor had a communication with Mr. Notter with regard to his speech; but he stated that it was qualified by words which preceded the extract, and not quoted in the Question—that the poor people of the country must behave themselves. Mr. Notter said that he intended his warning against outrages, having had experience with regard to outrages quite recently. The Lord Chancellor thought it right to express strong dissatisfaction with the language, and to caution Mr. Notter against its repetition. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) was glad that this had been done; but he believed, with the Lord Chancellor, that further steps were not necessary.

TUNIS—THE ENFIDA CASE.

Mr. MONTAGUE GUEST asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to a telegram from Rome in the "Times" of the 26th instant relating to the conduct of the French Consul General at Tunis; whether it is a fact that the French Consul General, in defiance of the provision of International Treaties hitherto strictly observed in Tunis, refused to allow the application of the local Law and the jurisdiction of the Tunisian tribunals, in the question arising from the sale of a large estate called the "Enfida" from Kheredine Pacha to a French Company, and this to the prejudice of a British subject, Mr. Joseph Levy, who had, according to such local law, an undoubted right to exercise pre-emption as regards the said sale; whether it is true that the French Consul forcibly ejected from the estate the agents of Mr. Levy, who was legally in possession of the same, and without the knowledge of the British Representative at Tunis; and, whether any Correspondence has passed between Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's Consul General at Tunis with reference to this case; and, if so, if he will lay a Copy of such Correspondence upon the Table of the House?

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD also asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can explain the circumstances under which the British Consul at Tunis is reported to have interfered in support of certain alleged rights of property, and in opposition to claims advanced by the French Consul?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Information has been received by Her Majesty's Government, both from Paris and from Tunis, respecting the incident referred to; but they are awaiting a further Report, and in the meanwhile it would be inconvenient to lay the Correspondence in its present stage before the House. When the case is fully before Her Majesty's Government, I shall be better able to answer these inquiries.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—ORDER IN COUNCIL JAN. 4, 1881—IMPORTATION OF IRISH CATTLE.

Mr. W. CORBET asked the Vice President of the Council, If his attention has been called to the injurious way in which the Order in Council of 4th January 1881 affects the importation of Irish cattle into England, although foot and mouth disease does not exist in Ireland at present; whether, under that Order, cattle imported from Ireland are not required to be marked with a broad arrow, and being so marked and once exhibited for sale cannot afterwards be exhibited for sale in any market, fair, exhibition, sale by public auction, or other public sale of animals, but must be slaughtered within six days after such first exposure or exhibition; and, whether, looking to the prejudicial effect of the Order on the Irish cattle trade, particularly in regard to store cattle, which should, under the Order, be slaughtered within six days if not sold when first offered for sale, he will cause such an alteration to be made in the Order as will remove the grievance complained of?

Mr. MUNDELLA: It is quite true that the Order in Council of January 4, which came into operation on the 17th, and which will continue for a period of six weeks, prohibits the sale in public markets or fairs in England of all store stock, and requires that all fat stock taken to fairs and markets licensed by local authorities shall be marked with a broad arrow by clipping the hair, and that they shall be slaughtered within six days. No doubt these regulations do cause inconvenience, not only to those interested in Irish cattle, but also to those interested in Welsh and Scotch cattle, all of which countries have been free for some time past from foot-and-mouth disease. The temporary restrictions imposed by the Privy Council have had for their object, not only the eradication of the disease in England, but also to prevent, if possible, that which has been a subject of much anxiety to us—the extension of the disease to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. It is certainly not in the interest of Ireland that any alteration in this Order should be made.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS ACT, 1868 — THE ELECTION COMMISSIONS.

MR. H. H. FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can give any information to the House as to the period when the protracted inquiries before the Election Commissioners will terminate?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he had called the attention of the Election Commissioners to the desirability of making early Reports; and, if his answer could be of any avail, he should like in the strongest way to urge them to make their Reports, as it was desirable for every reason that, if any proceedings were to be founded on these Reports, they should be commenced at once.

STATE OF IRELAND—DISTRESS AT CASTLEBAR.

MR. NELSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a resolution unanimously adopted by the Castlebar Board of Guardians with reference to the great distress prevailing amongst the small farmers and labouring classes generally in that district; and the pressing necessity for commencing the works authorised under the provisions of the Relief of Distress (Ireland) Act of last Session, otherwise deaths from starvation are likely to occur; and, whether he is prepared to take any steps in the matter?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had received a copy of the resolution referred to, which had been forwarded to him by the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board had received a telegram from the Guardians, asking for authority to give outdoor relief under Section 3 of the Relief of Distress Act of last Session. It might not be necessary to carry out all the works mentioned; but the Government would carefully consider the necessity of those recommended by the Local Government Board. Measures would certainly be taken to prevent the distress which the hon. Gentleman seemed not unnaturally to fear.

Afterwards—

MR. O'CONNOR POWER, who had given Notice to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state what steps are being taken by the Local Government Board in Ireland with a view to relieving the distress prevalent in the county of Mayo? said, that in consequence of the answer given to his hon. Friend, which he deemed satisfactory, he would not put his Question; but that at a future date he might feel called upon to repeat it.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he would prefer to answer the hon. Member's Question. The relief works suspended during the harvest in the county of Mayo were estimated at £7,000. These works had now been recommended to the Local Government Board as works that should be proceeded with. In the hands of the landowners in Mayo who had obtained loans, and who had expressed an intention of proceeding with the works, was a sum of £12,000. There was, therefore, every prospect of extended employment in the county mentioned in the Question. In the four Unions — namely, Ballina, Belmullet, Castlebar, and Killalla, orders under the Relief of Distress Act were in force, and the Government was watching the condition of that portion of the country.

AFGHANISTAN (POLITICAL AFFAIRS) —NATIVE AGENTS AT CABUL.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether, in reference to the concluding sentence of his Despatch of the 3rd December 1880, to the Governor General of India in Council, in which he says,

> "The Government cannot but think that the deputation to Kabul of a Native Representative of your Government would be cônducive to this end, and they would be glad to hear that you have been able to carry out this measure at an early date,"

any steps have yet been taken, and, if any, what steps, towards arranging for the residence of a Native Representative of the Indian Government at the Court of Abdurrahman; why this measure, stated during the last Session of Parliament to be intended, has not been carried out at an earlier date; whether the Government possess any means for obtaining authentic information of the progress of events in Northern Afghanistan; and, whether, if Candahar is evacuated by British troops, it is proposed to maintain a British or Native Representative of the Indian Government at that place?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I remain entirely of the opinion which I expressed in the despatch to which the hon. Member refers, that it would be desirable that a Native Representative of the Indian Government should be deputed to Cabul. I see no reason whatever to believe that the Government of India are of a different opinion, or are indifferent to the importance of the subject. I am unable to state what difficulties have, up to the present time, prevented the carrying into effect of this measure. The Government do possess means of obtaining information from Northern Afghanistan—of course, not of so satisfactory a character as would be obtained by the appointment of a Native Agent. With regard to Candahar, I have already stated that the arrangements, which will be made there on the retirement of the British troops, are not completed; but I am disposed to think that there—as at Cabul—it would be desirable, if possible, that a Native Resident should be appointed to represent the Government of India.

IRELAND—THE RECENT STATE TRIALS AT DUBLIN.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, If it is true that the Irish Executive, having unofficial knowledge of the fact that in the recent State Trials ten jurors were agreed on a verdict of "not guilty," intend not to afford the accused the opportunity of a new trial; and, whether it is the fact that the Government, instead of taking the necessary steps for a new trial, have decided to punish those gentlemen, or some of them, for the same alleged offences, under the powers of a Coercion Act?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): With reference to the first branch of this Question, the Irish Executive have no knowledge, unofficial or official, that in the recent trial 10 or any other number of jurors were agreed on a verdict of "Not Guilty." The hon. and learned Member who asks this Question is, of course, aware that no notice can possibly be taken of such a statement, which could only be made by a juror, and in direct violation of a juror's duty. At foot of page 722 of the official Report of Judge Fitzgerald's Charge, which I have had placed in the Library of the House, as I undertook in compliance with the request of the hon. Member for Carrickfergus (Mr. Greer), will be found what occurred. In relation to that portion of the Question which has reference to what is termed "a new trial," "a new trial," Sir, is a well-understood expression, involving the assumption that a trial resulting in a verdict has taken place. That has not occurred in this instance; and, therefore, no question as to "a new trial" has arisen. The last branch of the Question I answer in the negative.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN: I wish to ask—["Order!"]—I wish to explain my Question, and am perfectly in Order in doing so. I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman the first part of the Question not in the language of technicalities; but I meant by a "new trial" another trial.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. W. M. JOHNSON): I must ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to put his Question on the Paper.

STATE OF IRELAND—PRIVATE MEETINGS OF THE LAND LEAGUE—DOMICILIARY VISITS OF THE POLICE.

MR. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the action of the constabulary at Castlecomer, in the county of Kilkenny, on the 15th instant, in persistently demanding admittance into a room in a private house where a meeting of the local branch of the Irish National Land League was about being held, pursuant to advertisement, threatening its members with future accountability upon refusal of admittance, and finally stationing two policemen outside the door to take down the names of members coming to attend such meeting; whether steps will be taken to prevent a repetition of such proceedings; and, whether his attention has been called to the action of the Constabulary on the 26th of December last in stationing themselves at the entrance door of the Roman Catholic Church of Castlecomer to take down the names of persons then and there desirous of entering their names as members of the Irish National Land League?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he had received Reports of both proceedings referred to in the hon. Member's Question. It was clearly essential that the Government should have as full information as possible upon the proceedings of the Land League. The police, however, had instructions to do their duty so as to give as little offence as possible. The constable at Castlecomer had acted under a mistaken impression of his duty, and had been so informed by the Inspector General.

CROWN PROPERTY—SPORTING RIGHTS UNDER CROWN LEASES.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he is aware that the sporting rights are reserved from tenants occupying farms under the Crown, and that those sporting rights are let with the sporting rights of the wood and covers adjoining the farms; and, if so, whether it is intended to continue the system?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: There is no reservation of the rights of sporting in ordinary Crown leases. There are about 300 farm tenants of the Crown in England; and, with 21 exceptions, the whole of these tenants have the right of sporting over the land they hold. Of these 21 exceptions, in 16 cases the farms adjoin Windsor or other Royal Parks, and the sporting is not let, but is retained in hand for the protection of the Parks. The same system is observed in Scotland and Wales, with similarly slight exceptions.

ARMY—ARMY PAY DEPARTMENT.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE asked the Secretary of State for War, To explain why the officers in the Army Pay Department are placed by existing regulations in an inferior position, as regards relative rank and pay, than non-combatant officers in other departments of the Army, in view of the fact that, in the Commissariat Department, Army Medical Department, and Chaplains' Department officers may acquire the rank of Major General, Colonel, and Lieutenant Colonel respectively, and in the Army Pay Department no rank beyond that of Major is recognised; and, likewise, the retired pay of officers in the Army Pay Department is less than that of officers in the other departments of the Army; and, whether there is any intention of remedying this grievance?

MR. CHILDERS: I presume that my hon. and gallant Friend is not aware that within the last few days a Warrant has been issued under which officers of the Pay Department can acquire the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and retirement at £450 a-year, which is more than a Lieutenant Colonel's retired pay. I cannot hold out any prospect of further advancement to Paymasters.

AGRARIAN OFFENCES (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS.

MR. DILLON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can state definitely when the Reports on Agrarian Crime in Ireland for November and December will be distributed?

MR. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that he hoped the November Returns would be given to the House possibly on Thursday, or issued to Members on Friday, and the December Return would be circulated as soon as it could possibly be got out.

MR. PARNELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury assure the House that the second reading of the Coercion Bill will not be proposed until hon. Members have had an opportunity of seeing those Returns?

MR. GLADSTONE: As I was about to inform the House after the Questions, what we propose is to proceed from day to day, and to take the second reading of the Bill at the Sitting of the House next following the introduction of the Bill. That introduction of the Bill will, I hope, be voted by the House of Commons in the course of the present Sitting.

METROPOLIS — THE VESTRIES AND LOCAL BOARDS—REMOVAL OF THE SNOW.

COLONEL ALEXANDER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, having regard to the incapacity displayed by some of the vestries, notably that of Westminster, during the late frost, he will consider the advisability of taking steps to place the local government of the Metropolis in more competent hands?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I can assure the hon. and gallant Member that there is no need to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the desirability of improving the local government of London. As soon as there is some thaw in the Public Business I hope they will be able to devote their attention to the matter. The hon. and gallant Member will allow me to point out to him that this is not exactly the moment to represent to the Vestry of Westminster their incapacity to remove obstructions to Public Business, for they might possibly retort on a more august Assembly within the same precincts. I am afraid this and other matters of great and urgent public advantage must wait until the House of Commons has discovered some satisfactory method of transacting Public Business.

TURKEY AND GREECE—REPRESENTATION OF THE POWERS AT THE PORTE.

Mr. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, In the event of a Conference taking place at Constantinople, who will represent this Country at such Conference; and, who now represents Her Majesty's Government at the Porte?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Mr. Goschen will leave England in a few days to return to Constantinople. Mr. St. John, Secretary of the Embassy, has been in charge during his absence. There is no question of a Conference at Constantinople; but it has been proposed that negotiations on the Greek Frontier Question should be carried on between the Porte and the Representatives of the Powers.

SCIENCE AND ART—THE ROBINSON COLLECTION AT SOUTH KENSINGTON.

Lord ELCHO asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, When the price of each object purchased in 1879 will be affixed to the labels in the Kensington Museum, the total sum of money (£3,800) expended in the purchase of the Robinson Collection being distributed to the various classes of objects according to the usual practice?

Mr. MUNDELLA: It has not been the usual practice to attach the price to objects purchased in the way the Robinson Collection was acquired. That Collection, like eight others purchased before 1874, was bought for a lump sum. It consisted, in all, of 245 objects, 152 of which cost £3,000, and 93 £3,800, and it would be impossible to appraise the exact value of each object. I think it only right that I should state that the Robinson Collection, which was purchased by the late Administration, was carefully reported on by a number of experts, all of whom regarded it as a very desirable acquisition, and estimated its value much higher than the price which was paid for it.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—MILITARY OPERATIONS—THE REINFORCEMENTS.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the 15th Hussars and the Battery of Artillery from India, a portion of the reinforcements stated to have arrived at Durban, have arrived there without horses; whether, in consequence, they are unable to proceed to the front; and, when, and from what sources, it is expected the necessary horses will be obtained?

Mr. CHILDERS: With the permission of the House I will reply now, not only to the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie), but also to my hon. Friends the Members for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson) and Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), and to my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock-Allan), who have Questions on subjects connected with the Transvaal War addressed to the Prime Minister and myself. In the first place, as to the troops on their way to Sir George Colley, about which, without Notice and without Papers, I answered my hon. and gallant Friend with perfect accuracy on Friday—although I much regret that he should have thought I, what he calls, "boggled over" his Question—the facts are as follows:—On the 21st of December, within 48 hours after the news of the establishment of the Provisional Government at Pretoria, and before any requisition by Sir George Colley, we ordered the 97th Regiment, about to embark from Gibraltar for this country, to be diverted to Natal. On the 24th of December we heard of the disaster to the 94th, under Colonel Anstruther, and received a requisition for a regiment of Cavalry. On the 25th Sir George Colley also asked for a battery of Artillery, and on the 28th we arranged for the conveyance from this country of both the regiment and the battery; and, at the same time, telegraphed to Sir George Colley, offering to send from Bombay immediately another Infantry regiment, a Cavalry regiment, and another battery, asking whether he could mount the Cavalry and Artillery. Sir George Colley telegraphed in reply on the 29th that the reinforcements already ordered were sufficient; but that he would be glad if troops from India could call at Durban for orders on their way home. We ordered accordingly on the 30th; and on the same day he telegraphed that he thought he should require them, and was collecting horses. On the 31st we offered to send the horses from India, and on the 1st of January Sir George Colley replied that he did not require them. On the 4th of January, without waiting for any requisition from Sir George Colley, we ordered two more of the Infantry regiments in India, under orders home, to go *viâ* Durban, to be retained there or not, as Sir George Colley required, and we on the same day formed a squadron of picked mounted Infantry to embark on the 10th of January. During the fortnight between the 21st of December and the 4th of January we also despatched drafts, and men of the Army Service Corps and Army Hospital Corps, and a certain number of special officers, and we arranged to send nurses from Netley; but Sir George Colley telegraphed that he had made local arrangements, and did not require them. The general result is, that of these reinforcements the three regiments of Infantry, the Cavalry regiment, and the battery of Artillery from India, have all arrived; numbering 2,554 officers and men. The 97th, with 518 officers and men from Gibraltar, touched at the Cape on Friday last, and is due at Durban to-morrow. The 6th Dragoons and the battery of Artillery from England, and the miscellaneous corps, amounting in all to 1,419 officers and men, are due at Durban on the 10th of February. We should, therefore, have landed in 10 days from now altogether above 4,500. Sir George Colley's entire force, when the insurrection broke out, was 4,100 men, scattered over Natal and the Transvaal. I should add that immediately on the news of the check at Laing's Neck reaching us, I arranged for further reinforcements of two Cavalry regiments and a battery of Horse Artillery leaving in 10 days with horses; but Sir George Colley telegraphed to me yesterday that he does not require them, the reinforcements on their way being quite sufficient. I have received private Notice that a Question will be asked me whether the dismounted Cavalry from India took their saddles. We have paid special attention to this, and they took them. The House will be glad to know that all these regiments are well seasoned, very few of the men being under two years' service. Two of them formed part of Sir Frederick Roberts's force. I take no credit to myself for the promptitude with which this force has been despatched; but it does very great credit to the Departments concerned, both at the War Office and at the Admiralty. I pass now to the Questions of my hon. Friends the Members for Frome and Northampton. When the former put his Questions to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies on Friday, I confess I was surprised that there could be any doubt as to the Boers being treated according to the ordinary laws of war; but, to avoid all possible misapprehension, in the course of the evening I sent, with the concurrence of my Colleagues, the following telegram to Sir George Colley:—

> "Though the occasion has not arisen for determining any question of belligerent rights, you are instructed to treat the Boers according to the recognized rules of civilized warfare, including exchange of prisoners."

To this, within 16 hours, I received the following reply, which I think is a remarkable feat of telegraphy:—

> "I have avoided proclamation or raising question of belligerent right; but in my capacity as General have maintained relations of courtesy with Boer commanders, and, as they have released most of the prisoners taken from us, propose to do the same with any we take. They have acted with courtesy and humanity in the matter of our wounded."

SPAIN—COMMERCIAL RELATIONS—THE DIFFERENTIAL DUTIES.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, considering the Spanish Government continue to levy differential rates against British goods, in contravention of the principle of most favoured nation treatment, and greatly to the prejudice of British commerce and manufactures, the time has not now arrived when Her Majesty's Government might notify to the Spanish Government their intention of raising the duties on Spanish wines, so long as such differential duties on British goods are exacted by the Government of Spain?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: The imposition of differential duties is not in accordance with the policy of Her Majesty's Government; but we have just cause to complain of the differential duties which have long been levied by Spain on British goods.

IRELAND—INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS IN CONNEMARA.

Major NOLAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If there is at present an industrial school in the large district of Connemara; and, if not, whether he is prepared to grant an application for the establishment of an industrial school at Clifden?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: There are, I understand, four industrial schools in the county of Galway. No application has been made for a certificate for an industrial school at Clifden, and it cannot be entertained until the promoters have satisfied the Inspector on certain specified points.

STATE OF IRELAND—ALLEGED "BOYCOTTING" IN CORK.

Mr. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to a Resolution of the Town Council of the city of Cork directing the Town Clerk to request the city Members to ask him for his authority in stating that respectable shopkeepers in the city of Cork had been "Boycotted" for refusing to join the Land League; and, whether he will give the required information?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER, in reply, said, that no such statement had come from him. The Town Council of Cork had probably been misled by a mistake in the report in *The Freeman's Journal* of his speech delivered that day week. The hon. Member would see that no such allusion as that complained of could be found in *The Times*' report of that speech.

Mr. PARNELL said, that when he put the Question on the Paper, in consequence of a telegram he had received from the clerk of the Cork Corporation, requesting him to do so, he had not had an opportunity of reading *The Times*' report; but he had since done so, and found there was no allusion of the kind in that report.

BOILER EXPLOSIONS—EXPLOSION AT BATLEY.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the late boiler explosion at Batley by which 14 or 16 persons were killed, and many persons have been more or less seriously injured; whether he will institute a special official inquiry; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will consider the desirability of legislation for the protection of persons employed in factories and other establishments where steam boilers are used?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Home Office will, at the wish of the Coroner, send some official person to attend the inquest on the persons killed by the boiler explosion at Batley. I have also communicated with the Board of Trade on the subject. The question of legislation on the subject requires careful consideration.

COAL MINES—RIOT AT CLYDESLEY.

Mr. DALY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true that during the current week a fatal riot occurred at Clydesley, near Bolton; whether it is true that several thousand miners assembled and proceeded to the Wharton Hall Company's pit, and demanded that the men at work should be brought out; whether the crowd refused to disperse when required by the police, who were present in large numbers; whether the crowd hurled stones, bricks, and coal at the police, who were forced to retreat; whether it is true that one man named Findly was killed, and several colliers had their legs and arms broken, and that all the police were injured; and, whether, in vindication of law and order, he will deem it his duty to advise Her Majesty's Government to bring in some special remedial measures?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, it was true that during the week a very disgraceful and mischievous riot occurred at Clydesley, near Bolton; but he was not sure that the facts were exactly as stated in the Question of the hon. Member. The police reported that the man who was killed in the riot was crushed by a tub falling upon him. He had no information showing that several colliers had their legs and arms broken. Some of the police, however, were injured—two of them seriously. With reference to the latter part of the Question, he had only to say that he had no reason to believe that the ordinary law, supported by public opinion, in that part of the country, would be inadequate to cope with the difficulty.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any other Orders of the Day after the first Order has been reached, at any hour before half-past 12. The Parliamentary Elections Bill and the Naval Discipline Act Amendment Bill are opposed, and cannot, therefore, be taken after that time. With regard to the Ballot Act Continuance Amendment Bill, although no Notice of opposition has been given to that Bill, I presume the right hon. Gentleman does not propose to take it at the present Sitting.

MR. GLADSTONE: I think there is no reasonable doubt that the first Order will occupy the evening, and we should not think of proceeding with the Orders of the Day except at a time when there were reasonable facilities for their discussion.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—DECORATION OF THE CENTRAL HALL.

MR. SCHREIBER asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he intends to proceed with the mural decoration of the Central Hall of the Houses; if so, when; and, if not, whether he will state the reason why?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The question as to the best mode of filling the vacant panels in the Central Hall has been the subject of difficulty and doubt since 1871, when a Committee of Artists advised against proceeding further with mosaic pictures. I have not yet had time to solve the difficulty myself, and I cannot hold out hopes that an Estimate will be proposed this Session.

SCIENCE AND ART—THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE asked if the Government were aware that a quantity of rubbish from the alterations in the National Portrait Gallery, and thrown into a corner, had been found on fire that morning, and that they had very narrowly escaped a very dangerous conflagration?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: I am glad to be able to assure my right hon. Friend that the occurrence to which he refers did not assume the proportion of a fire. What occurred was due to an over-heated flue, which, through 9 inches of solid brickwork, caused to smoulder a little hay with which some rats who had bored a hole through some concrete had made themselves a nest adjoining the brickwork of the flue. The smoke of the hay gave warning, and in a few minutes the danger was removed. There is no damage to the building or its contents.

NAVY—H.M.S. "RUBY."

MR. WHALLEY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the Admiralty have received any information respecting the capsizing of two boats belonging to H.M.S. "Ruby" on the East Coast of Africa, as reported in yesterday's papers?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am glad to be able to inform the hon. and gallant Member that the alarming report which found its way into the papers is much exaggerated. The fact is that a cutter belonging to Her Majesty's ship *Ruby* was capsized on the 18th of October on the Myanterano Bar, West Coast of Madagascar, and a leading seaman named Henry Coles and a Marine named

George M'Convey were most unfortunately drowned. A second boat was likewise capsized on the following day, but no lives were lost.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) — PREMATURE CIRCULATION OF THE BILL.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I wish to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland a Question of which I have given him private Notice. It is to explain to the House the issue on Saturday morning from the Public Bill Office of a Bill purporting to be a transcript of the measure which the Government had applied for leave to introduce for the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland; whether this document is a correct transcript of the proposed Bill; and, if so, what is the meaning of the second document which was afterwards issued, stating that the Bill was cancelled?

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I am not surprised at the noble Lord asking the Question, though I was as much surprised as anyone to find that the Bill, or a document purporting to be the Bill, was circulated. I believe it arose in this way. I had this much to do with the matter: I was very anxious, if the Bill was brought in on Friday night, that, for the convenience of every Member and for Public Business generally, it should be in the hands of hon. Gentlemen on Saturday morning. Therefore, I certainly did make representations to the Public Bill Office that that was desirable. At the same time, I informed them—though I do not know it was my business to inform them—that they must take care the Bill was not circulated unless it was brought in. The last word I said to them, about half-past 4 in the afternoon, was that I had great doubts as to its being introduced. It is for the officials, and not for me, to explain the mistake, though I think that care should be taken to prevent its recurrence. I think it is perfectly reasonable, even at the cost of having to sit up late at night, that the officials concerned in the matter should be ready to print and circulate, especially short and important Bills like this, the morning after they are brought in. It is also desirable that they should not make such mistakes as this when Bills have not been brought forward. As to the contents of the document, it is almost word for word what I read out to the House last Monday. There is on substantial difference in it; and with regard to the slip that was sent round by the authorities, I suppose it was to rectify the mistake as to its being an official document, which it is not.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Would the right hon. Gentleman inform the House whether the officials in question have made any representation as to how this rather remarkable mistake occurred?

Mr. SPEAKER: Whenever it is important that a Bill should be circulated without delay after its introduction, it is prepared by the Queen's Printers, and they are directed to circulate the Bill after it is brought in and ordered by the House to be printed. This was the course taken on Friday last with regard to the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill. As the Bill was not brought in that night, no instructions for its issue were sent to the Queen's Printers; but, nevertheless, the Bill was printed by mistake, and put into circulation without such instructions by the Queen's Printers.

TURKEY AND GREECE—ACTION OF HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with regard to the impression alleged in the public journals to prevail at Athens that England would support the Hellenic Government in its efforts to have the recommendations of the last Conference at Berlin carried into effect, Whether Her Majesty's Government were prepared to give material support to Greece to effect this object; and, if not, whether they would take measures to inform the Government of Greece of the fact?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: As to the Question of my right hon. Friend, I am much indebted to him for the Notice which he gave me privately on Saturday of his intention to put it to me to-day. He is already aware, from my reply to him on the 18th instant, that the opinion of Her Majesty's Government on the questions at issue between Turkey and Greece is contained in the Circular Note addressed to the Porte on the 25th of August last, and has undergone no change. Her Majesty's Government are not engaged on any isolated action; and they trust that the negotiations at present going on may lead to such united action being taken by the Powers as will bring about a peaceable solution of the Frontier Question.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF wished to know whether any intimation had been conveyed to the Porte on the part of the Government that, in the event of hostilities breaking out between Turkey and Greece, with respect to the Græco-Turkish Frontier, they would be prepared to give material assistance to Greece?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: In reply to the last Question, I have to say that no such statement has been made.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) BILL — AN "ALL-NIGHT SITTING."

MR. ONSLOW asked, Whether, in the event of the House not having come to a decision at a reasonable hour that evening as to the introduction of the Bill of the Government for the Protection of Person and Property in Ireland, it was the intention of the Prime Minister to hold what was commonly known as an all-night Sitting in order to finish the debate?

MR. GLADSTONE: I do not think that it becomes me to enter into particulars; but, certainly, the expectation of the Government is that which I ventured to express, without imposing any limit or qualification. Our hope and trust and desire was that the Motion now before the House for the introduction of a certain Bill would be disposed of in the course of the present Sitting.

ORDER—MR. GLADSTONE AND MR. PARNELL.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN said, he wished to put to his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) a Question of which he had given him private Notice. It was with reference to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere); and he wished to know whether his hon. Friend would, before the end of the pending debate, inform the House what steps he intended taking with respect to the proceedings of the Prime Minister on Friday evening in quoting to the House a speech purporting to be a speech made by his hon. Friend, which it turned out he had never made at all?

MR. SPEAKER said, the Question of the hon. and learned Member was altogether irregular. He was referring to a previous debate that had taken place. If the hon. Member for the City of Cork, or any other hon. Member who had not yet spoken on the Question before the House, thought proper to address himself to any statement which had been made in the course of it, he would be perfectly at liberty to do so when the first Order of the Day came on for discussion, but this Question is clearly out of Order.

MR. PARNELL: I may say that I propose in the debate upon the first Order to read to the House a letter which I have received from a Cabinet Minister.

Afterwards—

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN said, that he desired respectfully to put to the Chair a Question upon a point of Order. In interposing awhile ago, he thought that he heard the Speaker state that he (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) had referred to a past debate; and, of course, he wished to say that if he did so he was clearly out of Order. But, as one anxious to be within the Rules and Order of the House, he wished now to ask the Speaker for future guidance if he ruled that the pending debate on the introduction of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill was a past debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Member must have misunderstood me if he thought I spoke of the current debate as a past debate. What I advised the hon. Member for the City of Cork to do was to address himself to the House in the course of the debate which will be resumed to-day. I again say that if the hon. Member has any desire to correct any statement in the current debate, it is open to him to address himself to the House, with a view of correcting any misstatement that may have been made.

ARMY—MILITARY PRECAUTIONS.

MR. FINDLATER asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention had been called to an exciting and extraordinary rumour, which was in circulation at the Clubs, that an Irish regiment at Aldershot had been disarmed; and if there was any foundation for the report?

MR. CHILDERS: I cannot say whether there was an exciting rumour of the kind circulated; but if there was it had no foundation.

ORDER — STATE OF IRELAND — THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT — PUBLIC OPINION.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR gave Notice of his intention to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he is aware that the policy of the Chief Secretary for Ireland has been condemned by large and enthusiastic meetings in Birmingham and Newcastle-on-Tyne; whether he is in receipt of a telegram from the latter place announcing the result of the meeting there; whether he is also aware that the policy of the Chief Secretary has been condemned by a large number of Clubs and Associations, amongst others the Tower Hamlets Radical Club, the Tower Hamlets Radical Institute, the Political Committee of the combined Chelsea Radical Clubs, the Battersea Liberal Club, the Southwark Radical Club, the King's Cross Radical Club, the Social Democratic Club, the Westminster Democratic Club, the Manhood Suffrage League, the Centaur Club, the Deptford and Greenwich Radical Association, the Marylebone Radical Association, and the Progressive Club, Notting Hill; whether, in view of this strong and widespread condemnation of such policy, he will suspend the discussion of the Peace Preservation Bill in its several stages, so as to give an opportunity to the working classes to pronounce its opinion on the question and on the Agrarian Returns which had been so recently issued? Also to ask the Chief Secretary——

MR. SPEAKER (interposing): The hon. Member in the Question of which he has already given Notice is not regular. It assumes that the Prime Minister of the Crown is responsible for the opinion of the country. He is not responsible for the opinion of the country.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he would also ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention had been called to a serious occurrence at Leigh, in Lancashire, involving 20,000 cases of aggravated assault, 20,000 cases of unlawful assembling, 20,000 cases of rioting, 20,000 cases of resisting legal authority, 20,000 cases of intimidation, 20,000 cases of malicious injury to property, and 20,000 cases of injury to the person—in all, 140,000 outrages in the course of a single day; and, whether, in these circumstances, he would introduce a Peace Preservation Bill placing the liberties of the people of Lancashire at the absolute discretion of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster?

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I may say at once that I should not feel it my duty to answer that Question. If it is a Question to be asked at all, it should be addressed to my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

PROTECTION OF PERSON AND PROPERTY (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [24th January],

> "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland."—(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

And which Amendment was,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard,"—(*Dr. Lyons,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

MR. CHARLES LEWIS said, he desired to place himself right, not only with the House and the Government, but with the public, on a point which he would not be justified in overlooking. When he moved the adjournment of the debate on Friday night, it was with the distinct understanding that if the House had been prepared to go to a division on the Amendment he would not have pressed his Motion, but would have concurred in a division of the House being obtained at once. Up to the present time no Member sitting in that part of the House (the Upper Opposition Benches) representing an Irish constituency had expressed any opinion on the Motion of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He could not help thinking it would be a very serious matter, in default of any other Conservative Representative from Ireland not addressing the House, if he did not state plainly, yet with diffidence, his own opinion, and that of his constituents, on this important proposal. He should have postponed his observations to the second reading, or to a later stage, but for one or two speeches delivered in the course of the debate. He thought the public must congratulate themselves, and those who wished well to the Government might also congratulate themselves, as well as those who wished well to law and order, upon three or four observations which fell from the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) in the course of his able speech on Thursday last. The right hon. Gentleman told the House, in the first instance, that all the Coercion Acts passed against Ireland during his long Parliamentary life were justified by the circumstances of the case at the time—["No!"]—although he accompanied that statement by the remark that he individually opposed almost every one of them because they were not accompanied by proper remedial measures. A further remark of the right hon. Gentleman was that he believed this measure, if passed, would be a measure of repression to the few and of mercy to the many. Another observation of the right hon. Gentleman was of the greatest importance—namely, that, speaking from his own personal experience and as one of the leading Ministers of the Crown, the communications which he received from all classes and denominations in Ireland with reference to the present relations of the people to law and order had furnished most abundant testimony to the necessity for this Bill. Those observations, coming from a Gentleman whose history and conduct in reference to Ireland and Irish Coercion Bills were so remarkable, were a matter of the gravest moment, and such as hon. Members had a right to congratulate themselves upon. He (Mr. Lewis) would now pass to the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere)—a speech so bold and daring that it would be misunderstood by the country if no attempt were made to refute some portions of it. It would not be forgotten by the House that one observation of the hon. Member which delighted so much hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway was that they were justified, not only in using, but in misusing or abusing, all the Forms of the House in opposing the introduction of this Bill. He (Mr. Lewis) was happy to notice, as a set off to that statement, a declaration by the Prime Minister that night, not only that he desired and would use every laudable exertion to obtain the opinion of the House for the introduction of the Bill, but that he intended to push forward the second reading of the Bill at as early a moment as possible. The argument of the hon. Member for Northampton was based on the false assumption that the Government on the one hand, and the supporters of the Bill sitting on the Opposition side on the other hand, based their support of the Bill on Returns which were inaccurate and utterly unreliable. They had endeavoured to boil down the Return until the only real essence it contained was that it recorded the reception of a large number of threatening letters, which were of no importance whatever. But what was the history of this Return? It had not been presented for the first time. It was a Return which had been made regularly for years, for the purpose of informing the Government and the country of the state of crime in Ireland besides agrarian crime, which, unfortunately, in Ireland had long been perennial. If the Government had cooked the Return and thrown out all cases which did not answer their purpose, they would have been open to the very charge of improperly treating the evidence on which they asked the House in some respects to proceed. What were the different classes of evidence on which the Government were proceeding, and not merely the Government, but the Opposition in the House in England and throughout Ireland? And let him say this—However much it might be the fashion for hon. Gentlemen who sat on that side of the House on the Benches below the Gangway to speak of themselves as the Representatives of Ireland, they were not the only Representatives of Ireland. There were vast masses, hundreds of thousands of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland at least as loyal, at least as reputable, and whose opinions were at least as worthy of consideration—nay, more so than were theirs. On behalf of hundreds of thousands of law-abiding subjects of the Queen in the country from which he had been sent as an humble Representative, he declared that they were looking with expectation, which he might say was almost breathless, to hear the action of the House upon this most important measure. It was easy to see why all classes of the community were to be found amongst the supporters of the Land League. They should presently see by what ways the numbers were swollen from day to day. As representing now for the third time, after vigorous contests, the constituency of Londonderry, he spoke for the majority of that constituency when he said that they thanked the Government and thanked the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland for his manly and straightforward speech when he introduced this Bill to the notice of the House. He supported the Bill heartily and strenuously, not merely upon the evidence contained within the four corners of this Blue Book, but upon the evidence furnished by the public Press of England and Ireland, and irrespective of Party; also upon the Charges of Her Majesty's Judges—Fitzgerald, Barry, and Dowse—but that was not all. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had been inundated with letters communicating the necessity for special legislation. Was there any hon. Member sitting on that side of the House, and who had any communication with Ireland, who had not the same kind of evidence accumulating in his possession? They had no experience of Boycotting in Londonderry; but within a few miles of it, in the county of Donegal, it was impossible for a man to buy or to sell unless he produced the green Land League ticket, which showed that he was pure in his creed. Do not let it be supposed that this agitation was merely to prevent the landlord getting his rent, for in some parts of Ireland it was impossible to enforce processes for debt, and hundreds of thousands of people had become almost paralyzed through fear. It was not to be wondered at that they had now in England Irish refugees as well as foreign refugees. There was no doubt, too, that, directly and indirectly, the trade of Ireland had been injured, and, in fact, her whole social system disorganized. The law of the land had disappeared, and the Land League had set up Courts which usurped authority to summon persons before them for having exercised their legal rights. The hon. Member for Northampton had spoken of those Courts as administering a sort of rude justice; and he afterwards described them as Courts of Appeal, in which they found the plaintiff, the witnesses, the Judge, the jury, the sheriff, and the executioner—all combined together against the unfortunate wight who happened to be dragged before them. That system of superseding the law of the land, not only by physical resistance, but by supplanting the Courts of the Queen by the Courts of the Land League, was a thing unprecedented in the annals of Irish disturbance. To illustrate what was going on in the country, he would quote a few cases from the published Returns. An unoccupied house on the property of Lord Listowel was maliciously set on fire and half consumed, because possession of it had been taken from a poor insane tenant, on whom Lord Listowel benevolently settled an annuity. That showed what treatment, under that beneficent Land League, might be expected even by a landlord who was kind and charitable. Another case occurred in September, when an armed party broke into a tenant's house at night, dragged him out of bed, and split his ear with a knife, because he had supported his landlord in some litigation in which he had been engaged. The hon. Member for Northampton had said the other night that it was an idiosyncrasy of the Irish—a part of their national character—to maim or hough cattle, and quoted Dean Swift in support of his allegation.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon, I never said anything of the kind.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS said, he repudiated, as an Englishman sent into Parliament by an Irish constituency, any such reflection on the character of the people of Ireland. It was not the Irish nation who were responsible for these outrages. It was the demagogues and the agitators, with the spirit of the murderer, without the murderer's boldness. He considered that in speeches which had been previously made the Returns the Government had presented had been most unfairly quoted; and he denied that it was wrong for the Government to ask for exceptional measures in view of the information they had produced. There was one case in which a caretaker at Kilbury House was attacked at night, placed on his knees, had an oath administered to him to the effect that he would leave the place, and then threatened that if ever again seen there he would be shot. He was then turned off the land and left in the public road. The fact of such a thing occurring in Tipperary should certainly have such weight with the House that they would not heed the fact of one offence being made into two in a few instances recorded in the Returns. What was wanted was that substantial justice be meted out to Ireland, so that all law-abiding subjects would be safe in protecting their own personal property. Another case happened in the county of Galway. About half-past 1 in the morning, the door of a Mr. Costello was forced in by a party of about 20 men, who dragged him out of bed and made him swear that he would not fence a field of grazing land formerly in common use; they then drew a wool card down his hip, lacerating the flesh. What would the country say if, with this evidence and all they had behind, the Government overlooked the condition of the country? Why, when people were sent for trial, witnesses who had sworn one thing before the magistrates knew nothing when called upon again at the Sessions and Assizes. The House and the country in this state of affairs would have had something to say to the Government if they had not brought in this Bill. Another case which he would mention was one in which a number of men went to the house of a man named Murphy at 3 in the morning, fired shots, and warned him against giving remembrance money to the parish priest. A threatening notice was posted on the man's door to the same effect. This priest was opposed to the Land League, and he was to have no remembrance money. What became, then, of the statement that the priests supported the Land League? In this system of terrorism the priests did not escape; in fact, according to the statements of an hon. Member, they dared not resist the Land League. In spite of their sacred character and conditions of life, the priests themselves were not their own masters, but had been subjected to this disgraceful and degrading tyranny. But the male sex was not the only one threatened. A woman in County Galway, in May last, was made to swear that she would give up a farm which she had taken and would not appeal to the Sessions for compensation in reference to an incendiary fire on her out-buildings. He thought he should be insulting the intelligence of the House and the intelligence of the country if he proceeded at greater length to state what was to be found in the Blue Book. They had the authority of the Chief Secretary for Ireland that beyond the statements made there was something behind; and although the Conservatives had been twitted with a desire for Coercion Bills, he thought this assurance should be sufficient to justify the Party in supporting the Government. As loyal subjects they should assist the Government heartily in any measure for the protection of life and property which they felt it their duty to propose to the House. The hon. Member for Northampton seemed to be very playful about threatening letters in Ireland. They were different things from threatening letters in London, where there were plenty of barracks, plenty of police, and a loyal population. The hon. Member for Northampton also spoke of the Irish magistracy. They all knew English Radicals desired to get rid of the unpaid magistrates; but the hon. Member, in dealing with Ireland, asked, what could they expect from the paid magistrates in the administration of the law? Who were these magistrates? The Conservative Party, since the year 1832, had been so few times in Office that they had few opportunities of appointing magistrates. The bulk, therefore, of the existing magistrates had been appointed by Liberal Governments. But what did the hon. Gentleman know about Ireland? When he heard a whole class of officials in Ireland, whose duties were of a most serious character, upon the discharge of which the lives, liberty, and happiness of millions of persons depended, brought into ridicule and contempt, without a single fact to support such charges, he was, indeed, astonished. Considering the great experience of the hon. Member, his knowledge and ability, he thought the hon. Member was incurring a great responsibility by so treating those who were engaged in the administration of the law. Why did the hon. Member speak of magistrates and policemen as "the camp of the enemy?" The enemy of whom? Of those who committed crime? Of course they were. Long might it be so. Yet the Government, according to the hon. Member, ought not to receive information from magistrates and policemen because they were "the camp of the enemy." Where were the administrators of the law to come from? He had no doubt, if the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary could find good reason for distrusting the existing magistracy and police, he would have no hesitation in turning them out. Then he had accused the Government of receiving information from "spies and informers." If it had been a Conservative Government which was in power such language might have been expected. But something better might have been expected from a Liberal, even though he sat below the Gangway, and for the borough of Northampton. But he did not believe the Chief Secretary would act at all on the information of spies and informers. Of course, if it was meant that information was received in secret, the charge was true. But how could it be otherwise? In the present state of things in Ireland no man would dare to give public information to the Government. Then the hon. Member had given a long disquisition on the Habeas Corpus Act. Of course, no one in that House knew anything about the nature and history of that Act except the hon. Member. There were no trained minds in that Assembly, embracing learned and experienced lawyers, who were capable of dealing with such a subject except the hon. Member. Yet, sacred as that venerable law was, the hon. Member was willing to sacrifice it in order to keep the Liberal Party in Office. The rights of 5,500,000 people were the minor, the Liberal Party the major consideration with the hon. Member. But the animus of the hon. Member's speech was but too clear. The hon. Member's aim was the disintegration of the Empire. Each locality, said the hon. Member, ought to be supreme in its own limits. The hon. Member did not seem to care into how small fragments the Empire was disintegrated. He would not object to some applications of that principle if the locality were confined to itself, and if—*e.g.*, the doctrine were applied to the borough of Northampton. There could be no doubt, as was stated in a letter in *The Daily News* a few weeks ago, that the state of business in Ireland had been seriously interfered with. He represented a portion of the community who were satisfied with the laws of the country; and he entreated the Government not to take one step which would have the effect of handing them over to the tender mercies of the wicked, which were known to be cruel. He agreed with the Chief Secretary that one of the chief results of the measure for the protection of life and property would be its effect on the conduct of those who were amenable to its provisions. The mere prospect of the introduction of the Bill had produced a great diminution in all classes of agrarian offences. The measure would cause hope to revive in the minds of those who were now living in a state of dependence upon the will of men who were the adversaries of the law. Those who had been so oppressed would, when the Bill was passed, be able to congratulate themselves on the fact that they had been brought within its cover and shadow. He did not, however, believe that either this Bill or the Land Bill which was to follow would bring about a permanent state of order in Ireland. The fact was that the relations between landlord and tenant had arrived at such a pitch that something more must be done than what he believed it was intended to propose. He believed if a system could be devised of assisting the tenants to become the owners of their estates at a fair and reasonable sum, it would be the only remedy by which order and contentment could be restored; and he was glad to say that the views which he held were concurred in by a gentleman of whose Toryism there could be no doubt, Sir Frederick Heygate, formerly Member for the County of Londonderry. He was satisfied a scheme might be formulated in which there would be no substantial risk of loss to the funds of the country, and without any compulsion put upon either landlord or tenant, by which a large number of tenants would become owners of their estates. No doubt this Bill would sooner or later pass into law; and in spite of what might be said in certain newspapers to the contrary, he had no fear that Her Majesty's Government, having put their hands to the plough, would turn back, and that the measure would not be frittered away to the demands of those to whom no concessions ought to be made after the conduct they had displayed. But when the Bill passed it would be necessary that it should be administered with a prudent as well as a firm hand.

MR. CHARLES RUSSELL said, he did not intend to enter into a discussion of the land scheme; and, therefore, he would not refer at length to the remarks of the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Charles Lewis). Indeed, he (Mr. Russell) wished the Government land measure was before the House, so that he might discuss it. Neither would he discuss the criticisms made by the hon. Member on the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). The hon. Member for Londonderry, at least, deserved the compliment that he was consistent, as was shown by his attitude in relation to the assimilation of the Irish franchise; and if it was possible to make this Coercion Bill stronger than it was, the hon. Member would, no doubt, be amongst its most staunch and earnest supporters. The hon. Member had done the argument of the hon. Member for Northampton some injustice. That hon. Gentleman did not deny—he (Mr. Russell) did not deny—that there had been a serious amount of crime shown to exist in Ireland during the last two years. But the question was—was it of such a character and of such an extent as to justify the suspension of the liberties of the people? He would not trouble the House by following the details of the half-dozen cases of crime referred to by the hon. Member for Londonderry. When the hon. Member spoke of cattle-houghing, he (Mr. Russell) had nothing to say to excuse a crime so offensive, and, to one's sense of humanity, so revolting; but upon the question of turning cultivated land into grazing land, he must say that it was pointed out by Bishop Berkeley, more than 100 years ago, that the taking of cultivated land for grazing purposes was offensive to the people of Ireland. It had come, unhappily, to be regarded by a certain portion of the Irish people to be expressive of revenge on the part of the landlord. The hon. Member for Londonderry took, it appeared to him (Mr. Russell), the Catholic priesthood of Ireland under his protection—a grave office for the hon. Member to assume. It was the first time the hon. Member had tried to play that *rôle*. He (Mr. Russell) thought he knew more about their feelings than the hon. Member, and he affirmed distinctly that the great majority of the priests and Bishops of Ireland sympathized with the legitimate aims, legitimate exertions, and the legitimate objects of the Land League. And if there were to any great extent bodies of priests and Bishops who had not taken part in the League's proceedings, it was not for want of sympathy—it was not because they did not believe the tenants needed some such organization for their defence, but because they well knew that there was inevitably attendant on every popular excitement, in every popular movement, when great national passions and prejudices were aroused, the danger of disorder, and the fear of going beyond legal bounds. He should now address himself to the Question before the House, and he should address his observations to hon. Members from a sense of duty, and with due regard to the responsibility attaching to his utterances. He begged that hon. Members on both sides of the House, who were impatient for the passage of the Bill, and who were, he was willing to believe, sincere in their opinion that its passage was a matter of pressing urgency, would give him credit for sincerity, when he said he believed that the measure would be injurious to the best and permanent interests of Ireland. He should oppose it, without resorting to Obstruction; and he would resist it, guiding his resistance by the laws of honour, and decency, and of reason. The measure of resistance to a Bill, and the justification for resistance, must depend upon individual judgment as to the injurious character of the Bill. The noblest utterances to be found in the record of the Commons' debates were to be found coming from men in small minorities standing up against a popular Minister and a powerful Party, to defend the Constitutional rights which had been won by the exertions of centuries. The Parliamentary precedents were sound and good in that respect. He would not trouble the House by referring to the long-continued, often-renewed, battle between the Prime Minister and the late Sir Richard Bethell on the Divorce Bill, when the Prime Minister made a most protracted resistance to that measure, and rightly, because he (the Prime Minister) believed it to be injurious to morality and to society. Students of Parliamentary history would know how Lord Clarendon told them in his history of how he—being then Mr. Hyde—in the Parliament of 1641, after the execution of Strafford, resisted the passing of the Bill for the extirpation of the Episcopacy. A powerful Party behind the Ministry brought in the Bill, and every attempt was made to gag its opponents; but for 21 nights he resisted the passing of the Bill, and, in the end, the Parliament of 1641 was obliged to relinquish it, and the Episcopacy was suffered to live. It would be ungenerous to have any show of impatience in the passing of the present measure, although he was willing to admit that right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench might have had their tempers sorely tried. No yielding to impatience on their part was justified, and no attempt ought to be made to curtail the fair liberties of hon. Members resisting coercive legislation for their country. How stood the precedents touching similar measures. In 1843, although it was but an Arms Act, the House was engaged in its discussion for 17 nights; and amongst the names of those who figured against it, he found those of Cobden, Macaulay, Roebuck, and Villiers. The following year, when the Bill was passed, Lord John Russell felt himself justified in saying that the Government of Ireland essentially differed from the Government of England, "for," said the noble Lord—

> "The Government of Ireland is a Government by force. The Government of England is a Government of represented opinion."

In 1846, the Protection of Life Bill, after passing the House of Lords, was opposed in the House of Commons by such men as Bright, Romilly, and Villiers. In 1848, the Liberals being then in power, the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; and he found a speech made by the Earl of Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, worth noticing now. The speech was important, because it marked the limitations of the cases in which, in his opinion, it was right there should be a suspension of the Constitutional liberties of a country. 1848 was the year of the insurrectionary movement, called the "Young Ireland" movement, and Mr. Disraeli said—

> "If I believed that the evils which now exist in Ireland were springing from political or social evils which ought to be met by redress, I would look with jealousy and distrust upon this proposition."

In 1866, when a Coercion Bill was introduced, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) made a speech which did more to raise and to encourage in the mind of the Irish people the hope that they might look to this Parliament for justice and redress than volumes of statutes. Had they not tried coercion long enough? Fifty-seven coercion measures in 80 years, and with what result? Had they succeeded in winning over the people to their side; on the contrary, had not each of those Acts left behind it its own sad history of individual injustice and individual wrong; and did they not, in their sum total, form a record which had painfully impressed itself on the mind of the Irish people, and made them distrust the goodwill of Parliament towards them? It was said the Ministers meant well. He (Mr. Russell) did not doubt it; but individual Members of the House were bound, if in their consciences they disapproved of the policy of Ministers, to vote against them. Each man in the House of Commons was, in his individual capacity, the guardian of liberties he was sent there to protect. There were two propositions before the House—Ought coercive legislation to pass at all, or ought remedial legislation to have precedence? He believed that there ought to be no coercive legislation, for, when actively applied, the ordinary law was quite sufficient to cope with the difficulties now existing in Ireland. Furthermore, for the evils which did exist coercion was no remedy. The Chief Secretary for Ireland now asked leave to introduce a Bill which would enable any person to be arrested upon the warrant of the Lord Lieutenant on suspicion of having committed any of the offences specified in the Act which a person might have committed or might commit. The import was grave, for it meant that upon secret information, and, notwithstanding what the hon. Member for Londonderry said, upon the information, it might be, of spies and informers—for such a policy as the present always gave birth to a crop of these — that upon such secret information, and without magisterial inquiry, without such aid as a solicitor or a counsel could give, without publicity, without jury, and without Judge, men could be imprisoned for 18 months. All those safeguards of individual liberties, which had been gained by painful and serious sacrifice, were with one stroke of the pen of a Liberal statesman to be wiped away. They had been told that the Lord Lieutenant and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would administer the law mercifully. That might be; but what guarantee had they that the Government had fixity of tenure, or that the Chief Secretary for Ireland might not, after having signalized his statesmanship in Ireland by this unhappy Bill, desire to pass to an office less laborious and more dignified? Again, it was said that only criminals would be arrested, and that the honest and virtuous man need not fear. What despot was there that would not say the same? What measure, however tyrannical, might not be defended on similar grounds? The Chief Secretary for Ireland, when he asked the House to assent to the introduction of the Bill, said he did not do so upon rumour or upon newspaper reports; but he presented it to the House upon official information. Now, he (Mr. Russell) considered the right hon. Gentleman was an unjustly and unfairly abused man. He believed the right hon. Gentleman went to Ireland desiring and believing that he would be able to propound a statesmanlike policy for the benefit of Ireland. He had hoped that after his Chief Secretaryship a true *Hibernia pacata* might be written. The right hon. Gentleman, however, had failed, and one reason was that he was isolated from the popular opinion of Ireland more than any other man. [" Oh, oh!"] Yes; for if one of the hon. Members opposite who represented popular constituencies were seen walking into the Castle Yard to consult him, no matter what the subject, the character of that hon. Member would be irretrievably ruined. But, although the right hon. Gentleman was shut out from popular opinion, he had daily poured in upon him official Reports from all parts of the country. He (Mr. Russell) was not going to say that those Reports were fabricated or made by men who were knowingly dishonest; but he did say that those Reports came principally from stipendiaries, who must reflect the opinion of the classes of society among which they lived. He therefore held that on this question, which was really a fight between the landed class on the one hand, and the tenant class on the other, the statement of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) was justified—namely, that the evidence for the coercion measure came from the opposite camp. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had said that he found from these Reports lawlessness increasing to such an extent that the ordinary law was not sufficient to cope with; and then, his judgment for the time reeling, he entered upon a mistaken course of policy. But when had lawlessness increased, and what were the magistrates doing? To their neglect or want of activity months ago he (Mr. Russell) largely attributed the existing state of things. The magistrates in Ireland might fairly be described as, in the main, landlords, because the Lords Lieutenant in counties were all great landowners, and nearly all the appointments of magistrates were made on the nomination of the Lords Lieutenant; and the magistracy of Ireland had a great deal to forgive the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The first thing was the Compensation for Disturbance Bill; another thing was the indignant speech prompted by a generous mind after the rejection of the Bill; and the third and most important thing was the manful attempt to govern Ireland without exceptional laws. While he (Mr. Russell) did not charge the magistracy of Ireland with wilful criminal neglect of duty, he did charge them with supineness in the discharge of that duty. If the same activity had been shown at the commencement of the agitation as was shown now, any lawlessness which had occurred would never have got to its present head. The magistrates, in short, were not sorry to show that their predictions, that the country could not be governed without exceptional laws, were well founded. There had been much talk about "Boycotting" in that House. He (Mr. Russell) said that the Chief Secretary for Ireland was the first victim of Boycotting, and that on the part of many landlords in Ireland. But more. The course of legislation for Ireland—the ease with which they, upon small provocation, obtained an Act of Coercion, had demoralized, to some extent, not only the people, but the magistracy of Ireland; and instead of exerting themselves with determination and firmness, and being willing to take each upon themselves their share of responsibility and, if need be, odium, for seeing that order was preserved in their neighbourhood, they had been induced by a sad history of evil legislation of that kind to look to the Government and to Dublin Castle for protection. He asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, was it not true that he had found in many parts of Ireland a proneness on the part of the magistrates to shift the responsibility which ought to be theirs to the Government—a feeling that they could come to Parliament when any difficulty occurred, with the certainty of getting coercive measures; and so they relaxed their efforts under the ordinary law? With regard to the figures in the Returns, he would not suggest that there had been unfair manipulation, he was sure there had not; but, for the purpose for which they were presented, there was a great deal that might properly have been left out; much that threw no light on the condition of the country; but which, totted up, made an imposing sum total. He ventured to say that, on the Returns, the masterly speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had never been answered. He (Mr. Russell) had read both the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and the Prime Minister, and neither of these made an attempt to answer it. He admitted that the statistics disclosed a serious amount of crime; but neither the amount, or its circumstances, made a case strong enough for the suspension of the liberties of the country. The Prime Minister, in his last speech, somewhat shifted the ground, for he said the Government founded their proposal on the failure of the administration of justice. He had also said that crime had increased in the last quarter, when distress was less and evictions fewest. But why was crime greater at the end of the last quarter? He (Mr. Russell) was speaking what he knew when he said that, although he thought the Compensation for Disturbance Bill was a small measure, yet it was looked to by the people of Ireland less for what it gave than for the feeling it evinced. Nevertheless, it would have kept up their hopefulness in the Government, and they would still have looked to Parliament and to Constitutional means to help them. It was not until that Bill was thrown out in the Lords that they began to look seriously to their own organization. By the end of the year, when October began, it was not till then the harvest was gathered, in many cases the seed of which was supplied by the hands of charity, and it was at that time that the pressure was put on a people barely escaped from famine, and, with its marks still upon them, to pay rent which should leave their children destitute. In some instances, in his opinion, the holding of the harvest, as it was called, was a justifiable act. He denied that it was any moral wrong, if a man was starving, or if his children were starving, he denied that it was any moral wrong for him, in his necessity, to put his hand into a baker's shop and steal a loaf. No doubt it was a crime in law; but morality would not condemn it. He feared hon. Members little knew that, in many instances, in Ireland it was but a narrow span which separated the people from actual want of the barest needs of life. The Prime Minister went on to say that crime "dogged" the steps of the Land League. His expression was, that wherever the Land League went, there crime resulted. That seemed to him (Mr. Russell) very bad reasoning. Was not the true answer to that, that the Land League meetings were held not in order to create disturbance, but were held in places already disturbed. The Land League meetings were held in the places in which some supposed unjust and arbitrary proceedings against tenants were threatened or were being carried out; and, therefore, it was hardly correct to say the disturbance was due to the action of the League. But the Prime Minister in his speech said he founded his case mainly on the failure of justice in Ireland. That was the point on which the right hon. Gentleman relied. Now, how did that stand? They had got a serious catalogue of 2,000 odd agrarian offences, big and little, which were admitted not to be of the most serious class —that was to say, not homicidal, but still serious and grave. Of those about 1,000 were threatening letters. He did not make light of threatening letters; it was a contemptible and odious offence, and, unhappily, not unfrequent in Ireland, and, he might add, not unfrequent in England. When he (Mr. Russell) recently had occasion to publish some matter, which he deemed would be of public interest, he received half-a-dozen threatening letters; and there was a distinction between these and those that were sent through the post in Ireland; for those he received, instead of being vulgar epistles, sent by illiterate persons, were forwarded by educated persons, who ought to have known better, and were, therefore, rendered the more offensive, especially as they had been sent openly through the post. No doubt, such offences were serious. The Prime Minister had laid great stress on the fact that, excluding threatening letters, in respect of over 1,000 offences only 200 persons were charged, or, as it was called, "made amenable;" and that out of the 200 persons charged, only 83 had been convicted. What was the main characteristic of these offences? Were they not chiefly of a secret nature—visitings by night and intimidations by persons with blackened faces, firearms discharged into and over houses for the purpose of creating fear? In the great majority of these instances, no person could be definitely named as the person who had committed the offence. In some of the cases the person who suffered would not disclose the names of the offenders. Then as to the proportion of convictions. If they took the same class of crime in England, or a class of crime which, for this purpose, was nearly analogous — namely, burglarious entries, &c. — the percentages of convictions would probably be very little higher in proportion to the arrests in England than it was in Ireland. It was clear, in such cases, the difficulties of identification were great, and, therefore, of securing convictions great. The right hon. Gentleman ought to have instituted a comparison with reference to the convictions in a special category of crime such as this, instead of convictions in every class of crime. Then the right hon. Gentleman, after having produced his figures, made the explanation that it was terrorism which made the number of convictions so small, as people would not come forward. But he (Mr. Russell) would like to ask, in all seriousness, was it not sympathy which protected the offenders, so far as they were protected, and not terrorism? Would that he could believe it was true, as had been said by an hon. and gallant Baronet (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) on the other side of the House, that 90 per cent of the people of Ireland were opposed to the wrongdoers, and had no sympathy with the offences. He (Mr. Russell) wished he could think so; but, unfortunately, he could not. They regarded these offences, unhappily, as a kind of rough protective agency to themselves. To illustrate that, he would cite an instance of what was said to him by a man, apparently of some intelligence, in the South of Ireland. Speaking of the Government expected land measures, this man said—

> "I am told that Mr. Gladstone is a very good man; but what can he do against a House full of landlords? No, sir; the men in Tipperary did more for themselves in a short time than Parliament ever did. When I was a boy a few of their landlords got badly hurt—God help them!—and now they tell me there's no better landlords in Ireland than in Tipperary."

He (Mr. Russell) deplored that such sentiments should exist; but they did exist, and could not be ignored. Thousands of men of this class, owing to the government of Ireland in the past, looked to other agencies for amelioration and redress than to that House. Then, the Chief Secretary for Ireland had said the Bill was aimed at the village blackguard. He (Mr. Russell) must say that he thought the right hon. Gentleman had been quite misunderstood by certain Members who accused him of including priests among the village blackguards. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman had no such intention. He (Mr. Russell) did not at all doubt that there were village ruffians; but there must also be village Hampdens—

> "Some village Hampden that with dauntless breast
> The little tyrants of his field withstood."

He should like to say something of the only Land League branch of which he could give that House the history. It was the Land League branch which was formed in the town of Dundalk. The initial meeting was presided over by a Catholic priest, and its members included gentlemen belonging to the two public bodies of the town—the Town Commissioners and the Harbour Commissioners—and several of the most respected, prominent, and trustworthy persons of Dundalk. Indeed, it was to the advantage of society that such men should be connected with the League. It was a guarantee against the lawlessness that undoubtedly had marked the conduct of some who acted in the name of the Land League. He contended that no case had been made out for that coercive measure, especially now, when they found that on the inspiration and under the direction of the Chief Secretary for Ireland the magistrates were acting with activity, and the law was taking its regular course. In one of the leading papers, under the heading of *Anarchy in Ireland*, a series of events were described which might occur in any country in almost a normal state. What had been done in Tralee showed that the ordinary law was strong enough. As to the number of persons under police surveillance, no sufficient explanation had been forthcoming. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) had referred to the case of a noble Relative of his. They must all be aware that he meant Lord Ardilaun, though he did not name him. Lord Ardilaun, while walking in County Galway, had been told that it was not safe for him; and if he had not been respected by all those among whom he lived, and if he had not also been a man of moral and physical courage, he would have been surrounded by policemen. As to the remedial measures, he agreed that while the Land League had done much good, it had, in some respects, done evil. It had had a demoralizing effect on the minds of some people; and its general advices as to rent and as to holding the harvest were, he feared, turned by dishonest persons to dishonest uses. But these were the consequences which followed all large movements. It was impossible, when they once set in force a great national movement, such as that undoubtedly was, appealing to the passions and interests of a large number of people, to carry it on without at times overstepping legal metes and bounds and without acts of violence. Take the Corn Law agitation, and, above all, the Reform agitation prior to 1832. Molesworth's account of that time would show any hon. Member how much crime and lawlessness followed in the train of that movement. It might be said for the Land League that, assuming the Government of the country were anxious to bring in a good Land Bill for Ireland as the only means of pacifying Ireland, they had to be thankful to the Land League for making it possible for them to do so. It should be remembered that the agitation of the Land League had more to do with the ripening of public opinion on both sides of that House on the question than anything that could be pointed to. The arguments adduced in support of the course taken by the Government was that 10 per cent of the population, the village ruffians, were terrorizing over the honest people of the country. Were they to suspend the Constitutional safeguards of 90 per cent of the people, who were honest and respectable members of society, because the "village ruffians," as they had been described, terrorized over them? It was absurd to say it could be necessary, and, if not necessary, it was unjustifiable to do so. The Prime Minister said that the men who would be hit by his Bill would never be reconciled by remedial legislation; and, therefore, it was useless to introduce it as a preventive of disorder. Perhaps the Prime Minister was right; but if those men went unpunished at present, they went unpunished, to a great extent at least, because of the sympathy of the masses of the people with them; and if, by remedial legislation, they took away the sympathy of the masses from the few criminals, they would put the agrarian crime which they could not now put down upon the same footing as social crime which was reprobated in Ireland as well as in England. Before he concluded he wished to say a few words about the remarkable speech delivered on Thursday night by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, his admiration, nay, his veneration, for whom dated many years back. It was now a long time since he (Mr. Russell) first heard the right hon. Gentleman in Belfast, when he accepted the hospitality of its citizens; and he (Mr. Russell) had since said publicly and privately, that he believed the noble utterances of the right hon. Gentleman then, and since, upon the subject of Ireland did more to encourage among the Irish people a healthy feeling of hopefulness towards Parliament than any Act ever passed by the Legislature. That speech had caused him great pain and disappointment. The right hon. Gentleman told them, although he believed he never voted for any measure of coercion or oppression for Ireland, yet, in many of the cases of Irish Coercion Bills, he either voted against them or abstained from voting, not because he did not think those measures might not have been called for by the necessities of the time, but because they were not accompanied by remedial legislation. Upon that argument, he thought he was entitled now to claim the right hon. Gentleman's support to the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons). The right hon. Gentleman, in effect, said this—"I have not voted for your coercive measures, because you did not accompany them with remedial legislation—in other words, because your coercive measures are called for by reason of a state of things which I believe is owing to the unjust or bad state of the law, and which I believe would be removed by a just and good state of law." Well, admitted that the state of Ireland was bad, and that an organization existed there which had something to do with the development of crime, that organization had been called into existence by the unjust state of the land system and the circumstances of the country. Why, therefore, did not remedial legislation precede coercive measures? The right hon. Gentleman answered that, because there would be remedial legislation, he supported this Bill. But how did he know that there was to be remedial legislation? He was a Cabinet Minister, and might possess information of which the House knew nothing as to intentions of Government; but how did he know, when the Cabinet brought in their Land Bill, if they had agreed upon one, that it would pass through the House? Remedial legislation, he (Mr. Russell) supposed, meant in the mind of the Chancellor of the Duchy thorough and complete remedial legislation. And could the right hon. Gentleman satisfy them that, if the Bill passed through that House, it was certain to pass in its original form through the House of Lords, and that what was a fair and goodly measure when it left them would not come back maimed and mutilated? And if those were not reasonable suggestions to make, he (Mr. Russell) again asked, why, on the arguments of the Chancellor of the Duchy, not give precedence to remedial legislation? The right hon. Gentleman, in addressing a meeting in 1867, said—

> "One thing, at any rate, I may be allowed to say—that I entirely disagree with those who, when any crisis or trouble arrives, say that you must first of all preserve order, you must first of all put down disloyalty and disobedience to the law. You must first of all assert the supremacy of the Government; and then, and not till then, consider the grievances that are complained of."

The right hon. Gentleman disagreed with that view then; and if he had not changed his opinion he (Mr. Russell) had a right now to claim his support for the Amendment. In 1868, the right hon. Gentleman made use of these words—he hoped he had not recanted—

> "If there be a people on the face of the earth whose hearts are accessible to justice, it is the Irish people."

If the right hon. Gentleman had not changed that opinion, he (Mr. Russell) was entitled again to ask him why he was a party to giving precedence to coercive over remedial legislation? He appealed again to the Government to leave this time-dishonoured instrument of weak statesmanship alone. He (Mr. Russell) had spoken from a sense of duty. He had spoken with a sense of responsibility; and he had tried, and he believed successfully, to be unswayed by unreasonable popular prejudice, but to give that just effect which he was bound to give to popular opinion in Ireland. If that Bill was persisted in it might be delayed, but it would certainly be carried, and carried by a large majority; for it was a sad fact that, while the passage of remedial legislation for Ireland through that House was difficult, the passage of coercive legislation was easy; but when the Bill became law, would it have won the people to order? Would it have gained respect for the law which the sense of the people rejected as unjust and oppressive? Nay, would not its operation turn men who might be properly styled criminals, if treated as criminals under a just and Constitutional law, to turn those who might come under the operation of this unconstitutional legislation into martyrs, and thus increase the contempt of the people for the law of the land? He did not know whether the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) desired a continuance and extension of his popular power; but if he did they had secured it to him, when they might, by going straight to the work of remedial legislation, have struck from his hand and broken the sceptre which they said he wielded. He (Mr. Russell) desired to say, with all the earnestness of which he was capable, that the Government, by the course they were taking, would, he believed, deprive their remedial measures, when they came, of half their healing efficacy, and throw back for many years the growth of kindly feelings between the nations.

Mr. METGE said, he would not have risen to address the House after the eloquent speech just delivered, but that he believed that a great responsibility rested upon them as Irish Members, connected, as they were, with the great movement which had aroused the fire so long smouldering in the hearts of the Irish people. They had striven to reanimate the spirit of independence in Ireland, and now they were brought face to face with a merciless despotism, which silenced their voice and suspended their action in what they considered to be their duty, by having recourse to that power which had been so often denounced by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. His answer to the speech of the hon. Member for Londonderry—a man who professed to represent Irish feeling and an Irish constituency—was the answer he gave to the hon. Member for Northampton—What did he know about Ireland? It was with feelings of pain he listened to the eloquent defence of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster of the position which he now occupied in connection with this Coercion Bill. Referring to the comparison instituted between the Anti-Corn Law League and the Land League, the right hon. Gentleman said the Anti-Corn Law League never in one single instance was supported by a course of violence or outrage. He (Mr. Metge) said, in the main, neither was the Land League supported by violence and outrage. Some irresponsible members of the Land League might have used unwise expressions, which they all strongly condemned; but to say that the practical and responsible leaders of the movement had supported violence or outrage, and incited the people to violence and outrage, was a base and unfounded calumny. How came it that England's only remedy for Ireland on all occasions was coercion? The Land League had many sins; but were it not for the operations of the Land League during the past year they would have heard as little about the coming Land Bill as they would have heard of all previous Land Bills, the history of which was so painful. The Prime Minister seemed to him to have used the figures he quoted most unjustly. He told the House that in Ireland for every 33 cases of outrage they were only able to obtain one conviction, and that the perpetrators of the other 32 walked about with impunity. No one knew better than the Prime Minister that out of those 33 cases there were 17 cases of threatening letters, which it was impossible to come at, numbers of those letters emanating from one and the same individual. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that none could be arrested under the Bill except upon reasonable suspicion. But under the provisions of the Westmeath Act, without accusation or any information as to the cause, Mr. Casey was kept in prison for three years. His case was brought under the notice of the House by Mr. Butt in 1874, and there was not even the shadow of a suspicion against him. Such were the arbitrary acts which would be put in the power of the magistrates. As a magistrate himself, he was actuated only by kindly feeling towards his brother magistrates; but all the landlords in his own county of Meath owed him a grudge they could not get over; and if this Bill were passed, what was to prevent those men from informing the Lord Lieutenant that he was inciting the people to outrage, and thus secure his imprisonment? He was sorry to say that arguments on the part of the Irish Members were in that House of no avail. Had he not seen Irish

Members night after night addressing empty Benches, as he was at present, and sleepy statesmen? Had he not seen argument heaped upon argument and proof upon proof, and what had been the avail? Their arguments had not been listened to. He asked Liberal Members to pause before they gave their consent to coercion. The action of the Irish Members was a protest which this country would in the end support. They were standing up for the Constitutional rights of the people, which had been fought for not only on the floor of the House, but on the battle field. Coercion was needed by the landlords to enforce eviction. That was the secret of the whole matter. He knew there were numbers of good landlords in Ireland; but even these men could not shake off class interest and prejudice, or separate themselves from those whose only hope was in this coercion policy. The landlords now saw that another power was rising in the land; they believed in that power, they believed and trembled. No matter what coercive legislation was passed, revenge would have its victim; and, therefore, he opposed legislation which would increase outrage in Ireland. The Westmeath Act had been cited to show how effectual the coercion now proposed would be. But the circumstances were entirely different. In the case of the Westmeath Act they were dealing with a limited area and scanty population; they were now dealing with a nation. He gave the Chief Secretary for Ireland credit for endeavouring to do his best for Ireland; but he knew nothing whatever of the country. All that he knew about Ireland had been derived, not from the people of Ireland, but from the chief butler, chief baker, and chief cook of Dublin Castle. The Irish people believed in their organization, and not in rebellion. Disaffected persons, of course, existed, and possibly their numbers had lately increased; but that was due to the manner in which Ireland had been treated by England. Disaffection would certainly not disappear before a Coercion Bill, but would rather be strengthened and intensified. It was useless to disguise the fact that England had never been friendly to Ireland; otherwise, if Ireland had hitherto had just laws, a measure of coercion would have been less keenly opposed. But, in point of fact, the record of Irish grievances had been the same, or nearly the same, for many years, and most of them still remained unredressed. The pages of *Hansard* showed a melancholy list of abortive reforms and rejected Land Bills. Nor would the measure now before the House be more fortunate in its results. Last year they had been foolish enough to believe in a Liberal Government, and the Chief Secretary had flooded the country with troops and the Courts with prosecutions. As the Government themselves said, it was doubtless their first duty to protect life and property; but the Bill would protect only the landlords, and would leave the 500,000 tenants to their fate. Such was the Coercion Bill, and he much regretted that the Government had thought coercion necessary. It came to this—that after 700 years British rule in Ireland had to be supported by force, and an unconquered people could be dealt with only by means of exceptionally severe measures.

MR. HOPWOOD said, as profession had been the order of the day, he might say he loved coercion as little as any man. He had worked hard with hon. Members opposite in endeavouring to obtain justice; and he, therefore, hoped they would bear with him while he stated why he felt compelled to support the Government in their present proposals. He did not think it necessary to refer to the long list of statistics; but this he must say—that, so far as he had heard, no one had denied that instances of terrorism and outrage existed considerably more in number than any hon. Member opposite would venture to justify. He had always entertained the deepest sympathy with Ireland in its distress, and earnestly desired to see its grievances redressed; but it was admitted on all hands that there now existed in that country an amount of terrorism and of outrage which no true lover of liberty could justify or view with indifference. He had come to the House at the beginning of the Session with a strong predisposition in favour of remedial legislation and against any measure of coercion, if it could be avoided; but what had since happened had forced him unwillingly to the conclusion that a case had been made out for granting the Executive Government some exceptional powers. That had been, in great part, brought about by the conduct of those who had undertaken the defence of Ireland up to the present moment; for they had palliated, excused, sometimes defended, and never sufficiently disowned and discountenanced, the lawless proceedings which made the will of the Land League law. Hon. Gentlemen below the opposite Gangway were pursuing a course which tended to light up afresh the old animosities between Englishmen and Irishmen, which it had been hoped were fast dying out. That, he maintained, was a proceeding inimical to the true interests of Ireland herself, as well as dangerous to the security of the Empire. Let them think what it tended to. If they relied on "Boycotting" to aid their political struggle, to what persecution did they not expose the many thousands of loyal, peaceful, laborious Irishmen employed in the service of the State, in commerce, or in humble labour in this country and the Colonies, by the natural indignation which was being aroused? Painful sacrifice to unoffending men. If there existed in England a system of terrorism analogous to that which at present prevailed in Ireland, and if its victims dared not invoke the aid of the law, then, strong Radical and lover of liberty though he was, he should be ready to invest the Executive Government for a time with the requisite powers to repress such an intolerable state of things. The life and liberty of loyal and honest people in Ireland were now so seriously threatened that the sooner the House granted the powers now asked for by Ministers the better; and then they might proceed to the consideration of those remedial measures which it was to be hoped would give the long-wished-for succour and relief.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN observed, that hon. Members talked as if Ireland was being brought to the Bar of that House and being tried as an incorrigible offender. Who was it that put her on her trial? The Representatives of the virtuous British nation. Were their hands so clean that they could afford to throw stones at Ireland? The whole case made by the Government went upon this statement—that Ireland was not worse in the matter of social crime than England was, but that she excelled in a special class of crime; that Ireland and England both sinned, but that Ireland's sins were not the same as England's sins, and therefore Ireland must be coerced. It was hard upon Ireland that she must assimilate her offending to the offending of England. If he must choose, he would rather have the crime of Ireland than the crime of England. The crime of Ireland sprang from bad agrarian laws, and if those laws were amended the crime they produced would cease. He did not see an equally easy way of getting rid of the crime of England. He did not regard the threatening letters as being any indication of crime, many of them being concocted; therefore, was it fair or right or proper to deal with this important subject as the Government statisticians had been dealing with it? In the system of double, aye, and even treble entry, he considered the Return to be utterly discreditable. They had had references made to the demolition of the homes of the peasantry. Well, Ireland knew something about the unroofing of the homes of the peasants. He thought the House would care very little for the six-and-eightpenny emotion of the hon. Member for the people of Ireland. The hon. Member had referred to the Catholic clergy, and he had presumed to say that the Irish clergy were intimidated. Let it be clearly understood that the Catholic clergy of Ireland could not be intimidated, and the statements with regard to them were base calumnies. If the palms of the Catholic clergy itched for money, if their consciences could be bought, they knew where the gold was ready for them. It was not in Ireland that such things were bought. The reason why the clergy of Ireland joined in the movement was because they felt this useful and much calumniated Land League was a beneficent movement for the political safety of the Irish people. It was said there was a reign of terror in Ireland, and that a gloom had spread over the land. He had seen the terrorists go throughout the length of Ireland, and he never saw any demonstration in their regard but one of love and affection. He was present at the Ennis meeting to which the Prime Minister referred; and he saw every window occupied, handkerchiefs waved, and the carriages were full of flowers, thrown by the ladies of Ennis. No doubt, that was a reception which some Members of the Treasury Bench would like very much to receive. Similarly, on the termination of the State Trials in Dublin, there were rejoicings from end to end of Ireland. At Athenry there was great joy, followed by illuminations. There were everywhere bonfires and rejoicing. He might refer to Irish newspapers in proof of that statement, for they contained accounts of such demonstrations at Fermoy, Kilmanagh, Tuam, Dundalk, Kilkenny, and many other places. The only people who were adverse to such celebrations were those who would, if they could, undo the Land Act of 1870, and even the Church Act. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, in his speech a few nights ago, had told an anecdote of the late John Martin. That revered patriot had told the right hon. Gentleman that he was his enemy. The truth of that remark had been signally proved. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that there was no comparison between the action of the Land League and that of the Corn Law League. It was true, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, that there was much excitement in both countries during the time. The right hon. Gentleman had further said that the Corn Law League was not responsible for outrages, neither was the Land League responsible for the various reprehensible acts which had occurred in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman added that the Corn Law League told the people to come to Parliament for redress. That was true; but they had not to appeal to a Parliament outside of their own country, as was the case with Ireland at the present time. The English people were told to look for redress to their own Parliament, not one sitting in Paris or Berlin. History confirmed and justified the feeling with which the Irish people had and still regarded the English Parliament. If the Irish people had a Parliament of their own they could look to it for redress of their grievances. They were now to have a Coercion Bill, one of the many imposed on their country. The continuity of these Acts was well kept up in Ireland. The present one, however, was more severe than usual, and was to last to September, 1882, that would be within a few days of the century of Irish Independence. In November, 1782, the Declaration of Irish Independence was carried in the Irish Parliament, and then came a golden era of peace, joy, prosperity, and happiness for the Irish people. ["Oh, oh!"] History testified to it, and he never yet heard a man deny it. It was an admitted fact that between the Declaration of Irish Independence and the Act of Union Ireland throve and prospered as never did any other country.

MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that he was travelling beyond the Question before the House.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN apologized, and, in conclusion, pointed out that they had neither material force nor numerical strength to resist the humiliation sought to be imposed on the Irish people. If it was thrust upon them, he could assure the Government that it would be remembered, and would form another item in the long list of grievances in the account between the two nations, and which yet had to be settled.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that, in the endeavour of the Home Rule Members to prevent the measures of Her Majesty's Government from making progress, the Speaker had been constantly obliged to recall their attention to the question that was actually before the House; and he (Mr. Newdegate) had observed, whenever these hon. Members departed from the question immediately before the House, it was always in one direction—a direction which indicated that their opposition to the proposals of Ministers was based upon ulterior political considerations. The hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. T. D. Sullivan) said that he did not expect the Parliament of England would ever pass measures that would be satisfactory to his adherents in Ireland. Such a statement as that gave to the present debate a peculiar character. It showed that the present measures of the Government were not opposed on their merits, but because ulterior views and objects were constantly being propounded by hon. Members who opposed these measures. These ulterior designs were manifest at the close of the last Session, and were equally manifest now. No one could have heard the speech of the hon. Member for Westmeath without coming to the conclusion that he had no confidence that the House of Commons, as at present constituted, would do justice to the people of Ireland. This showed what the House had to deal with in relation to the movement now going on in Ireland. The fact was that it was a movement for separating Ireland from the rest of the Kingdom—at all events for legislative purposes. He (Mr. Newdegate) was old enough to remember the agitation for Repeal of the Union; and why was that resisted? Not from hostility to the Irish people, but because English and Scotch Members were of opinion that it was essential to the safety of England and Scotland that the Union with Ireland should be maintained.

Mr. GILL rose to Order, and wished to know if the hon. Member for North Warwickshire was right in alluding to the Union?

Mr. SPEAKER recalled the hon. Member to the Question immediately before the House.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, departures from Order had been so frequent in the course of those debates that it was not easy to remain in Order. Everyone who spoke was liable to fall into the same error. Sitting in that House, and listening to the speeches from the Benches below the left Gangway, it seemed to him impossible for a man to draw any other inference from them than that which he had done. He wished, however, to call attention to what took place in that House in the year 1846, when he himself voted against a similar Bill to that which was now before the House, in company with the late Lord George Bentinck and the present Lord Beaconsfield. He was then induced to believe that the pleas then advanced, as they were now by certain Irish Members, would be verified; and with the permission of the House he would read a Question which, in 1846, was put by the late Mr. O'Connell to the late Sir Robert Peel. On the 25th of May, 1846, Mr. O'Connell said—

> "He believed he was quite accurate in stating that the amount of crime recently reported from Ireland was considerably diminished, and he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Baronet and of the House to the fact. He attributed it mainly to the attention paid by Government to relieve the wants of the people in various localities, as well as to the amount of private subscriptions in other situations. The peasantry of Ireland were duly sensible of the kindness and sympathy thus evinced, and to this cause he attributed a considerable diminution of crime. The conduct of Government in relieving the wants of the people had tended to diminish crime, and he believed had done more than could have been accomplished by a severe execution of the laws."—[3 *Hansard*, lxxxvi. 1203.]

This was the reply of the late Sir Robert Peel—

> "Sir Robert Peel was much obliged to the hon. and learned Gentleman for so handsomely doing justice, on the present as on a former occasion, to the efforts of Government. He would not now enter into any argument as to the cause of the decrease of crime in Ireland; the hon. and learned Gentleman attributed it to the attention of Government to the wants of the sufferers, but others might perhaps find a different cause in the promulgation of the fact that the Protection of Life Bill had passed with the almost unanimous consent of the House of Lords."—[*Ibid.*]

These arguments adduced by Mr. O'Connell and others had some influence with him (Mr. Newdegate). At that time he was one of those who believed that the Repeal of the Corn Laws would deeply injure Ireland; and the diminution of cereal cultivation in Ireland by 1,500,000 acres since that period had but confirmed that opinion. What was the result of his joining the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and the Liberal Party in voting against the Protection of Life and Property Bill in 1846? Why, that crime continued and increased until, in the autumn of 1847, Parliament was specially summoned to deal with the question of outrage; and he had the humiliation of having to reverse the vote which he had previously given in company with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. John Bright) and the Whig-Radical Party of that day. They walked through the Lobby like penitents, as though enveloped in white sheets with tapers in their hands. The right hon. Gentleman, he dared say, had not forgotten that circumstance. The right hon. Gentleman had repented, and so had he (Mr. Newdegate). In tendering to the Government his support of the measures they asked leave to introduce, he was acting solely on his own convictions, on the result of personal experience, and because when a responsible Ministry of the Crown, and especially when the Leader of the Liberal Party, who had so often opposed coercive measures, found it necessary to introduce measures of a coercive character, he thought that no man of sound sense, no true Englishman, would be justified in withholding his support. The situation was manifest—it was illustrated by the conduct of the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell), who refused the permission to Her Majesty's Ministers, which was commonly accorded to every private Member, to introduce a Bill. He was sorry to hear the hon. and learned Member following in the track of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). As representing one of the divisions of a Midland county, and not an unimportant division, the Borough of Northampton appeared to him (Mr. Newdegate) a revolutionary oasis in the Midland counties, and that not a very happy oasis. That borough seemed remarkable for opposition to the general sense of the large populations in its vicinity, no less than to the sense of their agricultural neighbours, and its Representatives had gone far to rouse the English nation's feeling on this subject. While hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway from Ireland had used such expressions as that the English garrison ought no longer to be allowed in Ireland, they had applied that language to the landlords of Ireland; and he had to tell those hon. Members that, quite irrespective of the qualities of the Irish landlords, the people of the centre of England were determined that the English garrison should not be removed from Ireland. But to revert to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk, what were the characteristics of the era to which the hon. and learned Member looked for precedents to justify the persevering Obstruction with which the proposal before the House was met? He looked to the period about 1640-41, and cited the Lord Clarendon of that day as having joined in a persevering Obstruction. But was not that a period the history of which conveyed a warning? There was an irreconcilable faction in the House of Commons of that day. Unhappily, the Court faction, of which Lord Clarendon, though distinguished as he was by his ability, had been the creature, contributed to make the House of Commons feel, by his persevering Obstruction, that its very existence as an authority was in danger; and he (Mr. Newdegate) believed that, if this system of Obstruction was persevered in, they would have to go back to the precedents of that period in order to meet the present mischief. Was not that a period which was fraught with warning? An attack was then made by the sympathizers with Strafford upon the Parliament, which afterwards resulted in that Parliament setting aside the authority of the Crown and declaring itself in permanence. And what happened in Ireland in 1641, after Strafford was beheaded? The Roman Catholic sympathizers with Strafford committed a massacre. ["No, no!"] He said "Yes." They had stained the annals of Ireland with blood, and imprinted a lesson on the minds of Englishmen and Scotchmen, and of all Protestants, that could never be effaced. He asked hon. Members, then, to reflect upon the precedents on which they were acting in the obstructive tactics they were now adopting. Were they not, unconsciously it might be, placing the House in a position in which it must feel the necessity of defending its independence and efficiency? He was sure that hon. Members did not intend to raise this issue, for, whatever the justice of their case in minor matters, that greater consideration—the maintenance of the authority of that House and of Parliament—must supersede all minor considerations, and render their advocacy of minor matters inferior in importance in the estimation of the House to the great object of maintaining the authority of Parliament. He was unwilling to detain the House further. He had been unwilling, indeed, to take part in a debate which he considered had already lasted far too long for the credit of Parliament. But he was one of those who were of opinion that they would have to revert to the precedents of the 17th century, in order to redeem the character of the House. In conclusion, therefore, he thanked Her Majesty's Ministers for the firmness with which they were discharging their duty; and he hoped that, should this obstructive course, based on such evil precedent, be persisted in against the independence of the House, the Government would take into their consideration whether the House ought not to adopt some measures similar to those which were adopted at the period to which he had referred, in order to vindicate its independence and efficiency.

MR. BROADHURST said, he rose principally to reply to the references, chiefly by innuendo, that had been made in the debate to liken the agitation they were now discussing to the conduct and progress of trades unionism. In the first place, he defied anyone to show where trades unionism in its corporate capacity had been associated in any way with crime or systematic offence. When there were crimes and outrages prevalent through labour agitations in the United Kingdom, it was at a time when trades unionism was under repressive laws, and when those who ventured to connect themselves with it were obliged to hide their books and other necessary matters in gardens and secret places. But, since they had emerged from these repressive measures, he defied any hon. Member to show a single instance in which they had tried to incite to a breach of the laws, however unequal, however unjust they were to trades unionists. He regretted to hear, when the Prime Minister was speaking the other evening, the word "Broadhead" uttered by some hon. Member, with the object, no doubt, of casting a slur on trades unions; but, so far as the sad event in their history to which reference was thus made was concerned, he would merely observe that it was a remnant of the spirit which prevailed among the people while they continued to be under the operation of repressive laws, and that it was the trades unionists of England who first asked for an investigation of the crimes which had been committed at Sheffield, Mr. George Odger, Mr. Allen, and Mr. Applegarth, being among those who had been sent down to inquire into the truth of the allegations which had been made. They it was who had encouraged the employers to demand the Royal Commission which met in 1866, 1867, and 1868, and proved to the world that trades unionism had no share in the crimes which had been laid to its charge. There was one other subject connected with trade matters to which reference had been made in the House during the last week or two, and that was the conduct of the miners in Lancashire and the adjacent counties. ["Question!"] What had called forth the excitement and indignation of the miners of that part of the country? He was not going to defend violence, he was not going to apologize for it; but, in the case to which he was referring, he would ask the attention of hon. Gentlemen to its cause. Parliament, in its wisdom, passed last Session a measure for the protection of the lives and limbs of those men; but those who employed them were now trying their utmost to force the men, by coercive measures, to contract themselves out of that beneficent Act. That was the cause of the excitement in Lancashire, and when any class sought to evade the law of Parliament, those upon whom they were imposing this evasion were justified, he thought, in resisting it by every legal and Constitutional means in their power. With reference, however, to the main question before the House, he felt that he was only uttering the sentiments of many hon. Members on that side of the House (the Liberal) when he described the position in which they found themselves as a most painful one, a position in which they never expected to be placed, and a position which presented extreme difficulty as to the way by which they could extricate themselves from it. Hon. Members opposite from Ireland called upon those in his quarter of the House to support them in their policy of opposition to a certain measure. With regard to that opposition he believed that there was hardly a heart in that locality which was not with it; but, unfortunately, this was an occasion when hearts would be in one Lobby and heads in another. [*Laughter.*] Some hon. Gentlemen smiled at his description; but it accurately conveyed the feelings by which many were possessed. If the hon. Gentlemen from Ireland had come forward with a well-defined policy and aim, then that would have been another matter for consideration altogether; but the House had nothing of the kind before it, and hon. Members were asked to go into the Lobby of opposition without knowing where that opposition must ultimately end. On the other hand, they were invited by a Government, of which it could, at least, be said that it contained men whose lives had been chiefly associated with justice to Ireland, according to their time and opportunity. He desired to recall the fact that, in the last Liberal Government before the present, the youth of their existence was given up, not for the purpose of redressing the wrongs of England and Scotland; but it was devoted, and ungrudgingly devoted, to the redress of a wrong which then existed in Ireland. What did they find the same men doing in the first Session of the present Parliament? Did they not find them showing their confidence in the good sense of the Irish people by not seeking to re-impose an Act which had been held over the heads of the Irish people by the Conservative Government? And did they not devote their time, energy, and influence to the promotion of a Bill which, had it passed, would at least have done a great deal of good to the people of Ireland? And, again, the present Session was marked by the promise of men whose words had never been proved false by the people of England. They had commenced the Session pledged to the highest degree that they would do justice towards Ireland; and he asked whether they, who had watched those grey-haired statesmen from their boyhood to the present day, had ever found them guiding the people on the wrong side of liberty or justice? As to the Land Bill which the Government had promised—which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. John Bright) had said would be a worthy monument to hon. Gentlemen who sat around him—he would ask that it should be of such a nature that it would dispose of this question of Ireland, so far as the Land Laws were concerned, for the next quarter of a century at least. The people of Ireland had been ever open, he said, to good counsel and advice; but during the last six or seven years what attempts had been made to lead them into paths of law and reason? Nothing at all. During the last six years no practical attempt whatever had been made to deal with the wrongs of the long-suffering people of Ireland. The House would be perfectly justified in giving the Government an opportunity of dealing thoroughly with the Land Question. Relying upon statesmen who had never yet failed, he confidently for this occasion placed faith in their promises of justice; and, therefore, he should unquestionably support the measure for the introduction of which leave had been asked. When, however, the Bill was actually before the House, he should certainly support those who sought to amend it, especially in regard to its retrospective effects; and he should do his best to make the measure as light as possible, and to help to redress the wrongs from which Ireland had so long suffered.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN, knowing the probable end of the debate, would appeal to the fair play of the House, while there was yet a calm moment in which the better reason of hon. Members might find utterance, in order to put on record his own position in this cruel emergency. This was a sorrowful and a sad combat. There were hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House who would support the Government, though with genuine regret. They were the friends of Ireland. He did not doubt it, and could say so more freely now than, perhaps, in some future stages of the struggle in which he and his Friends were engaged to defend the liberties of their countrymen. He blamed the Land League much in this—that during the past four months they had confined all their efforts to one side of the Channel, and had taken no thought of the duty of informing honest and well-disposed English opinion on this side of the Channel. He had seen growing daily in this country the storm before which the Ministry had quivered and gone down, and the members of the Land League did not realize the danger to their cause or the peril to the Ministry that was being created by the manufacture of a false public opinion by clamour and by untruth sent across the Irish Channel to prejudice the minds of honest Englishmen. The landlords of Ireland formed a Committee in Dublin, and instead of carrying on their campaign in Ireland, where their alleged facts would be tested, they commenced a campaign of pamphleteering in England. His friends, however, had allowed judgment to go by default in England; and what was the result? The Press of London, open to the landocracy of Ireland, was filled with letter on letter. There was not a terrified landlord in Ireland—terrified by conscience within—who did not write misstatements in the English Press; and the effect had been that Members, such as the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood), were prepared to lay down their love of justice out of resentment of the alleged misconduct of the Land League. It was alleged that there had been six agrarian murders during the last 12 months. Two of them, he was persuaded, were no more agrarian than the Harley Street mystery; but, whether there were six or four agrarian murders, they were too many for him, and neither here nor in Ireland should a syllable fall from him to palliate those crimes. The Government, however, anticipated agrarian crimes, and accordingly they brought in a remedial measure. The House of Lords spurned that measure, and the Government capitulated. If they believed in the necessity for that measure, could they be surprised that agrarian disorder broke out? The Government knew the root and source of crime, and they knew that if they would but stop the cruel origin of this agrarian crime there would be no need of a Coercion Bill. If the water-tap of a man's house was pouring a flood into his rooms destructive to his furniture, and he endeavoured to sweep it up, would you not cry out—"You fool, first stop up the tap and then drain out the water?" That was exactly what they were doing here—they were endeavouring to deal with the flood of agrarian outrage without stopping the sources of its supply. As a matter of Constitutional liberty, it was a vicious practice to resort to a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act for mere police purposes—for the purpose of dealing with ordinary crime. In the old and noble theory of their Constitution, all writers upon their liberties declared that there were two, and only two, great emergencies which had been held to justify Government in suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, which were imminence of foreign invasion or domestic insurrection. It was reserved for a Liberal Government—a strong Liberal Government—returned in 1868 by the votes of Irishmen in a large degree, to propose a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act for ordinary crime. He knew there were men who thought that, provided they had a vigilant public opinion in Ireland, it did not matter if the Habeas Corpus Act were altogether suspended in Ireland. He knew there were some who would hail that sentiment as, again, there were those who told them they might altogether do away with trial by jury, as that none but the criminal classes would have reason to fear the change, and that a Judge could try a case better than a jury, where the obstinacy of one man might lead to a miscarriage of justice. Just so; but in the same way it might be said that a Council of 60 or 70 Members appointed by the Queen could do all the Business of the country better and in shorter time—of course, with less talk—than the two Houses of Parliament could. All these proposals, fatal as they were to public liberty, would find hon. Members in that House to support them; and he must confess he was the other night surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster say there was no harm in a despotism if those who wielded it were kindly disposed. A doctrine like that might be agreeable to a Metternich or a Bourbon; but when the right hon. Gentleman used it to stab liberty one might well cry out, "*Et tu Brute.*" That, however, was a doctrine not always held by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. On referring to *Hansard*, he found that when the Habeas Corpus Act was about to be suspended in 1866, at a time when genuine peril of domestic insurrection menaced the authority of the Crown, the Minister who proposed the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was able to put upon the table a copy of the letter of the chief conspirator, announcing that the flag of the Irish Republic would float in the Irish skies that year. If ever there was an emergency which might have justified a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, it was in 1866; and yet what did the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster say of the proposal to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act under the terrible circumstances of 1866? He said—

> "The Secretary of State, on the part of the Government, of which he is a Member, has called us together on an unusual day, and at an unusual hour, to consider a proposition of the greatest magnitude, and which, we are informed, is one of extreme emergency. If it be so I hope it will not be understood that we are here merely to carry out the behests of the Administration. . . . It is now more than 22 years since I was first permitted to take my seat in this House. During that time I have on many occasions, with great favour, been allowed to address it; but I declare that during the whole of that period I have never risen to speak here under so strong a feeling, as a Member of this House, of shame and humiliation, as that by which I feel myself oppressed at this moment." —[3 *Hansard*, clxxxi. 686-7.]

The right hon. Gentleman was ashamed and humiliated at being asked to vote for a Coercion Bill, and even refused to do so, though armed insurrection was menacing the Queen's authority in Ireland; and yet he came there that evening to advocate the suspension of the liberties of the people of Ireland without one-tenth of the same provocation. The right hon. Gentleman might say there was a difference between the two occasions. He might say this was accompanied by remedial legislation, and that was not. How did he know that this Bill would be accompanied by remedial legislation? The Bill they were now passing every Tory in the House would heartily aid them in carrying through, and the House of Lords would receive it with open arms and pass it in one hour if they let them; but they well knew that any measure of remedial legislation, even if it passed that House, would be rejected in the Upper Chamber. The reformed Parliament of 1833 passed a Coercion Bill, on the promise that it was to be followed by a remedial measure; but the promise was not kept. What justification was there for the violence which hon. Members were now doing to their feelings rather than their consciences? Was it the Returns of crime? He denied entirely the Constitutional propriety or wisdom of dealing with these police matters by a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. At the time of the Reform agitation the King of England was hooted in the streets, and ducal palaces were burnt; but the Habeas Corpus Act was not suspended. Nottingham Castle, which then belonged to the Duke of Newcastle, was burnt to the ground, and from the hill on which it stood could be seen the blazing homes of several landed proprietors. But even Lord Eldon shrank from attempting to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act. It was said that the crimes in Ireland were exceptional—they were agrarian. But if a particular crime arose from a particular system of law, the Government, knowing the source of the evil, should first of all deal with the cause. The majority of the crimes in Ireland were undetected. How was the non-detection of crime of a particular class to be a justification for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act? That measure had not been proposed for England when it was said that there was a vast amount of undetected infanticide; nor, again, when there was an outbreak of ferocious brutality. So one measure was applied on the Irish side of the Channel and another on the English. But how would the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act facilitate the discovery of crime, enable the police to see round their corners, or discover who fired a shot in their absence? The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, in the course of his speech the other night, said that the authorities in Ireland knew perfectly well who the persons were who were guilty of agrarian offences. If this was so, why did not the Irish Executive proceed under the forms of the ordinary law, which they could easily do? That this course was not adopted was, perhaps, due to the fact that the law of the land had not as yet enabled the Government to do its will against the people of Ireland. They had instituted proceedings in the highest Common Law Court in Ireland against certain persons, and those proceedings had broken down in Court, the promoters having since put into the hands of the Prime Minister for quotation in that House passages in the speech of another gentleman, which they chose to ascribe to the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). He did not, of course, suggest for a moment that the right hon. Gentleman was conscious of the fact that he was putting the words of another speaker into the mouth of his hon. Friend; but he could not refrain from remarking on the fact, as showing how the Prime Minister had been misled by those who, more than anyone else, wished to coerce the Irish people. [Mr. Gladstone dissented.] As far as the prosecution of the Land League leaders was concerned, he wished the House to remember that the Crown prosecutors withdrew one of the counts of the indictment when they found that it was possible for the tenants to call evidence which would put their case in all its fulness and fairness before the Parliament and the people of England. There were 342 tenant farmers brought up from the 32 counties as witnesses; but the Solicitor General and his chief fled the field; they withdrew that count and sealed their lips in order to stifle the cry of the Irish tenantry from reaching the Parliament of England. The Land Leaguers were accused of using incendiary language. Strong language had been used. But 50 or 60 years hence, when the Correspondence of the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary came to be published, it would be found that they had used stronger language than ever was used on any Land League platform. In an exactly similar state of things as existed to-day, Lord Chesterfield, who was twice Viceroy of Ireland, and knew the state of Ireland well, used these words—

> "I see that you are in fear again of your Whiteboys, and have destroyed a good many of them; but I believe that if the military force had killed half as many landlords it would have contributed more efficiently to restore quiet."

There were before the minds of the English people two Land Leagues—a Land League of fiction, which aroused their anger and prejudices, and a Land League of fact. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said 20 years ago that if Ireland were removed far enough from England the landlords would be exterminated by the tenantry. That was not the language of the Land League. And who, he asked, were those who were terrified and alarmed in Ireland? Was it the banking classes? He appealed to the statement recently made by the

Chairman of the National Bank; he appealed to the Chairman of the Munster Bank, who sat opposite, in support of his assertion that in all England there were no banks safer or sounder than were the Irish banks? Well, was it the mercantile community? Only a few days since 120 commercial travellers, representatives of English houses, met in Dublin, and declared that the interests of their employers were safe and secure, and that debts were honestly and promptly paid. Were the professional classes scared? No. Were the clergy alarmed? No. Then he had to fall back on the largest class, and he took the 600,000 tenant farmers. Were they, he asked, the victims of disorganization? He fearlessly asserted that they were not. Well, then, was it the manufacturing class that was scared? Was it the shipping interest? Certainly not. The story of Her Majesty's Government, in fact, melted down to this—that of one class, numbering about 10,000, probably 2,000 were said to be in a state of alarm, while not a quarter of the 2,000 had any genuine cause of alarm. And yet the 500 counted for more in English social circles than did the 5,000,000 of Irish people beside. The reason was this—they were intermarried with the leading families of England; they had their representatives in English drawing-rooms, sisters-in-law, and cousins, and that small class was heard in England, while the great nation outside was unheard. His recent visit to Ireland had proved to him that the outrages recorded in the London Press were, in a great measure, without foundation. Out of a list of 22 cases which he had personally investigated, 14 he found had already been contradicted; but the stories had done their work. He knew, however, that time would bring a vindication and a justification to his country. The present was a moment of heavy trial for the Irish people; and for himself he could say that, while he was capable of making an effort, this Bill, the object of which was to fetter the liberty of his countrymen, would be resisted inch by inch. If the Government succeeded in suppressing the open Land League agitation, he knew who would come to the front in Ireland. That League had stood between the landlords and the tenantry during the past winter. The skies of Ireland would have been reddened by conflagrations during the past winter but for the Land League agitation, and he might go to the length of saying that he knew it had arrested the hand of the assassin. He knew it had arrested crime. Had it not been for the Land League, instead of six murders there would have been, as in 1848-9, 60 during the past winter. On the track of a great movement like that land agitation, just as on the track of a great army, there would be miserable camp-followers whose excesses would do much to stain the banners that went before. But no commander in the field and no political leaders could be held responsible for the acts of such persons. If the leaders of the League were arrested, and its organization put down, the landlords of Ireland would spring upon the wretched peasantry and take a terrible revenge for the terrors of the past 12 months, and the wreck of many a homestead would lead to increased outrage and crime. Another danger, almost as grievous, which he foresaw, was that the spirit of peace and reconciliation which had been growing up between the two countries, and which he and others on those Benches had of late years done their best to foster, would be wrecked by this message of war from the Treasury Bench. It would be the worst day's work for Ireland, and for England too, that had ever been brought about by the worst Tory Government since the days of Lord Castlereagh. The future was with the majority. As for the Irish Members—a handful— hey would be taunted with Obstruction; but that would not deter them from resisting coercion for their country, as English Members would resist it for their own. He recalled the words spoken by the Commons of England in a moment of terrible peril, when they were resisting even more powerful oppressors—

> "The prerogatives of Princes may easily, and do daily, grow; but the liberties of the people are at an everlasting stand. They may be by good Providence and care preserved; but, once lost, they are never recovered, save by struggle and sacrifice on the part of the nation."

Tuesday, 1*st February*, 1881.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons) simply took up the ground that remedial legislation ought to precede any measure of coercion, and that it would be more consistent with the nature—or rather, to paraphrase his words, the "good nature"—of Parliament to adopt that course. He did not deny for a moment that the discussion had taken a much wider range than usual upon the introduction of a Bill, and that many important issues had been raised. Personally, the standpoint he took up was a different one from that which had been occupied by most hon. Members who had taken part in the debate. He was an Irish landlord, and the greater part of his income—probably three-fourths of it—was derived from the receipt of rents from land. Like most Irish landlords, he found that from time to time he had something to complain of. He had a good deal to complain of in regard to the present year, and, perhaps, more in regard to last year. At the same time, he was able to aver solemnly to the House that he had had nothing to complain of which in the least degree amounted to panic. Although many unwise observations had been made in his hearing by Irish tenants and their friends, he believed that the opinion which they formed of the state of affairs in Ireland was, on the whole, more rational than the opinion formed by the House of Commons. He had often been told in Ireland, when he complained in his own way against certain of his friends for putting the case of the tenant too high, or attempting to make out an impossible case for them, that they had for their sustainment the sympathy of Her Majesty's Government. Long before the Government showed their hand in the matter of coercion, he had arrived at the opinion that it was extreme folly for some of the speakers at the local meetings of the Land League to have placed so strong a policy before the public. Since he entered the House of Commons—now 15 years ago—in almost every Session there had been some discussion npon the question of the Irish land, and a good deal had been done within that time to establish certain rights in favour of the tenantry, which were previously only local customs, and had no existence or place on the Statute Book or in the Irish legal system. But the experience of the tenant farmers of Ireland as to the agencies by which such reforms as they had already got had been accomplished, was that invariably they had been obtained in consequence of the manifestations made by people who had been driven for a time to excess. At the present moment they saw actual coercion placed in juxtaposition with a promise—but only a promise—of remedial legislation. As usual, the two went hand in hand together. Under these circumstances, he asked if there would have been any promise of effectual remedial legislation even now if it were not that the Land Leaguers had committed—if they chose to say so—excesses? Excesses of speech, however, were all that could be attributed to them; and it was a matter of extreme doubt to him (Sir Joseph M'Kenna), if the people had not been stimulated by these speeches, but had maintained themselves in the ordinary fashion duly submissive to the law, whether the remedial legislation they were promised would now be so near at hand. He, for one, certainly did not believe it. The unhappy experience of the people of Ireland was this—that if they were too chary about the legality of their acts nothing would be done for them. He was sorry to say this; but it was really the fact. Again, he would ask, in extenuation of their excesses of language, if the Irish people had not a perfect right to believe in the utterances of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), and in the speeches made from time to time, and especially in recent years, by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury? Those utterances contained a full concession that the people of Ireland were treated with injustice, that that injustice ought to be remedied, and that so far it had not been remedied, or only partially so. He asked how it was possible, when the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government told them that ejectments in Ireland meant, in their minds, death, that such a statement should not go directly home to the hearts of the Irish people? And if the assertion were true, would not the rude and ignorant peasant feel justified in coming to the conclusion that if ejectments meant death, they ought to be resisted unto death? Personally, he was not prepared to say that they should be resisted unto death; but he asked the House calmly to consider what effect strong language of sympathy like this must have on the minds of ignorant Irish peasants, and whether they were to be too much blamed, or blamed at all, for improving on the right hon.

Gentleman's language by their conduct? When he heard the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster rebuke his hon. Friend the Member for Tralee (The O'Donoghue) for some of the remarks he had made in the course of the present debate, his (Sir Joseph M'Kenna's) mind was insensibly carried back to a period of 14 years ago. In the month of October, 1866, the right hon. Gentleman was entertained at a banquet at Dublin, and the hon. Member for Tralee was chairman on the occasion. Very few of the utterances of the right hon. Gentleman were likely to receive censure from him (Sir Joseph M'Kenna). He admitted, as fully and as freely as the late Mr. John Martin, that in the course of the right hon. Gentleman's career nothing contemptuous and nothing unfriendly towards Ireland had ever fallen from the right hon. Gentleman's lips; but he was of opinion that the right hon. Gentleman viewed the case of Ireland from an entirely erroneous standpoint. At the Dublin banquet, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster delivered a speech which was precisely of such a character as might have been delivered by any well-wishing English Member at the present day. It was, he thought, before the right hon. Gentleman joined any Ministry, and when he was less trammelled by Party ties. The right hon. Gentleman stated that just 500 years ago, at the Parliament of Kilkenny, a question was raised how it came to pass that the King was never the richer for his Kingdom of Ireland? and the right hon. Gentleman further told his hearers that at that day —1866—precisely the same question might be asked. He went on, in his own impassioned and eloquent language, to point to various transactions and passages of Irish history which struck most forcibly upon Irish ears and Irish hearts; but he (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) would offer this opinion—that it did not become Englishmen, and men in high office, to express sympathy with the Irish people very much in advance of what they were prepared to do. Upon that occasion the right hon. Gentleman said enough, as he had also done on many other occasions, to justify —if not expressly, inferentially to justify—revolution in Ireland, if it were a feasible thing to accomplish. A great change appeared to have come over the right hon. Gentleman. He now drew nice distinctions. He admitted that in the past that the Irish people were bound by unequal laws; that the whole policy of England had been adverse to Ireland; that the Land Laws of Ireland were in a most unsatisfactory condition, and that remedial legislation was needed; but, notwithstanding all those admissions, he turned round when the conduct of the people was brought under consideration, and because, in isolated instances, acts of violence had been committed, he called upon the House of Commons to come to the conclusion that because 2,500 cases of crime, or supposed crime, including threatening letters, had occurred, 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of people ought to be deprived of their rights and freedom. What was it but doing away with protection to life and property in Ireland, if any single individual was to be entrusted with supreme power over their personal liberty? By the Bill which the Government sought to introduce, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, or the Chief Secretary, was to be empowered to send into gaol any man who was merely suspected of entertaining seditious and treasonable views, and keep him there for 20 months without trial. And the Chief Secretary or Lord Lieutenant would be able to do this for any offence alleged or suspected to have been committed before, as well as after, the passing of the Act. He knew of nothing more contrary to all the principles upon which British liberty was established, and upon which Irish liberty ought also to be established. [" Divide!"] It was unnecessary for hon. Members to cry out "Divide!" so peremptorily. The question now before the House and the country was not that which was before the country 14 years ago, and was not the question mooted in the Parliament of Kilkenny—How the King was never the richer for Ireland?—but the question for consideration, both in Ireland and here was, How was it that Ireland was the poorer? That was the real question they had to deal with now. He contended that Ireland was the poorer because of the unjust legislation of England; and he, therefore, opposed the introduction of the Bill until a measure of remedial legislation was placed before the House such as would tend to put an end to the present state of things. On a recent occasion the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) stated that the vital question was one of

£4,000,000 or £5,000,000 a-year. That was so, or very nearly; at any rate, it was proved to be a question of some £3,000,000. At present the landlords derived an income from the land of Ireland which amounted to about £3,000,000 a-year more than was estimated under Griffith's valuation in 1852. It might be asked why this should not be the case, seeing that the price of produce had gone up considerably since 1852, and why should not rents go up equally with them? [Mr. WARTON: Hear, hear!] The hon. and learned Member said "Hear, hear!" He (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) put the question very plainly. The proposition was this, Why should not rents also go up? [Mr. WARTON: Question!] That was the Question—Why should rents not go up along with the value of produce? The answer was, that between 1852 and 1870 there had been not only an increase of £3,000,000 in the rents of the Irish proprietors, but more than £3,000,000 annual burden had been placed upon Ireland in the shape of increased taxation. The case of Ireland would never be fairly settled, nor justice done to the Irish landlords as well as the tenants, until Parliament was prepared to indemnify the landlords for consenting to part with some of their existing rights. He desired to be plainly understood. He had no interest in the matter, except as an Irish landlord, apart from the feeling of patriotism which animated him as an Irishman; and he boldly asserted that it was impossible for Parliament to do justice to the Irish landlords and tenants without the Ministry coming down to the House of Commons and asking for a Vote of money. Passing from that subject, he was prepared to admit that Griffith's valuation could not be held to represent the present value of Irish land. It was quite true that in 1850 the instructions issued by Sir Richard Griffith were consistent with the valuation they had placed upon the land at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now discussing the details of a Land Bill which is not before the House. He must confine himself to the Question before the House.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he would endeavour to keep himself strictly to the Question before the House. He had been endeavouring to put hon. Members right with respect to something which had passed in the course of the debate that evening. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Meath (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) had referred to the question of Griffith's valuation, and had made a point of the matter; but if he (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) was irregular, he would not refer to the subject further. In the main he agreed with the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Meath; and when Mr. Speaker permitted his hon. Friend to say certain things in the course of the discussion, he had assumed that he (Sir Joseph M'Kenna), without any great violation of Order, would have been permitted to say how far he agreed with and how far he took exception to the views of his hon. Friend. He had nothing more to say on that head, and would now simply address himself to the Question before the House, which was, Whether remedial legislation ought to precede, or ought to follow, coercive legislation? The position taken up by his hon. Friend the Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons) was that it ought to precede coercive legislation, and many hon. Members who sat upon the Benches below the Gangway on each side of the House entertained the same opinion. Personally, he was anxious to clear himself from all responsibility for coercion in any shape. He believed that coercion would have been quite unnecessary if the Government, six months ago, had shadowed forth their Land Bill, even if it went far short of providing full justice to the Irish tenants. If the Government had intimated their readiness to bring in such a Bill, and endeavoured to carry it through Parliament, while at the same time they would strictly punish agrarian crime, there would have been no necessity for any such measure of coercion, nor would the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary have been able to lay before the House the long catalogue of criminal offences which he had submitted.

MR. DAWSON remarked, that, in obedience to the advice of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of Her Majesty's Government, he proposed to sift the facts which had been laid before the House by the Chief Secretary. He was sure that in respectfully following the advice of so eminent a statesman the House would give him a patient hearing, and he promised that he would endeavour to confine his remarks to the Question before the House. He also ventured to address the observations he was about to make to the House in obedience to a higher call than even the instructions of the Prime Minister—namely, from a sense of duty to the constituents who had sent him there for the important purpose of preserving the liberties of his country. In most of the addresses which had been delivered, the facts of the case and the figures had been studiously ignored. They had only been dwelt upon by the right hon. Gentleman who moved the introduction of the Bill and the right hon. Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland. The figures adduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary—bare and ridiculous as they were—were totally insufficient to establish the case of the Government—nevertheless, the right hon. Gentleman found it necessary in common decency to submit some figures, and the Solicitor General for Ireland found it an easy task to reiterate the statements of his Colleague. But in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, and in the statement of every hon. Gentlemen who followed him except the hon. Member for Stoke, no attempt was made to deal either with facts or figures. If they were to suppress the Constitution of Ireland and to deprive the Irish people of their rights, liberties, and freedom, there ought to be some better justification for their action than the anonymous letters which had been quoted *ad nauseam*. If they were to be the groundwork of the suspension of the liberty of Ireland, he was not prepared to deny that Her Majesty's Government might not have made out a case; but he did not think the House should be led away either by newspaper statements or anonymous letters. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster told the House that it was the letters which he had received which induced him to leave the path he had hitherto travelled and support a policy of coercion. He (Mr. Dawson) wished to show what the real character of these anonymous letters was; and he could not do so better than to refer to the instance of an hon. Member who represented an Irish constituency (Mr. Tottenham). A false report was inserted in *The Dublin Daily Express*, a Tory journal, of a speech the hon. Member for Leitrim was alleged to have delivered in Lancashire, and the hon. Member wrote to *The Daily Express* to contradict it. He (Mr. Dawson) would ask the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government to give him his attention while he read the letter. His object was to show the right hon. Gentleman that no reliance was to be placed either upon anonymous letters or many of the statements contained in the Irish papers. The letter of the hon. Member for Letrim was written to the editor of *The Freeman's Journal*, and was as follows:—

"Carlton Club, Pall Mall, S.W., Jan. 7th.

"SIR,—My attention has been called to a letter in *The Freeman* of some days back from the Rev. John Maguire, written apparently in consequence of a false report in some of the newspapers of what I said at a meeting at Southport, in Lancashire, on 29th ultimo. I beg to inform you that on the 30th I addressed a letter to the editor of *The Daily Express* denying the accuracy of the report, in as nearly as I can recollect the words of enclosed copy from memory. As you have given publicity to the same report, and also to the Rev. John Maguire's letter, I shall feel obliged if you will give this letter and the copy of letter to *The Daily Express* also a place in your paper. I may also add that on the 2nd inst., finding no correction had been inserted in *The Express*, I telegraphed to the editor asking him to publish my letter, but my request was not complied with.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"A. LOFTUS TOTTENHAM."

This was the letter written by the hon. Member to *The Daily Express*, which published the inaccuracy, and which *The Daily Express*, which gave the inaccurate report of the meeting at Southport, refused to publish—

"Carlton Club, Pall Mall, S.W.,
"Dec. 30th, 1880.

"SIR,—In a short report of the proceedings at a meeting at Southport yesterday, which appears in *The Daily Express* of to-day, I am reported to have said that 'I was obliged to leave the country and bring my wife and children to England for protection.' I beg to inform you that I said nothing of the kind. In a recent paragraph based upon a letter to *The Times*, written by my brother, you describe him as a magistrate and resident landlord, and as being of Glenfarne, though his own letter begins by saying he is neither one or other, and gives his correct address. If such matters are worth reporting at all surely they should be reported correctly, as such mistakes lead to very unpleasant misapprehensions. — I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"A. LOFTUS TOTTENHAM."

That letter was suppressed, notwithstanding the fact that the falsehood was freely circulated. But there was another circumstance in the matter which must not be lost sight of. The editor of *The Daily Express* was the correspondent of the leading paper in the Kingdom, and he it was who refused to correct the false statement to which he had given a wide circulation. The same gentleman was in the habit of supplying the great English journal with which he was connected with a column of Irish intelligence daily. The Chancellor of the Exchequer talked about Irish landlord refugees coming over to England for shelter. At a large meeting the other day, the hon. Member for the City of Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) made use of these expressions—

> "Now you have great sympathy with a few hundred landlords, but point out to me any sympathy which has been manifested for the hundreds and thousands and millions of Irish people who were expatriated from their homes in the Famine of 1846."

Although the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had now become the advocate of the few landlords, the hon. Member for Manchester reserved his sympathy for the thousands of Irish people who sought refuge in foreign climes from the unjust legislation which had thrust them from their homes. Frequent allusions had been made to a speech of the right hon. Gentleman in 1866, in which, referring to the Coercion Bill of that year, he said—

> "And it may be that those who sit here 18 years hence will find another Ministry and another Secretary of State ready to present you with a cup of the same overflowing and ever poisoning medicine."

The hand which now presented the overflowing and ever poisoning cup was the hand of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. He said, in the same speech, that the majority of the people would wish that the Island were unmoored from its fastenings in the deep. There was as much truth in this now as there was at the time it was spoken, for when the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman was considered it would seem to sever the last chain which bound Ireland to this country. The right hon. Gentleman had abandoned figures. But the Prime Minister examined them, and made the extraordinary statement that outrages had increased during the last three months of the year in exact ratio with the Land League meetings. But the right hon. Gentleman never told the House what those outrages were. They consisted not of malicious firing at persons, murders, or any of the most serious crimes. The crimes which had increased were the sending of threatening letters, which numbered 1,000 out of the crimes reported. Was it, he asked, candid or ingenuous on the part of right hon. Gentlemen to put before the House the statement that crime had increased, when they knew that the only increase had taken place in the offence of sending threatening letters, which could be written by hundreds in response to the orders sent down for their production? He asked hon. Members to bear in mind that the pith of the right hon. Gentleman's statement was that crime increased with the increase of the Land League meetings, and that the fact that threatening letters only increased altogether deprived his statement of efficiency. They had been told that the members of the Land League, without any reserve, and even without using the word "unjust," condemned the tenants and others who went into the occupation of farms from which a person had been evicted. But that doctrine of the Land League had also been advanced during the Anti-Corn Law agitation, at which time the right hon. Gentleman now the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said—

> "When a farmer failed they scarcely ever saw his name in *The Gazette*; that the people who made the Corn Laws also made a new law, which was that everything payable to landlords must be paid first. The farmer might migrate; he might take a wayside public-house or become a labourer, while the consequence was there were 20 others ready to step into his shoes and pay more rent than he had given. The man who did so might struggle on, but only until he also went down into the vortex."

That, he submitted, was the very argument of the Land League. They had no need to propose violence; but they had told the Irish farmer, as the right hon. Gentleman had told the English farmer, that when they took farms upon which others had failed to pay a rent beyond their scope, they only went into a vortex in which they were sure to be engulphed. Again, some of the so-called poetry published at the time of the Anti-Corn Law agitation contained suggestions even of assassination, which had certainly never appeared in any literature connected with the Land League. He now came to the tatement of facts and figures on which it was proposed to base this extraordinary demand for coercive legislation. He would not deny that there were crimes in Ireland, or that there existed there a vast deal of excitement; but the Statement laid upon the Table of the House, though it contained an account of crime, and showed that there was excitement, did not, in his opinion, establish a sufficient case upon which to base the measure proposed by Her Majesty's Government that struck at the liberties and Constitutional privileges of the Irish people. As he had pointed out, there was an increase as regarded threatening letters; but it had been shown that these could not rightly be relied upon, for they were produced in an extraordinary manner. Again, the Prime Minister had made a great point of the numbers of crimes which escaped detection, saying that there had been one conviction for 33 crimes; but did not the right hon. Gentleman know that one man could write 100 threatening letters, and that this would account for the small proportion of convictions? When the contrary was shown, the right hon. Gentleman could then fix upon Ireland the charge that only one criminal out of 33 was convicted. With regard to malicious fires, it was well known that many of the claims for insurance money were contested in this country, and in the North of Ireland also, on the ground that the fires were malicious and had been caused for the purpose of getting the money insured for; and in 1847 an Act was passed to give compensation for malicious injuries of the kind. Now, in 1847 there were 100 incendiary fires; in 1848 there were 201; in 1849 there were 238; while in the year 1859 they rose to 311, and that at a time when there was certainly no Land League. Those incendiary fires followed in the track of those distresses which always brought about and created them. He entirely denied that the increase of crime alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman could be traced except by a strange process of reasoning to the meetings of the Land League. Having shown that crime had not increased, that its increase was imaginary and its sources disputable, he would now show that there had been a decrease of crime for the year 1880 as compared with the year 1845. In that year there were 18 agrarian murders committed, while in 1880 the number was 8. In the former year the cases of firing at the person numbered 46, while in 1880 the cases were 24, or a decrease of 22. Could hon. Members, in the face of Europe, vote away the liberties of the Irish people upon such figures as these? Again, it had been stated that the Queen's Writ did not run in Ireland; but how many cases were there to prove that assertion? There had been but 17 cases during the whole year of resistance to legal process, while the number of similar cases in the year 1845 was 19. One of the cases which occurred in 1880 was that of Mr. Fitzgerald; but it would be seen that legal proceedings were all sufficient in that case and that punishment followed, and not only was the law vindicated and the criminals punished, but so untenable was the position of the landlord and so unjust the rent, that the tenants were restored by the landlord after some consultation, the arrears were wiped out, and the rent reduced. The charge, therefore, under this head had not been sustained. Then he came to another mode in which the vindication of the law was sometimes prevented—namely, that of rescuing prisoners; and it was but true that a criminal could not be arrested but some officious clown was ready to attempt his rescue from the hands of justice. But in 32 counties of Ireland, in a population of 5,000,000, in a time of great excitement and great injustice, hon. Members would learn that there had been only two persons whose rescue was attempted amongst the people whom Her Majesty's Government were about to abandon to the level of the blackest slaves that had the sympathies of Englishmen in the most distant climes. He had stated that the crimes reported in the Papers before the House were not agrarian; and the other day he had been much struck, in perusing the Judicial Statistics of Ireland, to find that for 10 years Dr. Hancock had ceased to discriminate in the Official Returns between agrarian and non-agrarian crimes. When, also, those Papers were read before the Statistical Society in Ireland, he said that most of the crimes which occurred were attributable to the social condition of the people—their differences, being of a different character to those which existed among the same class in England, had to be settled by the ready justice of family quarrels. They proceeded from their difficulty of getting relief from the Poor Law Board, which differed in Ireland from its operation in England, where relief could be given even when the person was in occupation. In Ireland, however, be a man's circumstances never so bad he could not get relief to the extent of one shilling while in occupation. On page 86 they had another case of murder. In that case a dispute arose between two persons, who were relatives, about the ownership of a field. They were told that one man fired a shot from a fowling-piece and murdered the other. Then they had the result of legal proceedings. The offender pleaded guilty at Omagh Assizes to the charge of manslaughter. The Court took manslaughter as being the real count, and sentenced the man to 17 years' penal servitude; and yet the compilers of that Blue Book had the audacity to put that case among the murders alleged to have occurred in Ireland. Another case was one where a man pleaded guilty to a common assault, and was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment. It was most unfair that charges such as these should be introduced into the indictment against their country. Here was another case of injury, where a person was killed by his step-brother. Each had a farm that belonged to their father. They lived on bad terms, and one sent to the other warning him not to trespass on his land. As he took no notice of the warning, he was shot at and killed. The verdict was manslaughter, and the prisoner was sentenced to two years' penal servitude. The law was vindicated, and an adequate punishment was given; and yet, notwithstanding, that case was included in the list of murders. It was not a case of agrarian crime; it was unconnected with any relation between landlord and tenant; and yet it was retained in that extraordinary document of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. He would now give them a case of aggravated assault. A woman named Norah Green, who had held a field for five years, was compelled to give up possession on the 14th January. She, however, persisted in retaining the field and keeping her cattle in it. That led to an aggravated assault. He looked with horror upon the mutilation of dumb animals as much as anyone else did in that House; but there were only 10 cases of that kind of crime during a period of 12 months, among 5,000,000 of people, and in 32 counties. He ventured to say that three out of four of the cases quoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary would be found to contain false accusations against the people of their country. The majority of those cases were not agrarian crimes at all, but arose out of family quarrels. In the case he had before him the law was vindicated, the case was proved, and the offender was sentenced to two months' imprisonment with hard labour. It was idle to dwell upon such alleged cases of crime as some were. For instance, two women had a row and fell out, and hurt each other. That was put down as injury to the person. There was nothing to show that the case had any connection with the ownership of a field, and it was monstrous that such cases should be quoted as reasons why the Government should, in the face of Europe, say that the Constitutional liberties of the Irish people could be dispensed with. He wished to call the attention of the House to the maiming of cattle referred to on page 63. There, the case was as follows:—One James Draper had some sheep, one of which fell into a drain. Mr. constable, one of the men who would be responsible for the passing of that awful measure then before the House, found the sheep in the drain. He immediately concluded that it had been put there by some evil-disposed person. On page 101 there was a case of the maiming of two horses. In fact, some hairs had been pulled out of their tails, and that was put down as an instance of maiming of cattle upon which they were asked to pass that measure. It was trifling. Another case of outrage was where a landlord had made himself obnoxious to his tenants, and a wooden gate of his was broken with a large stone. He was almost ashamed to detain the House by reading documents so trifling and unworthy of their attention. With the exception of a few cases mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in his speech, there was nothing at all like outrage in the

Blue Book he had then in his hand. Another instance was one in which some turf, of the value of 10*d.*, had been scattered about on the ground. That was believed to have been done by a tenant with whom the landlord had had a quarrel. The Government had no case whatever for deliberately bringing that awful act of vengeance upon the people; there was not even the shadow of a shade of any reason or justice in such a proceeding. But they were told that they would be quite safe if that measure were brought in, for it would be used with great discretion. He could only say that he pitied the English Nobleman whose duty it was to hold the Office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He remembered that Lord Cornwallis, when he held that Office, wrote that he was disgusted at having to invite people to dine with him in order that he might hear what they would say and make use of their words in order to betray them. The present Chief Secretary for Ireland and Lord Cowper must feel the same disgust at having to do such an act as that. But, further, in whose hands was that discretion to be placed in the administration of that measure? Was it to be those of the Chief Secretary? It was not. It was to be placed in the hands of the police. They were told that many of these inspectors of police were graduates in arts. He believed that some of them had graduated in infamy. In 1844, in County Tipperary, there was a very vigilant sub-inspector. He was an officer who had got many persons convicted for concealing arms and having Ribbon documents in their possession. So successful was he that the grand jury of the county presented him with an ornamented sword. It was afterwards found out by accident that this officer and his myrmidons had been putting the arms and those Ribbon documents into the houses of the people. The matter was brought before that House, and an investigation took place, the result of which was that the inspector was expelled from the force. He contended that, under the proposed measure, there would be no safety for the lives and liberties of the Irish people, for crime would be committed by the officers of the law and the Irish people would be punished for it. He had just received a letter which would support that statement. It was from Templemore, and ran as follows:—

"Dear Sir,—One night, about 7 o'clock, a window of my house was broken in. I can prove that the police were seen going towards the house within half-an-hour of the time the act was committed. I reported the matter to the inspector, but no notice was taken of it. On the same night that the window was broken, a poor man living here, going out to the place where his donkey was kept, found a policeman in the house. When asked why he was there he was unable to give any excuse. There is no doubt in my mind as to who are responsible for such outrages as knocking down hay-cocks, removing loads from carts, and other acts of a similar nature.

Signed, EDWARD BURN."

From 1844 to 1880, and from 1880 to the close of that system, they would find that there were always persons who were ready to swear away the lives of the Irish people. He thought the admission of the Chief Secretary, in his speech, was a more powerful argument in their favour than all those he had used. The right hon. Gentleman acknowledged himself, when referring to those outrages, that they had, perhaps, been somewhat magnified, and that they were the result of evil laws. Was it just, then, for Parliament to punish the people for falling into the trap that same Parliament had laid for them? It was frankly admitted that the present state of affairs was due to the existence of evil laws; and yet they were then asked to punish the people of Ireland before any steps whatever were taken to remedy the evils from which that people suffered. Looking upon evictions as sentences of death—and as such they were described in eloquent words by the Prime Minister—instead of condemning the Irish people for what they had done, they should consider it slight and trivial under the circumstances, and feel surprised at the resignation and patience which had been manifested. He could not describe what that resignation and patience had been and was.

"Who made the heart? 'tis He alone
Decidedly can try us;
He knows each chord, its various tone,
Each string its various bias.
Then at the balance let's be mute,
We never can adjust it;
What's done we scarcely can compute,
But know not what's resisted."

He would ask the Government to do what they did last year. They brought in a measure of justice, and they dropped that measure. They had now brought in a measure of injustice; let them drop that. It was introduced to the House, as the Prime Minister had confessed, with dismay; it would be carried in the face of Europe with discredit, and would be executed in Ireland with disaster.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Gabbett.*)

Mr. GLADSTONE: I beg to say, on the part of the Government, that we propose to resist that Motion.

Major NOLAN regretted that neither the hon. Member who proposed the adjournment, nor the Prime Minister, had thought it right to refer to, or seemed to forget, a little incident which must be in the recollection of the House. On Saturday morning the Bill was circulated amongst hon. Members. The House was supposed to have no cognizance of it, yet it was distributed. It had transpired that the circulation of the measure was an entire mistake, and hon. Members were informed that they ought to shut it out from their recollection. But they could not "shut it out from their recollection," and it was, and must remain, known to the House. The whole current of the debate had been changed by the production of the Bill. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members might cry "Oh!" but surely they would not say that they would debate a Bill, the provisions of which they were acquainted with, in the same way that they would debate a measure the provisions of which they were ignorant of? If hon. Members could reply that they would debate both in the same manner, his argument would fall to the ground; but he denied that they could make that answer, and he would say that the mere fact of their knowing in a definite manner what were the precise provisions of the Bill must have a considerable effect upon their minds, particularly when they considered the enormous importance of the measure with which they were dealing—a measure to suspend the Constitutional liberties of the people of Ireland. If the Government would take into consideration the fact that hon. Members were now, for the first time in their lives, on the Motion for its introduction, debating a Bill with the clauses of which they were familiar, he was sure they would agree that not one more, but probably two or three more nights, should be given up to the discussion. He did not think the Bill had improved, now that he had seen it; on the contrary, he thought it was a somewhat worse measure than the one the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland in his opening speech sketched out. He had thought the right hon. Gentleman's statement a candid one, although he had been long enough a Member of the House to know that a Bill as seen in the opening speech of its chief advocate on the Motion for its introduction, was a very different thing to the Bill as brought in and laid upon the Table. This, in fact, had become a maxim in the House. It must be admitted that the Irish Members would now debate the Bill in a different manner to what they had intended; therefore, the Government ought to concede to them a little more time, and he trusted to hear a somewhat more favourable reply to these appeals than had been made on former occasions.

Mr. DILLON said, the hon. Member who had just spoken had pointed out that the current of the debate had changed in consequence of the Bill having, through inadvertence, been published to Members since the last evening of the debate. He (Mr. Dillon) desired to point out also that the character of the debate had changed in consequence of the total change in the position of the Government, as shown by the speech of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman, with regard to the policy of the working of the measure in Ireland, contradicted in almost every sentence the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and had therefore, by his utterances, entirely altered the character of the debate. There were several statements in the speech of the Prime Minister which, before the Bill was allowed to go to another stage, the Government ought to be distinctly pledged to. They were very important statements; and, however much the right hon. Gentleman made them in good faith, he believed the Government of Ireland would go behind every one of them. The Prime Minister had stated that if the Bill passed its provisions would not be used to put down the members of a certain organization in Ireland; but the Chief Secretary for Ireland had said that they would be used for that purpose. From the point of view of the Irish Members, this was an essential consideration in decision of the attitude they were to take in regard to the measure. He should like very much to know whether they were to believe the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, or whether they were to believe the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, as to the purpose the Bill was to be used for in Ireland. He would repeat that the debate had assumed a new character from the speech of the Prime Minister, and he, for one, thought the Government were not treating them fairly in not allowing another night to debate the question. Before he sat down, he would say that to his mind a most unjust and indecent pressure had been put on some English Members who were going to speak for Ireland to-night, to prevent them from raising their voices. He was sure there was truth in the statement that such pressure had been exercised, because he knew several English Members who had intended to speak against the Bill, but had not done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman must address himself to the Question before the House. The observations he is now making have no relevancy to the Question.

Mr. DILLON said, that, in conclusion, he would merely say the announcement made at the beginning of the debate by the Prime Minister, that it should close this evening, had a very unfair effect in prejudicing the opposition of the Irish Members, and preventing English Members from giving them that assistance which they had a right to expect.

Mr. PARNELL doubted whether the Prime Minister was well advised in adopting his present course for the purpose of saving the time of the House, because, so far as he (Mr. Parnell) himself was concerned, he did not think it would result in the saving of any time whatever. If they were to have another night's debate, those hon. Members who wished to speak on the Question before a division was taken would, no doubt, have sufficient opportunity for doing so. He himself had not yet spoken on this matter. Of course, he did not put that forward as a matter of any great importance; but he should have liked to have had an opportunity of alluding to some passages in the speech of the Prime Minister, more particularly to a charge the right hon. Gentleman had made against him, and to a speech which the right hon. Gentleman had put into his mouth—a speech which was delivered by another person. The House, at the time the Prime Minister put this speech into his mouth, did not desire him to interrupt with an explanation. He had desired to do so; but the House had in a most distinct and emphatic manner refused to grant him permission whilst the Prime Minister was speaking. The matter was of some slight importance, because the Prime Minister was at the time endeavouring to prove that he (Mr. Parnell) could be justly convicted under the provisions of the proposed Bill, because he had made the speech in question—a speech really not made by him, but by another person. If the Prime Minister persisted in going on with the debate, he did not, as he had said, believe that time would be saved; and, moreover, he was sure that the dignity of Parliament would not be enhanced. The House heard a great deal about impediments placed in the way of Public Business. He should be very sorry, indeed, to place any impediment in the way of Public Business—["Oh, oh!"]—Perhaps hon. Members who signified their dissent in the articulate fashion that was sometimes customary in that House would kindly inform him on what occasion he had ever placed any impediment in the way of the transaction of Business by the present Government? He admitted that, with the exception of the present measure, the measures to be introduced by the Government would be for the advancement of liberty and the amelioration of the suffering classes in Ireland, and he should be very sorry to stand in the way of measures of that kind. He would repeat that he had never, at any time, stood in the way of the Business of the present Government. Well, shortly, the situation seemed to be this. If they were kept up all to-night and all to-morrow and all to-morrow-night, they would not be so far advanced in the end as they would have been if they had been allowed to continue the debate in its ordinary course to-morrow, for in all probability they would have come to a division to-morrow night. The passions on both sides of the House would have been roused, and the compromise, now possible, would have been rendered impossible. He regretted exceedingly that the House was placed in this position. It was very easy, he knew, for the Government to get up a shout of "Obstruction!" Nothing was easier; but if he were in the position of the Government, he should be ashamed of pandering to such a manifestly unjust accusation. But, of course, the shout of "Obstruction!" having been got up, the path of this Bill would be proportionately smoothed, and the Government would be enabled with greater ease to ride roughshod over the opposition, and still further deafen the ears of the people of this country to the voice of reason in the matter. He had ventured to urge on the Government that they should not go on with the Bill now; but, of course, if the Government insisted, the Irish Members would endeavour to fight the battle out as strongly as they could, and in this course they would be supported by the public opinion—["No, no!"]—he maintained that the Irish Members would be supported in this cause by the opinion of the majority of the people of Ireland. [An hon. Member: Of Ireland only.] An hon. Member said, "of Ireland only." Well, he (Mr. Parnell) estimated at much greater value the wishes of his constituents than he did those of the ill-informed persons who had sent the hon. Member interrupting him into the House. Although the Irish Members—or those who acted with him—were few in number, yet they had the consciousness, when they were now trying to do their duty, that they were endeavouring to stand up for a people who were worthy of all the poor exertions they could make for them. To his mind, it was a glorious task to attempt to defend their people. He believed the tide was near turning, and that this would be the last insult which would be offered to Ireland by a Liberal Government. The Government were to blame. They had turned their back on all their pledges and all their promises, although not all their traditions. It was, unfortunately, too true, that the present Prime Minister had been, perhaps, more identified with coercion than any other Minister in that House. In 1866, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, said he felt ashamed to be a Member of a Parliament which was called on to enact a Coercion Bill for Ireland; but, to-day, he was not only a Member of a Parliament, but Member of a Government, which came forward, when Ireland was at perfect peace, and endeavoured by getting up a shameless panic in England, by the spreading of unfounded rumours, by the manufacture of reports of outrages which had never taken place, and by every means which a powerful and unscrupulous Government had at its hands, to create a constituency for the reception of this measure—a measure which had not been equalled in severity since 1846. The House had taken four nights over the discussion of this first reading. In 1846, the first reading of the Coercion Bill which was then introduced occupied seven nights in its discussion. Why did the discussion of that stage of the Bill occupy such a period? It was because the Coercion Bill of that day was made the battle-ground of the rival English political Parties. The Tories introduced it, and the Whigs opposed it. It was unfortunate for Ireland that the Tories were not in Office to-day; they would not then have had this attempt to bring forward a measure of coercion of this kind, or if they had made the attempt, the Irish Members would have had the assistance of the united Whig and Radical Party. They would have heard, then, all those platitudes about the desire of the Liberal Party to pass equal laws for Ireland—that everything that was to be applied to Ireland should also be applied to England, and that there should be no difference between the treatment of the two countries—all the stock phrases that did the various Members of the present Liberal Cabinet such good service in the days when they were out of Office, but which were now forgotten, would be repeated for the confusion of Tory attempts at rising a cry of "Obstruction!" Unhappily, there was now a Liberal Government, and they had now the spectacle of two united Parties; but only united for one purpose—to crush, put down, and bully a poor, weak, and starving nation which they had not attempted to assist during years of famine and suffering. There were those two Parties united to coerce Ireland, and for nothing else. He did not know how long the debate was to last; but the duty of the Irish Members was to use every Form of the House in order to prevent the passage of that stage of the measure until they had had a fair opportunity of discussing it. He would call to mind some words spoken by the Prime Minister a long time since, which, perhaps, the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten. They were uttered during the passage through the House of the Divorce Bill; and it was a true saying which, perhaps, the Prime Minister had heard, that "curses, like chickens, came home to roost." The things people said in past times were often used against them. The right hon. Gentleman, perhaps, remembered his own conduct on that Bill, when he declared that he and the 40 Members with him would strain every Form of the House to defeat the Bill.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Give me the reference.

Mr. PARNELL said, he should be happy to give the reference; but did the right hon. Gentleman deny that?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I want the reference.

Mr. PARNELL resuming, said, the death of a relative of the right hon. Gentleman, and the adroitness of Lord Palmerston, only secured the passing of the Bill.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Are those my words?

Mr. PARNELL said, he had not quoted them as the words of the right hon. Gentleman, but as the substance of what he had said. Of course, if the right hon. Gentleman could deny the correctness of the quotation, he would be able to do so. Now, the Irish agitation had been contrasted very much with O'Connell's, and they had been told that if only they were like O'Connell, nobody would have anything to say against them. It was said to-day that O'Connell's agitation was Constitutional and orderly, while the present agitation was the reverse. But O'Connell was denounced just as they were to-day—in fact, much more so—and experience of Irish politics taught them that no Irishmen could conduct an agitation in Ireland without being denounced as murderers and ruffians. *The Edinburgh Review* had said—

> "The most common excuse of the 'great shabby' is that the Catholics are their own enemies; that the violence of Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Shiel have ruined their cause, and that but for their boisterous courses"—

precisely the same charges that were made against the present agitators—

> "The questions would have been carried before this time. The answer to this nonsense is that the very reverse is the case. The mild and the long-suffering may suffer for ever in this world. If the Catholics had stood with their hands before them, simpering at the Earls of Liverpool and Bathurst, they would not have been emancipated until the year of our Lord 4000. As long as the patient will suffer, the cruel will kick. No treason, no rebellion, but as much stubbornness and stoutness as the law permits; a thorough intimation that you know what is your due, and that you are determined to have it if you can—this is the conduct we recommend to the Irish. If they go on withholding and forbearing and hesitating whether this is the time for discussing or that is the time, they will be laughed at as fools for another century, and kicked for another as slaves. 'I must have my bill paid,' says the sturdy and irritated tradesman. 'Your master has put me off 20 times under different pretences. I know he is at home, and I will not quit the premises till I get my money.'"

An hon. Member: I rise to Order. Sir. I should like to know if this has anything to do with the case before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see the connection, and the remarks of the hon. Member seem to me to be irrelevant.

Mr. PARNELL, resuming, said, he had intended to point out the connection between his remarks and the Question when he had concluded the extracts; but he would do so at once. In the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and also in the speech of the Prime Minister, it had been repeatedly charged against the Land League that they had conducted their agitation in an improper manner. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster went so far as to say that if the Land League had conducted its agitation in a proper manner, he would have joined it and sent a subscription; and he was endeavouring to show by reference to history the analogy between O'Connell's agitation and the present agitation. Just as this agitation was said to be conducted improperly, so there were men who charged O'Connell with conducting his agitation in an improper manner. He would quote from Sydney Smith to show that there were men in those days who believed that O'Connell was right in the method and plan of his agitation, just as the present agitation was the only way in which to win this great cause. But he did not wish to persevere in reading the extract if Mr. Speaker should decide that it was not relevant. *The Edinburgh Review* continued—

> "Many a tradesman gets paid in this manner who would smirk and smile himself into *The Gazette* if he trusted to the promises of the great."

Every word of that, he thought, was singularly applicable to the present day. O'Connell was described as the most restless and reckless of demagogues in 1830. Sir Robert Peel thus spoke of him in 1841—

> "O'Connell came down to the House every night, increasing the difficulties of the Government of Lord Melbourne, and denouncing their measures by every calumnious expression which an imagination could invent."

But O'Connell himself told us how he was treated by English statesmen. He said—

> "I do not think I am guilty of the least vanity when I assert that no man ever made greater sacrifices to what he deemed the cause of his country than I have done. I care not how I may be ridiculed or maligned. I feel the proud consciousness that no public man has made more, or greater, or more ready sacrifices. Still there lingers behind one source of vexation and sorrow—one evil, perhaps, greater than any other—upon the gratitude of my countrymen. It consists in the bitter, the virulent, the mercenary and, therefore, the more envenomed hostility towards me, which my love for Ireland and for liberty has provoked. What taunts, what reproaches, what calumnies have I not sustained? What mode of abuse? What vituperation? What slanders have been exhausted against me? What vials of bitterness have been poured on my head? What coarseness of language has not been used, abused, and worn out in assailing me? What derogatory appellation has been spared? What treasures of malevolence have been expended? What follies have not been imputed? In fact, what crimes have I not been charged with?"

In those days no Irishman could enter on an agitation without being charged with every crime. In those days it was possible to direct public opinion with fatal force against any Irish agitation, no matter how Constitutionally carried on or properly conducted. But how was Mr. O'Connell's agitation carried on? What were the features of dissimilarity between the agitation of those days and that of ours? He quoted the following passage from the Duke of Wellington's letter to the King in 1827, with reference to O'Connell's trial. He said—

> "I do not suggest an impossible hypothesis to your Majesty, and I state the possibility—I might state it more strongly—of the Roman Catholic tenantry of the country refusing to pay tithes or rents. The clergy and the landlords might have recourse to the law. But how is the law to be enforced?"

MR. WARTON: I rise to Order. Has this anything to do with the adjournment of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is that the debate be adjourned. The hon. Member is speaking to that Question. He has not yet shown any reason why it should not be so adjourned, and I am bound to say that the House would be better pleased to hear some original observation. These long extracts do not seem to bear very strictly upon the Question.

MR. PARNELL thought he was speaking to the Question of adjournment when he said that Members ought to have full liberty of placing their case before the House. He was showing how easy it was to slander any Irish politician. The Duke of Wellington went on to say—

> "How can they distrain for rent or tithes upon millions of tenants? This measure, which will most probably be the first of resistance and rebellion in Ireland, will occasion the ruin of all your Majesty's loyal subjects residing in that country, and of many in this; and it must be observed that it will give the rebellion a vast resource of money of which your Majesty's loyal subjects will have been deprived."

But the right hon. Gentleman had accused the Irish Members in a speech which he put into his (Mr. Parnell's) mouth—a speech which was spoken by somebody else—of having incited to crimes of violence and to disturbance of the public peace; and, as a consequence, the right hon. Gentleman indicated him as one of the persons who ought to be imprisoned. Now, if he imitated the Prime Minister in certain speeches he had made in the House, and in the country upon the Irish question, he should have fallen, and justly fallen, under the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman. He had been very much struck by a speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman in Scotland in 1879——

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I must really put it to you, Sir, whether the observations of the hon. Member at the present moment have anything to do with the Question before us?

MR. O'DONNELL: I rise upon a point of Order, Sir, to point out that the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed you has interrupted the hon. Member who was addressing the House in the midst of a sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I invited the hon. Member for the City of Cork to speak more strictly to the Question, and I am bound to say that, in carrying on the observations he has been making and in reading so many extracts, he is really trying very severely the patience of the House.

Mr. PARNELL said, he would not for the world transgress the ruling of the Chair; but he was bound to say that he should have to try very severely the patience of the House in the course of the debate. He was not aware, however, that trying the patience of the House was a breach of Order, and it sometimes became necessary to do so. Personally, he should be very unwilling to do so; and if he was told by the Chair that he was not entitled to read the extract he was reading at the time, he should at once desist from doing so. His object was to show that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, delivered in Dalkeith, on the 24th of November, 1879—["Order!"]—was far more criminal—["Order!"]—and far more liable to censure than the speech which the right hon. Gentleman quoted from him (Mr. Parnell) on Friday night, and which the right hon. Gentleman intimated ought to include him within the scope of the Bill about to be introduced. The right hon. Gentleman intimated as plainly as he could, and gave the House to understand, in fact, that his (Mr. Parnell's) speech on a particular occasion was calculated to incite to a breach of the public peace. The point which he wished to establish now was simply this—["Question!"]—was simply this—["Question!"]——

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN: Two can play at that game.

Mr. PARNELL: The point he wished to establish was simply whether the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, delivered in Scotland, in November, 1879—["Question!"]——

Mr. R. N. FOWLER: I rise to Order. I wish to appeal to you, Sir, what the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister's speech at Dalkeith has to do with this debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork does not appear to understand clearly the Question before the House. The Question before the House is that the debate be now adjourned, and the hon. Member is, in speaking to that Question, entitled to refer to the Main Question, before the House in so far as it relates to the question whether this debate shall or shall not be adjourned. References to speeches which have been made at different times and not bearing upon the question, as I have pointed out to the hon. Member, are not in Order.

Mr. PARNELL continued: Of course, after the ruling of Mr. Speaker that a reference to the speech in question was not in Order, he should not think of pressing it for a single moment, and he should have desisted long ago if the Chair had distinctly expressed that opinion. He might state, as explanation, that his reason for making the reference to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was this—["Question!" "Order!"]—that the Irish Members were particularly upon their trial in that House. The Irish people were also upon their trial; and he considered—until he heard the ruling of Mr. Speaker—he considered he was entitled to show, by reference to the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government, and by a comparison between the right hon. Gentleman's speeches and those which he (Mr. Parnell) had delivered, the harmlessness of his own contrasted with the particular statements made by the Prime Minister. The speeches of the right hon. Gentleman were, of course, made at a time when he was not Prime Minister. ["Order!" *and* "Question!"] He would now leave the question of the Prime Minister's speeches, and merely say he believed that if he (Mr. Parnell) had uttered the sentences which he had been about to read from the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman in Scotland as his own, he would have been prosecuted. ["Question;" "Order!"]

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: I rise to Order. I understood you, Sir, to rule that the hon. Gentleman was to confine himself to the Question before the House, and that it was not in Order to refer to the speeches delivered by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government in Scotland. I put it to you, Sir, whether the hon. Member for the City of Cork is obeying the ruling of the Chair or not?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call upon the hon. Member to speak to the Question before the House, which is, that this debate be now adjourned. He is entitled to refer to the Main Question before the House in so far as it has any bearing on the Question that the debate be now adjourned.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, may I say a word upon this point of Order—[" Order ! "]—I wish briefly to submit to you——

MR. SPEAKER: I have been appealed to on a point of Order, and I have expressed my opinion upon that point of Order. Having done so, the hon. Member for the City of Cork is in possession of the House.

Mr. PARNELL resumed: The Irish Members asked for more time to conclude the debate, and they expressed the opinion that one night more would be sufficient. If the Prime Minister and the House refused to give them that one more night, it would be a sign that they did not desire the Irish Members to have that full and fair opportunity of discussing the question which they thought they were entitled to. He submitted to Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that the Irish Members were the best judges of the extent and nature of the resistance which they ought to make to this measure of coercion. If Her Majesty's Government continued to oppose the adjournment of the debate that night, they could not possibly save the day that the Irish Members desired to have for the purpose of full and fair discussion. He asked in the name of common sense, and common reason, what was the use of entering into the contest that the Government now proposed to enter into? What did they propose to gain by it? They would not save time. Did they think they would save the credit of their Assembly? Did they think when the Government was exhibited, as they must be exhibited, to the people of Ireland as a Government bent on forcing a policy of coercion down the throats of the Irish people in hot haste, and almost at the point of the bayonet, pressing it forward from day to day almost without allowing proper time for the inspection of the Returns which had been laid on the Table of the House, without waiting for the other Returns explaining the outrages during the months of November and December on which they based their entire case—did they think that such conduct would be looked on as fair or generous in Ireland? Did they expect that the reputation of that Assembly would be maintained as one desiring to hear both sides of the question before it pronounced its judgment; and did they suppose that public opinion, either in Ireland or in this country, would not support the Irish Members in the appeal to all the Forms of the House against the indecent haste with which the measure was being pressed forward?

DR. COMMINS remarked, that a few moments ago, when he heard the scornful laugh with which an appeal for fair play was met—[" Order !" " Question !" Divide ! "]—he would repeat that when he heard, a few moments ago, the scornful laugh with which the appeal for fair play from those Benches was received by the Liberal Benches opposite, when he heard the derisive cheers which greeted the appeal of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) for fair dealing in the matter, he could not help thinking that it had not been, and was not, a fair discussion that hon. Members wanted so much as they wanted to exercise upon the House a somewhat similar coercion to that which the promised Bill proposed to apply to the Irish people. It might be that the Constitutional liberties which they enjoyed there might be of as short duration as he feared the Constitutional liberty of Ireland would be; but while hon. Members did enjoy them, they were entitled to insist upon them, and insist upon them they would. He believed that one of the Constitutional privileges of a Member of that House was to express his opinions upon any subject that came before the House of Commons. That was not only a Constitutional privilege; but it was the bounden duty of a Member of that House to express his opinion upon a matter that vitally affected the freedom of his constituents. He should certainly like to express his opinion upon the Question that was before the House. There had been speeches made by the Prime Minister, by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis), which he should much like to comment upon. There had been other speeches that he had heard and read upon which he should also like to comment. He did not believe that the question was at all exhausted. He did not believe that the cause was decided because the Prime Minister had spoken. He did not believe that the cause was decided because the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had turned his back upon his lifetime, and professed upon this question opinions which he had been reprobating all his life. He did not believe that the cause was decided because the Representative of a small handful of people in the North of Ireland professed to speak for the majority, but which the hon. Member (Mr. Charles Lewis) no more represented than he (Dr. Commins) represented the Republic of France. He, therefore, contended that the question had been by no means argued out, and the people of Ireland and the people of England, too, would require it to be argued out. If, therefore, the slightest indecent haste was exhibited, if the slightest suspicion of endeavouring to burke discussion was aroused—["Divide!"]—he would pay no regard to the clamour of hon. Members and their inarticulate cries of "'Vide, 'vide!" He warned them that they would have to answer to the public opinion of their countrymen for their actions. There was a Court of Appeal beyond the floor of that House, and the seats of some hon. Members might not be as safe as they imagined if they persisted in this course of endeavouring to stifle discussion and put down the voice of Ireland. ["Question!"] He did not propose to take up a minute of the time of the House unnecessarily; but the clamour to which he was subjected would certainly not have the effect of inducing him to abridge by half-a-minute the remarks which he intended to make. ["Speak up!"] Hon. Members who cried "Speak up!" were Members whose reason was as steeled against argument, whose minds were as hardened in prejudice as a blacksmith's anvil; and it were just as easy to endeavour to make an impression upon an anvil as to endeavour to bring them to reason. He had spoken much longer than he should have done if he had not been interrupted. Indeed, he would have finished all that he had to say in one-half of the time. He had only wished to suggest that an opportunity should be afforded to himself and many hon. Members on the other side of the House who had not spoken, of addressing the House upon the Main Question. He knew that many Members on the Liberal side who had not indulged in clamour, but, on the contrary, had sat quiet, wished to speak, and it was only a matter of justice and fair play to the people of Ireland, that the question should be allowed to be discussed at greater length. He had, therefore, risen to support the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, and he trusted that right hon. and hon. Members on the Treasury Bench, if they wished to show that they were prepared to give the Irish Members fair play and a fair hearing, would consent to give way. If Her Majesty's Government wished to rule the Irish Members by argument and reason, and not by brute force, they would accede to the proposition now before the House, which he had great pleasure in supporting.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said, that, in rising to support the Amendment for the adjournment of the debate, he felt bound to say that it was too important a question to be dealt with in a hurry. The English Members regarded it as an inconvenient thing that they should be kept there for a few nights; but the Irish Members were fighting for the liberty of their country, and not for the convenience of hon. Gentlemen who objected to be kept there night after night. He himself was anxious to say a few words upon the Main Question in regard to the views of his constituents, and he had not yet been able to catch the eye of the Speaker. There were upwards of a dozen Irish Members who still desired to address the House, and it would be unfair to close the discussion until they had had an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN expressed a hope that he might shortly be permitted to retire to rest. He was glad to see that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had already retired, for no one would wish to shorten a life that was of so much value to his country. He trusted, however, that the right hon. Gentleman had left with some of his able lieutenants full discretion how to act. His own impression was that at about 2 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, after a number of them would have spent the night and day on the floor of the House, and some of them would have lost their tempers as well as their night's rest, something would happen which would be likely to lead to a compromise. ["No, no!"] He knew that it was the correct thing for hon. Gentleman to cry "No, no!" to such a suggestion when it was made at the beginning of the struggle. He had seen it done three or four times already, and "No, no!" was sure to be cried out to any hon. Member who rose, as he did now, to suggest a compromise He hoped his words would be on record, so that those who shouted "No, no!" so lustily now might be able to refer to them at 2 o'clock to-morrow. All of them were ready to fight and see it out; but they all knew what would happen at 2 o'clock. A few men with cool heads would meet as if by accident in the Lobby, and negotiate a common sense course of getting out of the dilemma. He asked why they could not take that course now, and cut out the 15 or 16 intervening hours, doing now what they were pretty certain to do if the House consented to sit until 2 o'clock to-morrow? ["No, no!"] Of course, hon. Members opposite cried out "No, no!" That was quite correct and according to the card; but he would put it to the Treasury Bench. ["Question!"] This was the Question. The reason for the adjournment of the debate was the question; and if any hon. Gentleman was calling out "Question!" in his sleep he hoped some other hon. Member would push him and wake him up. The reason for adjournment was one of justice. The Government could not be so unfair as to expect that the hon. Member for Cork was prepared to make his speech in reply to the terrible attack which had been made upon him on Friday by the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government at an hour when he knew that his remarks would not be reported. The attack which had been made upon his hon. Friend was almost an unprecedented one, and it was most desirable that a fair opportunity should be afforded for a reply. It was but justice that the discussion of the Bill should be heard at a time when the Press of the country could report the hon. Member's explanation. There would be nothing lost, inasmuch as the hon. Member had intimated that the debate would close on Tuesday, when all the speeches to be made could be reported. Unless the Government agreed to the adjournment, the House would be in precisely the same position at 3 o'clock on Tuesday as they were at that moment, and nothing whatever would be gained. He thought that the debate should be resumed at the usual hour on Tuesday in a manner worthy of that Assembly, when the division would be no doubt reached.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the hon. Member who had just sat down had made use of the only argument that had been advanced in favour of the adjournment of the debate. The hon. Member urged that the debate should be adjourned in order that the hon. Member for the City of Cork should have an opportunity of replying to the speech of the Prime Minister at a time when his explanation could be recorded by the Press. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member that this was desirable; but what was to prevent the hon. Member doing so at an earlier period of the evening? The House would undoubtedly have accorded the hon. Member a careful and attentive hearing at any hour that he might have thought fit to rise. He had not, however, risen, and it was not thought too much to ask the House to protract the debate simply because the hon. Member had not thought fit to reply to a speech made last Friday by the Prime Minister. The hon. Member had stated that no instance could be brought forward in which he had obstructed the Business of the House; but it was difficult to reconcile that assertion with one which he made shortly afterwards, when he stated it was the duty of Irish Members to exhaust every form of opposition in the House to this Bill. It was true the hon. Member had qualified this by adding the words—"until it was properly discussed;" but who was to be the judge? The Government's sense of propriety in the matter was that every Member of the Party opposed to the Bill should be heard. But this was not the idea of proper discussion which had prevailed in that House. It had generally been considered sufficient that a certain proportion of the Party opposing a measure should lay their objections and views before the House of Commons. But the hon. Member said that Irish Members must be the best judges of the amount of resistance to be given to this Bill. Hon. Members had a perfect right to offer any resistance they pleased; but he (the Marquess of Hartington) submitted that the majority had also a right to state what amount of endurance they were prepared to show. It was all very well to come down after a great deal of time had been expended, and, like the hon. and learned

Member for Meath (Mr. A. M. Sullivan), propose a compromise. The time for compromise on this subject had almost past; but, if some such suggestion had been made at an earlier stage of the discussion, the House would possibly have been glad to entertain it. But hon. Members opposite had not asked for any compromise. The discussion which had taken place during 10 nights had been on precisely the same subject. It must be remembered that the House was only discussing the introduction of the Bill, and that its forms as well as the principles it contained would form the subject of further discussion, while its provisions remained to be discussed in Committee. The question before the House at that moment was very simple and limited—namely, whether any such measure of protection for life and property as Her Majesty's Government had brought forward was required; and whether, after four nights' debate, further discussion was necessary?

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR remarked that, although, no doubt, some hon. Members were anxious for a division, it appeared to him that the speech of the noble Marquess should not pass unanswered. It would be found that any unfavourable change which might take place in the tone of the debate dated from that speech. He had hoped up to that moment that the discussion would proceed in a calm and moderate temper; but that expectation had been removed at the time the noble Marquess intervened. When the Prime Minister was pressing any question it gave some pain to hon. Members on those Benches to find themselves in opposition to the right hon. Gentleman, who never treated them with unfairness, but with the courtesy and chivalry of his nature. When, however, they had to deal with the noble Marquess, they had the same experience as those who were called upon to deal, not with the knight, but with the knight's squire—they felt, in short, that Don Quixote had been succeeded by Sancho Panza. He felt that hon. Members opposite, who interrupted him with so little courtesy, were the very men whose hearts responded to his description of the situation of the Leadership of the Liberal Party; and who knew that the day when the noble Marquess succeeded to the Leadership of the Party——

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that the Question before the House is—"That the Debate be now adjourned."

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR was endeavouring to show how the speech of the noble Marquess affected the Motion. There was another difference in his mode of dealing, very different from that of the Prime Minister. That right hon. Gentleman made some show of reason in his addresses; but the noble Marquess laid down the proposition that, in all the evenings of discussion which had taken place on the Queen's Speech, and on the Motion for leave to bring in this Bill, Irish Members had been practically discussing the same question. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) utterly denied that proposition. In the course of conversation with an hon. Member on the subject under discussion that evening, and on the question discussed on the Address from the Throne, that Liberal Member observed to him that in the debate on the Address the English Liberals and Conservatives were allowed to take the greater part in the discussion, while poor Ireland was but a pawn on the chess board. "But," added he, "if I were an Irishman I would insist on spending as many hours on the first stage of the Bill as were spent on the Address from the Throne." Therefore, his reference was quite relevant to the discussion before the House. But the position of the original question had changed, because, on Tuesday morning, for the first time, the House had been placed in possession of the documents showing the evidence on which they were asked to take away the liberties of the Irish people. At that time a portion only of the indictment against Ireland was laid on the Table of the House; and hon. Members had not, even at the present moment, the whole of that indictment before them, for the Returns of crime for November and December had not yet been presented to them, and these constituted the most important part of the charge. The reason for this was that Her Majesty's Government had, in November, refused to accept coercive proposals. Why, then, he asked, had they decided to adopt in December what they had rejected in November? It was the crime of these two months which had decided the mind of a vacillating Government.

But he again pointed out that the Returns of that crime were not yet before the House; and that, as they constituted that portion of the indictment which changed the minds of the Government, they might also change the minds of hon. Members with regard to the policy of the Government. By presenting to the House only the mendacious and disputed totals to which he had referred, the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had obtained the pledges of his Colleagues to receive his proposals under false pretences. Not till then had Irish Members been enabled to test the truth of the figures and facts, the examination of which had destroyed the basis of the whole case. Therefore, he maintained that since last Tuesday the whole question had not been before the House. Whatever might be the indictment of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, he could not but observe that the production of the Returns was remarkably slow. The little truth that had appeared with regard to this question leaked out on Tuesday morning, and everything that had gone before had proceeded on imperfect information, and upon false issues. While the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) was speaking on Thursday night last he had watched the Prime Minister, and felt himself justified in saying that the expression on the countenance of the right hon. Gentleman was that of surprise and shame; and he appeared to be shocked by the revelation made to him by the hon. Member with regard to the case of his right hon. Colleague, which made clear to him the trap he had fallen into, and the means by which his Ministry had been led to propose measures of coercion for Ireland. He, therefore, said that the publication of those Returns had revolutionized the question before the House. There was a second revolutionary change in the position of the question. The character of the Bill which was to be brought before the House could not, he knew, be discussed at that stage; and he should not, in the remotest degree, go against the ruling upon that point. But he thought he might be allowed to say that the character of that measure was pretty generally guessed by Members of that House. They had a vague idea of what it was going to be. [*Cries of* "Question!"] Perhaps he was speaking a little too much to the Question for the minds of some hon. Members listening to him. He thought he might interpret the feelings of hon. Members opposite by saying that they would support a coercive measure of the same character as the document which was then distributed among them. But, perhaps, when that measure was brought in, it would be found to be of another character. That was the second revolutionary change. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) was the temporary, but he hoped that he would not be for long, the Leader of that House. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had truly said that the noble Marquess might, with advantage, confine his attention to his own Department. The noble Marquess had said that the question before the House was the same as that debated a short time ago. But in the face of two revolutionary changes in the character of the Bill, was it too much to ask for another night's discussion? He was strongly of opinion that another night's debate might be fairly taken upon that question. If his hon. Friends were willing to obey the dictates of selfish prudence, he was not sure that they would not be acting wisely in agreeing to a division. There was nothing so useful to a Government that wished to pass unpalatable measures as to keep those measures for a long time before the House, so that a feeling of weariness and apathy might ensue. Weariness was, in fact, the great ally of Ministers when they wanted to pass unpalatable measures. Any measure could be passed by the aid of hon. Members who were willing to obey the directions of Whips. When a Bill, however objectionable it might be, had been discussed for some time, hon. Members refused to listen to the merits of the case any longer. [*Ironical cheers.*] Those cheers which he had just heard confirmed his worst suspicions as to the intention of Ministers in regard to that question. He hoped that the Bill would be discussed upon its merits. There was not one Member of the Government speaking from the Treasury Bench who had attempted to discuss that question, or to answer the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). One right hon. Member had said that he was quite willing to discuss, but would not do so, the interesting and amusing speech of the hon. Member for Northampton, for he was quite willing to trust the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. That was a new dogma of Liberalism—that the liberties of 5,000,000 people should be curtailed by a so-called Liberal Ministry, because one of their number said that it was necessary to do so. If that right hon. Gentleman was willing to rest his case upon the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Mr. Forster), he would be, to his (Mr. O'Connor's) mind, mainly responsible for the committal of that blunder and crime towards Ireland. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Bright) was willing to take the *ipse dixit* of the Chief Secretary in January, why was he not ready to do so in November and December? If he was willing to vote for coercion because the Chief Secretary said it was necessary, why not when the Chief Secretary asked for it in November? Why hold out when the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was begging and imploring coercion in an abject manner? It really showed what a misfortune it was to the two countries when a man like the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster was placed in a position of responsibility. The Government had forced that contest upon the Irish Members, having a clear perception, and having made sagacious calculations as to the consequences. They knew that every contest like that one tended to raise public opinion and that of the House against the Irish Members. They knew that if these all-night Sittings took place then they would be able to curtail discussion of a free and frank character on the second stage. Hon. Members on both sides would then be irritated against the Irish Representatives, and would not listen to any arguments they might use. The fact was, the Government did not want the merits of the Bill discussed, nor did they want to give time to them to appeal to the Democratic feelings of the working classes of the country. They wanted to raise a false issue before the people of this country. The so-called Liberal Ministry were guilty of a high national crime in exciting the passions of the people of England against those of Ireland, in order to help them to carry their coercive legislation. He had said that the Government were afraid to give them time to appeal to the working classes of the country. If they would only give them one fortnight between the different stages of the Bill, he would venture to say that from every town in England, in which there was a large working-class population —— ["Question!"]—he was arguing whether or not it was advisable to adjourn—the voice of that class would be raised against that Liberal Ministry which was thus betraying them. He spoke with some experience on that question. He did not neglect, so far as his pursuits would allow him, to observe the opinion of the working classes of the country. [An hon. MEMBER: Clubs.] Some hon. Gentleman said "Clubs." He was quite willing to take those as representatives of working class opinion. They were better exponents of that opinion than subsidized Associations. There was not a Radical Club—[*Cries of* "Question!"] He was endeavouring to show that an adjournment would give them an opportunity of appealing to the opinion of the working classes of the country. He had read out at Question time the names of some Clubs where that question had been discussed. It was a list of some 20 or 25. He did not know a single Club in London, at any rate, that had not pronounced its opinion against the coercive policy of the Ministers. His hon. Friend the Member for County Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) had spoken at a meeting, at which Englishmen were present in large numbers, at Birmingham. The inhabitants of that town were willing to adopt the policy of a Ministry in which two of their Members held Office; but at that meeting, which was a free and open one, attended by English and Irish Radicals, the policy of the Government was condemned. He himself had attended in London within the last few days two meetings open to the public, which was attended by Englishmen as well as Irishmen, where resolutions were passed condemning the policy of the Government. At Newcastle, on Saturday night, there was a meeting of 5,000 people, and at that meeting only 13 were found to support the deliberate conspiracy of the Ministry against Liberalism. Therefore, if a fortnight were given them, they would show that the working classes were opposed to the action of the Government. If hon. Members opposite were free to vote, and not hampered by Party ties and other undue influences——

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN asked if the hon. Member were in Order in speaking of hon. Members on those Benches in the way he had? It seemed to him that those remarks had nothing to do with the adjournment of that debate.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN wished to say a word on the point of Order. The Prime Minister, in his speech on that debate, referred to communications from various Associations in the country expressing their confidence in the course being taken by the Government upon that matter. It was perfectly in Order for his hon. Friend behind him to show that the adjournment of this debate would convince the Prime Minister that he was wrong in the statement he had made.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood that the hon. Member was giving as a reason why the debate should be adjourned that they might have time to inform public opinion upon the subject. I cannot say that in doing so he is out of Order.

MR. HUSSEY VIVIAN said, his objection was not to that portion of the speech of the hon. Member; but to the allusion to the influences under which a certain portion of that House was. He said that they could not give their votes as they desired.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member charged Members of this House with being under improper influences he is out of Order.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR did not say that they were under improper influences. He accused them of being under influences of Party ties. It might be that there were other improper influences; that he would leave to their own consciences to decide. In conclusion, he would say that if Ministers would give them opportunity, they would appeal to that public opinion outside which was in their favour. That opportunity would not be given them, for the Government wanted to force the Bill through before they could have time to bring in protests against it. Therefore, the Government had taken the initiative in the contest into which they were driven. For his own part, he did not like physical contests; he would rather the debates were conducted with decency and decorum. If the present state of things was indecent and indecorous, the responsibility for that rested with the Government. But he thought that when passion cooled and better judgment intervened, the public verdict of this country, as well as of Ireland, would be that this Liberal Ministry were guilty of apostacy from Liberal principles, and the consequences would be the same as those which always followed Ministers who adopted that course.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY wished to make a few observations, and he would confine himself as closely as possible to the question whether the debate should or should not be adjourned. He did think that the issue was, at the present moment, somewhat confused. There was, in reality, but a small issue before them. The Prime Minister had stated his desire—and in that there could be no doubt that he spoke the desire of the majority of the House of Commons—that the first stage of that Bill—that was, its introduction—might be disposed of at once. The hon. Member the Leader of the Irish Party opposite (Mr. Parnell) had said that he would permit the Bill to be introduced if the debate could be allowed to go on until to-morrow. The dispute was really between a small minority of Irish Members—amongst whom he himself was one—and an enormous majority of the House of Commons. He would ask hon. Gentlemen whether it was worth while to raise a dispute of that kind on so small an issue, and to fight *à l'outrance*, seeing that all their strength and resources would be required for the second reading and the other stages of the Bill? They would then have something to fight about; but what was there now to sit up all night for, destroying their constitutions and losing their tempers? To settle the question whether the Bill was to be introduced now or introduced to-morrow! The reasons given by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down appeared to him to be of a most contradictory character. ["No, no!"] Well, they were contradictory in his opinion, and he should show the hon. Gentleman how he thought they were so. The hon. Member said that if they wished to consult public opinion they ought to allow the Bill to be introduced, and he had told them that what he most desired was to have public opinion at his back. If that was the case why, did not the hon. Member and his Friends allow the Bill to be introduced? Another hon. Member had told them that in consequence of the course that had been taken what he might call the "Irish cause" at this moment was deprived of the support it would have received from the speeches of a certain number of Liberal Members who sat on that (the Ministerial) side of the House. Why were they deprived of the services of those hon. Gentlemen? It was because some of the Irish Members were persisting in a course which was really unreasonable. [An hon. MEMBER: No; the Government are.] He did not speak of the Government, but of hon. Members opposite, and he protested against being interrupted. He, on his part, had not interrupted hon. Members who had fairly expressed their opinions, and he claimed liberty to express his without hindrance. He did think the course which was being adopted was unreasonable. The issue must be fought out, and the majority must eventually prevail against the minority, or else, instead of having Members of Parliament chosen from amongst gentlemen of position and education, they had better select them from amongst the coalheavers of London and the Quay porters of Dublin. People of that kind would be able to sit up all night; but why those who had to contend for the rights of a country by their intelligence, and not by their physical force, were to enter into these contests, he could not for the life of him understand. But this Bill, with which they had become acquainted on the night the Chief Secretary moved for leave to introduce it, he had a right to assume was not unknown to hon. Members in its details. By an accident which had occurred—and to which he would not further allude—the measure had become known to them in a manner it was not known before; and he was certain that all that was necessary was to allow the Bill to be introduced into the House of Commons and to go forth to the country to insure a much more active opposition to it than anything that had yet been threatened. The description which had been given of it by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was bad enough; but the reality was worse. Let them get to the Bill. Let them have the document before them. What was the subject before them now? It was the question whether they should sit up all night debating whether the Bill should be put on the Table now or 12 hours' hence. What sort of an issue was that to those who were defending the rights of their country?—what sort of a ground was that on which to fight this great battle? Let them fight for an issue on ground that was intelligible. Let them have the Bill before them, as the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) admitted they must have it before them to-morrow, and let it go before the country and be debated. Under the circumstances, he ventured to appeal to hon. Members whether it would not be wiser in the interests of the people whose rights they defended not to force this contest any further, but to allow the division to be taken on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons), and then the division on the question of the introduction of the measure. They would, by doing that, only be forestalling the inevitable by a few hours, and would insure that the Bill in all its deformity and wickedness should come before the country for full and candid discussion on its merits. Under the circumstances, he trusted that hon. Members would allow the House to go to a division; but if not, not being so young and enthusiastic as some of his hon. Friends, he should have respectfully and sorrowfully to take leave of Mr. Speaker for the night.

MR. DALY appealed to the common sense of the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) and the Government, and requested them to go back in their memory to the period when the debate was resumed to-day. The first hour and 20 minutes was occupied by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis), who was certainly no Irish Obstructionist or sympathiser with Obstruction. Then a long period was occupied by the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. C. Russell), who, though a good Irishman, was not one of the Irish Active Party. Let the House bear in mind that the issue to be fought was the destruction or maintenance of the liberties of the Irish people. The Irish Members declared that they resisted the Government proposal because it was founded on supposed conditions that did not really exist, on exaggerated facts, and on allegations that had been multiplied; and, under the circumstances, he maintained that it was not unreasonable for hon. Members to ask for a fair opportunity of examining the proposal. Some little opportunity had been afforded them of examining the facts by which the Government had been guided; and he had devoted his attention to those relating to the county from which he had come. The outrages relating to that county, as shown in the Blue Book, were certainly no foundation for threatening the liberties of the people. The hon. Member for Galway County (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had said that the Active Irish Party were unreasonable, and that they should forestall the inevitable and not prolong the struggle until to-morrow; but he (Mr. Daly) considered it still more unreasonable in the noble Marquess and in the majority at his back to compel the Irish Members, on an issue so momentous, to come to a decision to-night. Such a course certainly would not add to the dignity of the House; on the contrary, it would detract from its dignity and from the dignity of the noble Marquess and the majority at his back. The question should not be one of endurance, but of reason and common sense. The noble Marquess had said that it was unusual to prolong a discussion on the mere question of leave to introduce a Bill. But he would ask the noble Marquess the character of the present introduction or of the present measure. The Bill was prefaced by a most momentous and weighty statement by Her Majesty in the Speech from the Throne, the truth of which statement he utterly denied. Then the right hon. Gentleman introduced the Bill in a long and important speech, and the personal character of this Member of the Government stood so high that many would accept the accuracy of his statement purely on his allegation. A notable fact—which he had noticed at the time—was that one of the most gifted Members of this Parliament—a right hon. Gentleman who, by his own admission, had been 37 years a Member of the House of Commons — had so forgotten his own responsibility as to declare that he accepted the accuracy of the facts on the authority of the Chief Secretary. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) had in this way shelved a weighty and solemn responsibility. A man, in making up his mind on such a question as this, had a right to think for himself. Well, taking all these things into consideration, and bearing in mind the importance of the statement of the Chief Secretary, if the Irish Members could prove to the English nation, and to the independent Members of the House, that the right hon. Gentleman was not warranted in making that statement—that what he put forward as facts were inaccuracies and untruths, although he was not aware of it—despite the high position of the Government, the whole indictment against the Irish nation would fall to the ground. He would ask, therefore, was he, who had been sent to the House of Commons to take his part in the Legislature of the country, to be debarred from the opportunity of proving that the series of accusations in the Blue Book—the series of crimes alleged to have been committed by the people of the county of Cork—were ill-founded, and that no crimes had been committed, or the few that had been committed had been grossly exaggerated? He would put it to the noble Marquess that his position in the House had its responsibilities as well as its assurances. The noble Lord might think he was vindicating British pluck and endurance by prolonging this unseemly scene to-night; but, with great respect, he (Mr. Daly) would say that it would argue much more for his personal dignity and the Party he led, if he would accept the fair alternative proposed by the Irish Members that they should meet again to-morrow afternoon to discuss the present stage of the Bill.

MR. NEWDEGATE was not surprised that the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India was unwilling, in the absence of the Prime Minister, to resign the Leadership of the House to the hon. Member for the City of Cork. The noble Lord was unwilling to acknowledge that the Forms of the House had been permitted to be so systematically abused, not for one Session but for four, that the minority could dominate the House. This was contrary to the whole system of Constitutional Government, and he begged to recall to the recollection of the noble Lord the evidence that Mr. Speaker had given before the Select Committee on Public Business, when he (Mr. Speaker) had favoured that Committee with his presence; and he (Mr. Newdegate) begged to suggest to the Government that the House was being made a focus for agitation out-of-doors, as declared by the hon. Member for the City of Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) when he said—"Give us a fortnight, and we will rouse the working classes against this House"—["No, no!"]—well, against the decision of the majority of this House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR was sorry to be obliged to interrupt the hon. Member; but he did not wish to be misrepresented. What he had said was, that if the Government would give them a fortnight, they would be able to rouse the public feeling of England against the Government.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, the hon. Member had not correctly repeated his words, although they came much to the same thing. A section of the House had used the House as a focus of agitation for some time; and he believed he represented a large majority of the people of England and Scotland in what he was about to say—namely, that the people were most impatient at the delay of this Bill, and looked to the Leader of the House to suggest such means of correcting its proceedings as would enable those proceedings to be properly transacted. The noble Lord, he hoped, would take what he said in good part; but he did not think what was occurring was conducive either to the credit of the Government or to the credit of the House, and that it would lead to much greater changes than any reasonable politician desired, if this House were degraded by repeated physical struggles of this kind. It had already become the duty of the Leaders of the House to suggest some remedy for the domination of a minority, and against the House being used as a focus for agitation. He hoped that Mr. Speaker would take into consideration the position in which the House stood, and the danger under which it rested of being discredited as an institution for exhibitions such as had occurred last week, and would not improbably occur again.

MR. LABOUCHERE so far agreed with the hon. Member who had just sat down that he thought the fault was more with the Standing Orders than the Irish Members, for he could not feel surprised that these Gentlemen should use to the utmost all the Standing Orders of the House in order to debate a Bill which practically was to enable the Government to put in prison without trial either them or their constituents. He was perfectly convinced that if the positions were reversed, and English and Scotch or Welsh Members were threatened with imprisonment, they would act in the same way as the Irish Members. He was one of those who did not see his way to aid and abet the Government in paving the way towards the introduction of this Bill; but, at the same time, he did not see any call upon him to sit there all night aiding the Irish Members, because it seemed to him that those Gentlemen could take exceedingly good care of themselves. He would ask the House to look at the matter from a plain, political, common sense standpoint. Let them look at the thing practically. By the Rules of the House hon. Members were able to continue moving the adjournment of the House and the adjournment of the debate from now until 4 o'clock to-morrow, and beyond if necessary. They could speak upon these two questions, so that, practically, they could effect their purpose—namely, discuss the question for another evening. The question, therefore, was, was it wiser for all of them to go home now and return at 4 o'clock to-morrow, or to sit there dividing and listening to very interesting speeches, no doubt, from hon. Gentlemen opposite; but, at the same time, rather monotonous speeches? It was a matter of choice for the House. If the Government could bring on a division at once, he could perfectly understand their forcing it on; but they could not do that. They could not prevent the Irishmen having their way—going on dividing the House, and continuing the discussion through to-morrow. The question was not whether the division should take place now; but whether hon. Members should remain in the House all night, or whether they should return at 4 o'clock to-morrow. He would call attention to another thing. They must not lose sight of the impossibility of pursuing the course suggested by the noble Marquess. He pointed out that the Speaker had then been in the Chair for 11 hours; but his endurance could not last much longer, and he would then have to resign his seat to the Deputy Speaker. A Standing Order of the House provided that—

> "Whenever the House shall be informed by the Clerk at the Table of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means do perform the duties and exercise the authority of Speaker in relation to all proceedings of this House as Deputy Speaker until the next meeting of the House."

He would not read further, for that was his point—that when the Speaker was replaced by the Deputy Speaker he would not be able to resume his place so long as the Sitting continued. How, then, was it possible to ask the Deputy Speaker to remain in the Chair from, say, 4 o'clock this morning until 4 o'clock on Wednesday morning? He should like to have some practical answer to that point, because the endurance of the Deputy Speaker was limited; and if the House pursued that course they would find themselves eventually unable to carry it on, and the Sitting itself would have to be suspended.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER thought that, while the right hon. Gentleman the Deputy Speaker was resolving the difficult proposition put before him, it would be more practical to discuss the statements of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) than anything that could be said on a wider aspect of the question. The noble Lord had, he thought, properly stated the case as regarded the majority, that the majority should determine when a debate should be brought to an end; but he must remind the noble Lord that the majority generally acted in such circumstances on the advice of the Government, and the noble Lord could not shift the responsibility of protracting this discussion on the Motion for adjournment on to the majority. The noble Lord entirely left out of sight the exceptional character of the Bill the House was now discussing. It was perfectly true what the noble Lord had stated, as to the usual rule of the House in dealing with Bills of an ordinary character; but until the noble Lord was prepared to show that the opposition of the Irish Members to this Bill, notwithstanding that it was of an exceptional character, was of an exceptional character in itself, his argument would remain inconclusive. He (Mr. O'Connor Power) was as little anxious as his hon. Friend the Member for the County of Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) to enter into a purely physical contest; but he felt that he ought not to spare himself in any effort to defeat the policy of the Government, and that if he neglected to exercise in a reasonable and manly spirit the Forms of the House to resist the Bill he should not have acquitted himself of the duty imposed upon him as the Representative of an Irish county. If the Bill were of an ordinary character he agreed with the noble Marquess that it would be unreasonable to ask the House to afford facilities to every Member opposed to it to make a speech; but he insisted on the exceptional character of the Bill, and he could not contemplate with satisfaction the position of any Irish Representative who went back to his constituents and said it was true he was opposed to coercion; it was true that, like the hon. Member for Galway and several other Members, he was anxious to speak against coercion, but he was restrained from doing so, from a desire to accommodate himself to the convenience of the House. On any ordinary Bill that would be a very fair defence; but no Representative could go back to his constituents and say he was anxious to speak upon this Bill, but consented in silence to it, and had not protested against it, because he was told by the Leader of the House that that would be for the convenience of the House. That would be a poor defence, and Irish Members were justified in resisting the Bill. He objected to the noble Marquess, or any other hon. Gentleman, prescribing the limits of the debate; he objected to the hon. Member for Cork City saying the debate would close to-morrow. He did not know that it would close then; but he did know that if all his hon. Colleagues were anxious to speak it would be difficult to close the debate to-morrow. He objected to any individual Member, no matter what Party he represented, or how high his authority, prescribing the limits of the debate and saying—"Thus far shall the debate proceed and no further." The opposition of the Irish Members should be an opposition which, on the one hand, should not be calculated to forfeit the sympathy of people outside the House; but, on the other hand, should be a guarantee to those they represented that they had not been a party to the humiliation and enslavement of Ireland. That was his view, and he had not been convinced by anything that had been said from the Treasury Bench, or from any other part of the House, that it was an unreasonable thing to adjourn the debate still further. Every Irish Member who was opposed to the Bill should have an opportunity of making his opposition audible in speech as well as manifest by votes. The issue he conceived to be this—that this was a Bill of so extraordinary a character that it was unseemly on the part of anyone to seek to prescribe the limits of a discussion upon it; and upon that ground, and not upon the ground of affording any particular individual an opportunity of addressing the House, he based his support of the Motion for adjournment; and if his hon. Friend took it to a division he should support the Motion.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY argued that, in the opposition to the introduction of the Coercion Bill, there really was nothing extraordinary or exceptional whatever. It would be an unusual course in ordinary times to oppose the first reading of a Bill; but when the Bill proposed was of a remarkable character, introducing any great Constitutional change, or making any sudden innovation on the practices of the House, it had not only been habitual, but almost invariable, to have a long discussion on the first reading; and sometimes even to give the first reading a distinct and decided opposition. For examples of that, the House had only to look to the introduction of almost any Bills in themselves exceptional and remarkable. He had already referred to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, which he said was a Bill in itself of the slightest practical importance as bearing on the Constitution of the country. It was admitted to be a Bill of very little practical effect whatever. It was brought in by the Government because they felt bound to do something, and did not know what else to do; and yet, on the first reading of the Bill, there was strong and decided opposition offered, in which some of the most illustrious Members of the House, including the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, took part, and the discussion was prolonged over five, six, or seven nights. Then there was the discussion on the proposal to introduce the Coercion Bill of 1846. There, again, the introduction of that measure was opposed; and the debate, extending over seven or eight nights, took place without any indignant protestations on the part of any Minister that the time of the House was being wasted, or that the impatience of the country was being roused against insolent opposition. Then, again, when Lord Grey's Reform Bill was introduced, it was announced, over and over again, by the speakers who opposed the Bill, that they did not intend to divide against the introduction of the measure. Yet the House was occupied in a debate on the first reading for eight nights; and when, in the course of that debate, some objection was raised by impatient Reformers to the occupation of so much time on a debate which was to lead to no division, Sir Robert Peel indignantly asked whether the House supposed that Constitutional changes were to be introduced of that kind without Members having an opportunity of discussing the Bill at every stage, even where it was not proposed to take a division? The introduction of the present measure was more important to the Irish people than two, at least, of the three measures referred to; and yet, on the introduction of each of those three, there was a longer debate than there had been on this measure. How, then, could the Irish Members, with any show of fairness or justice, be accused of breaking through the traditions of the House? Why should they be threatened with something like being dragooned by the Government because they claimed the right to express their opinions against the whole principle of this measure? He could not but wonder that there should, apparently, be no sympathy among hon. Members who claimed to be Liberal and Radical—at least, among the majority of them—no sympathy for the small minority who were struggling as well as they could to oppose, at every stage, a measure which was, in sentiment, an insult to the country, and which, in practice, would place the liberty of everyone in Ireland at the mercy of every pelting petty officer. Even if Liberal Members could not go wholly with them, he should have thought they might have shown some sympathy and tolerance for a small minority charged with so essential and important a duty.

That was, indeed, an exceptional state of things. Under the auspices of a Ministry from whom they expected only remedial measures, they were having this measure of coercion forced upon them. They were entitled to ask to be allowed to fairly discuss it. They might be asked why they did not go on then with the discussion; why the hon. Member for Cork City had not gone on discussing it? He thought the temper which the House exhibited when the hon. Member rose was a sufficient answer to those who said he could have continued the argument against the measure with any profit. Hon. Members did not, he presumed, speak merely to hear the echo of their voices, or for the gratification of their friends; they wished to set forth their opinions inside the House and outside the House, and at that hour it was too late to do that. That, he thought, justified the course that had been taken to induce the Government to assent to an adjournment, in order to give Members a fair chance of expressing their opinions upon this subject. There were hon. Members who were well able to speak on the subject, and who were bound in duty to their constituents to express their opinion, but who had not yet had a chance of speaking on the introduction of the measure. He wished to remind the House how unfair it was to say that the Irish Members were repeating the same arguments and on the same question as when speaking on the Address. On the Address they had to discuss the whole policy of the Government; on the first reading of this Bill they had to discuss the policy of the Government on coercion, and they maintained that coercion was not needed in Ireland; and when they came to the second reading of the Bill, they would have the actual principle of the particular measure proposed by the Government to face. He urged the House to be a little liberal in spirit with regard to the minority. The stronger the majority the more they were bound to consider the rights and the freedom of speech of the minority. He expressed a hope that the time would never come when a small minority might not have every opportunity of resisting any measure which might be fraught with the greatest evil like the present Coercion Bill, and could not produce the smallest amount of good.

MR. CRAIG expressed the belief that every Member on that (the Liberal) side of the House had made up his mind on the question, and complained that Members should be required to sit there night after night without cessation upon this debate. It was still worse when they were charged by hon. Members on the other side with being unduly influenced by Party considerations; for he did not believe that Party considerations would induce any Members to vote for this measure, unless they felt that they could conscientiously do so. With regard to the statement of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), that, if an adjournment were granted, they would convince the people of England that this Bill should be resisted, he (Mr. Craig) felt convinced that the Irish Members would not succeed in any such attempt, unless they dealt with the question in a very different manner from that which they had adopted. He knew something of the feeling of the people. During the Vacation he had had occasion to address something like 15 meetings, and he had found everywhere that the people were ripe to do justice to Ireland, and that they had the strongest aversion to coercion. It was, therefore, with the greatest disappointment when the House met, and the Queen's Speech was delivered, that he saw such prominence given to measures of coercion. He had listened to every speech which had been delivered in the course of the debate on the Address, and especially to that of the Solicitor General for Ireland. The hon. and learned Gentleman certainly made out a strong case for coercion. Time passed on, and then the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant brought forward his Motion for the introduction of a Bill. That right hon. Gentleman also succeeded in making out a case, which he (Mr. Craig) thought had not been successfully assailed. The right hon. Gentleman rested his case on the fact that there was a power in Ireland which had usurped sovereign authority —that the Land League was supreme as a power opposed to law and order, and that it was in consequence of those circumstances that the present measure was sought to be introduced. All the speeches on the other side had been addressed to a different ground from that on which the Chief Secretary rested his case. They had been addressed to a consideration of the agrarian crimes alleged to have been actually committed which had been enumerated. The Irish Members had endeavoured, and he believed had successfully endeavoured, to reduce the number of such crimes, and to show that they were by no means so formidable as had been stated. But what did that come to? It simply came to this—that the Land League, by the enforcement of its unwritten laws, had not committed all the crimes it was possible for that organization to commit. But, in the same breath, the Irish Members confessed that the Land League did rule supreme, and that it was intended that it should do so. The Irish Members had, therefore, by such confession, more firmly established the ground on which the case of Her Majesty's Government rested; and he was satisfied that if they were to go to the English constituencies now, and endeavour to convince them that there was no ground for coercion, they would entirely fail. Up to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Meath (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) no attempt had been made to cut away that ground; and the general impression on the mind of the public would be that the measure proposed by Her Majesty's Government was amply justified by the facts. Personally, he would gladly sit there night after night to listen to hon. Members opposite, if they would address themselves to that part of the question. Perhaps, under all the circumstances, it would be as well to adjourn the debate. It was demoralizing to every Member of the House to have these physical contests, and it was unquestionably degrading the House as a deliberative Assembly. He trusted, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government would re-consider their decision in regard to the question of adjournment; and, in the event of the debate being adjourned, he trusted that the Irish Members would address themselves rationally to the real question before the House—namely, the soundness of the ground upon which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary rested his case. If they succeeded in proving that the Land League was not the usurping power which it had been alleged to be, but that it was merely a legal and legitimate agitation to remedy harsh and unjust laws, he (Mr. Craig) would willingly give his vote against the coercive measures of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR was desirous of saying a word by way of personal explanation. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had misunderstood him. He had not said that hon. Members opposite were acting under undue influence; but what he said was, that their votes were given, not on the true merits of the Bill, but on the larger question of Party policy.

Mr. O'DONNELL was sure that every Member of the Irish Party had listened to the speech which the hon. Member for North Staffordshire (Mr. Craig) had just addressed to the House with great attention. If, as a general rule, the Irish Party were addressed, even by the Ministers of the Crown, in the manner in which they had been addressed by the hon. Member for North Staffordshire, there would be a very different feeling prevailing between Her Majesty's Government and the Irish Representatives. The hon. Member had spoken firmly and earnestly on behalf of his convictions. He blamed the Irish Party severely for many points both of omission and commission; but, from the beginning to the end of the hon. Member's speech, there was not a single sentence to which the most susceptible Irish Member could take offence. The speech of the hon. Member was most unlike the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, unlike the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and unlike the many speeches, full of appeals to passion, which had been uttered by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India. It was unnecessary, however, to go through all the speeches which had been made from the Treasury Bench. Considering all the circumstances of the case, he could only say that one was no worse than another. The speech of the hon. Member for North Staffordshire was really the speech of the evening. It was the only speech which it behoved the Irish Members to answer. He did not intend in the slightest degree to pay a compliment to the speech of the hon. Member. It was a plain, straightforward speech, without ornament or rhetoric. ["Order!" *and* "Question!"] Observations which, either in disparagement or otherwise, came from that part of the House, were not deserving of attention from Irish Members. The Irish Members were anxious to place their case before a larger audience and a fuller public. The hon. Member for North Staffordshire himself admitted the importance of that object, and recognized that the challenge which had been given in that respect ought to be taken up at a different hour. The hon. Member went so far as to appeal to Her Majesty's Government to afford a fair opportunity for discussion by forthwith adjourning the debate. The hon. Member was under the impression that the Land League was the supreme power in Ireland; that it overrode respect for the Crown and the Government. Did the hon. Member for North Staffordshire mean to say that he considered success—the success of a popular agitation—as an overwhelming and irrefragable proof of its guilt? Did the hon. Member only recognize the legality of a popular agitation which failed to be popular? So soon as a popular agitation was found to answer the wants of a nation; so soon as it included practically within its ranks the entire nation, when morally, and as a matter of fact, its opinions were supreme, because it coincided with the opinions of everybody else, the hon. Gentleman asked for no proof, but said it was an illegal organization. He granted that the Land League might have failed, and he himself had considered that a different form of organization would have been preferable, and he had opposed to the utmost of his ability the formation of the Land League on its present basis; but he had found that the Land League answered more correctly to the wants of Ireland than what, in his opinion, was the organization that ought to be applied to the wants of Ireland. He had since fallen in with the feeling and general opinion of the Irish people, just as the hon. Member for North Staffordshire would fall in with the general feeling of England, were two contending schemes presented to his choice. The hon. Member would go with his country; and he (Mr. O'Donnell) had simply gone with his. If the Land League had failed, the hon. Gentleman would have had no objection to make. Was it merely because it had succeeded that he objected to it? Why did the hon. Member object to it? Was it because the Land League distinctly differed from the permanent Government of the country that it was perilous? It was ostentatiously and undeniably a temporary organization to meet the temporary wants of tens of thousands of persons; and there were millions more who only desired the possession of settled forms provided by the Government to induce them to declare, with the leaders of the Land League itself, that there was no longer a necessity for the organization of the Land League. The Irish Members had plenty of other businesses to look after in Ireland besides the important business of the Land League. They earnestly desired to see the end of the Land Question and of the Land League, and to see all the tenant right organizations that might be started set about some other portion of the national work. They wished, as soon as possible, to organize the country for the highly useful purpose of county government. At present the Land League was a stumbling block and an obstacle; but it would not be got rid of so long as Parliament refused to grant the reform which the Land League was established to obtain. The Land League had put forth a number of programmes. With some of them he perfectly agreed; with some of them he disagreed. But of this he was perfectly certain—that as soon as a Land Reform, substantially calculated to root the Irish tenantry in the soil was passed by Parliament—call it what reform they liked—the days of the Land League would be numbered. A distinguished Member of the Liberal Party—the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. C. Russell)—had declared that in its inception, and in its general powers, the Land League was perfectly lawful. Of course, it was called illegal—most illegal by its opponents, by the men most interested in stopping its growth, and in the failure of any scheme of thorough-going Land Reform; but he would ask what popular agitation ever arose in England against which its enemies did not vomit forth imprecations and denunciations of the most extraordinary character? He had listened with surprise and astonishment to the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and of the Premier, in which those right hon. Gentlemen denied that there was any comparison between the organization of the Land League and the organization of the Anti-Corn Law League and of the trades unions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is now wandering from the Question before the House, which is that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he was replying to the arguments which had been employed by an hon. Member, and he was replying to those arguments for the special purpose of giving force to his appeal to the House to adjourn the debate until a time when this most important question could be properly discussed. It was not new, he freely admitted, to point out that the Corn Law League, and other Leagues, had been violently denounced, and that hon. and right hon. Members who now sat on the Treasury Bench had been spoken of by their political opponents as criminals and agitators of the worst description. No epithet had ever been applied to the hon. Member for the City of Cork which had not been applied to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. The right hon. Gentleman had been denounced as a firebrand from one end of England to the other, and as a professional agitator whose object was to set class against class. ["Question!"] It was the question. The question was that the guilt of the Irish Party was so clear, and the guilt of the Land League so clear, that they might proceed at once and come to a vote upon this Bill—a Bill worthy only of the Ministers of King Bomba—and pass it at once, because it was clearly proved that all the allegations made against the Irish Party were true. What he now said was, that allegations as serious had been made against the Leaders of the Liberal Party. The pages of *The Quarterly Review* and the columns of *The Times* were filled with epithets quite as bitter and as venomous against the leaders of the Anti-Corn Law League as any that were uttered against the Irish Party in the present day. If hon. Members admitted that the mere calling of names proved a case, they would be obliged to admit the justice of all the hard names which the Irish agitators employed against English statesmen. He believed that, hotly as the hon. Member for Cork had been abused in England, a number of English Members had been abused just as hotly in Ireland. He contended that the House ought not hastily to rush to a decision under any idea that if they called plenty of nicknames the case would be decided. Calling nicknames had really been the main argument made use of as yet against the Irish Members. ["Question!"] If it was not alleged that the success of an Irish organization proved its guilt, then the hon. Member for North Staffordshire was morally bound to vote for the Irish Party. It was complained that the general Business of England and Scotland was impeded by the action of the Irish Members. He denied this. It was not the Irish Members who insisted upon priority for Irish coercion; and it was not the Irish Members who were taking away from the English and Scotch Members every opportunity of giving expression to the grievances of their constituents. It was not the Irish Members who were upsetting the constitution of that House; but the Representatives of England and Scotland, who were doing all in their power to convert the House of Commons into a mere registering Chamber for the ukases of the despotic Minister for Ireland. In all his references to the Chief Secretary, whenever he had spoken severely of the right hon. Gentleman or condemned his actions, he wished the House to remember that his denunciations were intended to be considered in the most figurative sense. In point of fact, the right hon. Gentleman was a mere lay-figure, introducing in the House of Commons measures for which Colonel Hillier and Mr. Burke of Dublin Castle were really responsible. He wished to explain to the House that there was no personal animus in their references to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and that they endeavoured to separate the man from the office, and it was certainly amongst the Irish Members that the most flattering and cordial appreciations of the right hon. Gentleman could be heard. He concluded that Irish Members were in no way responsible for the priority granted to the discussion of Irish measures. Another reason why they appealed for the adjournment of the debate was that Her Majesty's Government had done all in their power to prevent the Irish Members having a fair opportunity of stating their case in public. When the Bill was first brought in almost all the evening had been occupied by the long and inflammatory address of the Chief Secretary for Ireland—one of those phonographic speeches he had just referred to produced at Dublin Castle and despatched to the right hon. Gentleman. That speech, as he was sure would be corroborated by the senior Representative of the Government, led to a brief debate in which there was no sufficient opportunity given for testing the astonishing statements which it contained; and amongst other reasons which prevented this being done was the fact that the Chief Secretary for Ireland had been instructed to make his accusation speech while still keeping back the Returns which he alleged justified his measures. A large portion of that evidence was still kept back. He would not accuse any individual Member of the Government of that; but could the House consider that if there existed any real urgency for the Bill all this time would have been allowed to elapse without the presentation of the November and December Returns? It was well known that with regard to these Returns a thousand brief Reports could have been put in order and printed within 48 hours at the presses at the disposal of Her Majesty's Government. But the Government had not thought fit to hasten the production of these Returns, to which they were always pointing with lowering gestures, indicating that there was something evil behind the curtain. This delay had forced upon the Irish Members the belief that they were keeping back evidence for the purpose of leading the country to come to a false conclusion, which, of course, as the depositaries of all the virtues Her Majesty's Government would deny. The debate of Monday had closed at an hour which did not give Irish Members an opportunity of meeting the charges contained in the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the next day was taken up by the Motion of the Prime Minister to give priority to the Coercion Bill. Without referring to the debate on the Motion for priority, which would be out of Order, he would remind the House that Mr. Speaker had, in the course of that debate, ruled that any reference to the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland was entirely out of Order. According to the Rules of the House, Her Majesty's Government were able to add Tuesday and Wednesday to the days deliberately taken from Irish discussion. On Tuesday the lion's share of speaking fell to Irish Members, who had also reserved for them some hours at the end of last evening for their especial use. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman had done well in picking and choosing the hours of debate for the purpose of urging all his charges against Ireland, Irish Members being put off till the dinner hour, or to an hour as late as that at which he was speaking. Then came Friday, which was similarly taken up, the dinner hour being again assigned to Irish Members. Then the Prime Minister himself lay in wait for an opportunity of occupying the rest of the evening to deliver an official oration against that unfortunate Ireland which the tactics of Her Majesty's Government still persisted in gagging. The debate was again adjourned on Friday; and he had certainly expected two days, at least, to reply to Her Majesty's Government would have been afforded. Her Majesty's Government might, in common Parliamentary decency, have left the counsel for the defence two clear nights to reply to the voluminous, he might say obstructive speeches, which had been launched at the Irish cause. But they had acted in a way quite contrary to this. In the first place, they had persisted in doing their utmost to poison the public mind of England against the Irish Members and all their arguments in the House of Commons. They had declared that the object of Irish Members was not debate, but Obstruction. But the course pursued by Irish Members was not Obstruction in the proper sense, but partly Obstruction to a particular Bill for oversetting Constitutional liberty through the whole Kingdom of Ireland. But before proceeding to that kind of Obstruction Irish Members wished to have an opportunity of proving their case, and this Her Majesty's Government had prevented their doing by forcing them to listen to the interminable speeches of the Law Officers for Ireland, the Solicitor General for Ireland having occupied three hours in delivering an oration which contained nothing against any Member of the House or anybody else. If the Government continued their tactics of silencing such Members of the Irish Party as were desirous of speaking, they could not be surprised if further time was asked for. The whole essence of their tactics was to push back the Irish Members to such hours of the night when they would be placed in such a position that it would be impossible for the English nation to know what sort of case they were making. In answer to one portion of the speech of the hon. Member for North Staffordshire, who continued to imagine that the Land League was favoured by the Irish nation more than Her Majesty's Government, he pointed out that the Irish nation was trying to do nothing more than to go on money making, and get its own profit out of farms which a robber race of landlords had hitherto prevented their doing. But it was clear Her Majesty's Government intended to carry on the debate until the Irish Members were exhausted, and that when the time of publicity came it was hoped they would be unable to talk against time. No matter how triumphant might be the arguments of Irish Members, there was not a single English constituency that would be able to hear them, nor the most convincing speech which they might deliver. Could hon. Members be blind to the evident intentions of the Government? Doubtless, it was considered a legitimate dodge to suppress the expression of their views, and Irish Members might take such a dodge in a good spirit if the subject of discussion were some fifth-rate measure. But here the Government were proposing nothing less than to set up a third French Empire in Ireland, or even something worse than the reign of King Bomba.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not confining his observations to the Question before the House. I have had to call the hon. Member to Order in that respect several times.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It was not at that hour that a proposition of that kind should be presented. It ought to be brought forward in the full face of publicity. They asked for an adjournment because they knew that at that hour the people of England, who were masters of Ireland, in spite of the Land League proclaimed by the hon. Member for North Staffordshire, had no opportunity of learning what were the facts of the Irish case. He openly challenged the hon. Member to give him an opportunity of addressing his constituents upon this question. Whenever an Irish Member went down to an English constituency and stated the case of Ireland he was always told in reply that they were not going to vote again for a Government that presented coercive measures against Ireland. There were a dozen Irish Members perfectly prepared to discuss this question before any English constituency; and Her Majesty's Government knew right well what would be the effect of their accepting the challenge of the Irish Members to bring them face to face with English constituencies. He had no desire to stop Public Business; but he wished to postpone the further consideration of so dangerous a matter to a proper time. He was anxious to facilitate the progress of the debate, and the discussion of the Business, within proper limits. He had only to re-echo the expression of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), and warn the Government against proceeding in a manner which was not calculated to facilitate the termination of the discussion. If the Government were objecting to the waste of time they were acting against their own interests in refusing to accept the Motion before the House. As regarded the Irish Members, they could, if they wished, waste time until 10 or 12 o'clock of the next day, and, after that, go into a lengthened discussion on the Amendment, and then upon the original Motion, and then they could proceed again with Motions of adjournment. That time could be wasted if the Government refused to yield in this matter. If only fair opportunity had been given to Irish Members to discuss that stage, and facilities had been given for obtaining information that had never yet been produced, he was quite sure that the present stage would have been soon successfully passed over. If the Irish Members chose to waste time, the first stage of the Bill would not be gone through within 36 or 40 hours from that time. Why did not the Government recognize that? He might say that unless Irish Members were superior to ordinary temptations, and most accomplished debaters, it was impossible that they could give that care to the marshalling of facts, at an hour like that, which they would be happy to give before a proper audience at a proper time. If English Members were only anxious to understand the Irish case, about which they confessed themselves to be ignorant —and he would not deny the accuracy of their professions, they would allow Irish Members to bring forward their case at a reasonable time. A very just and due stress had been laid by Irish Members upon the plea that time should be given for popular agitation throughout England, not merely agitation by Irish Representatives, but also by English friends of Ireland. He certainly thought there could be no more valid plea than that, unless the Government were anxious to convince the classes of the Irish nation that what they wished was to act by the brute force of a majority. Such conduct as that was not likely to promote permanent conciliation between the two Kingdoms. Time should, moreover, be given to the hon. Members of that House to reflect upon the difference which they already perceived to exist between the original statements of the Government and the later ones. It was quite impossible that hon. Members could have an opportunity of revising their own judgments, when one section of them was present merely for the purpose of keeping a House, and another section necessarily absent recruiting themselves by sleeping or taking nourishment.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the Question before the House. I have already three times called him to Order. The patience of the House is nearly exhausted.

MR. O'DONNELL was sorry to be the object of the slightest misunderstanding on the part of the Chair. He was not desirous of being out of Order. He thought he should be quite in Order in calling attention to the necessarily divided condition of the House as a decisive reason for adjournment. That was purely and entirely why he had referred to it. If they went to the vote then, an enormous mass of that Legislature would be absent, at a time when they were pressing the first stage of a Bill for suspending the Constitution in Ireland. He would venture to say, with all submission to the Chair, and if he was wrong he would withdraw the expression, that that question ought to be decided before a full House, under every circumstance of deliberation. The division of that House would, no doubt, be against the adjournment. He was afraid that others would then move another adjournment, and thus really promote the waste of time which the Government wished to avoid.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA thought that right hon. Gentlemen ought to agree to the adjournment, for a reason which had not yet, he believed, been stated. If they divided upon the Main Question then, it would go forth to Ireland that the decision had been come to in the absence of the chief Member of the Party to which he had the honour to belong. His hon. Friend the Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) had not yet spoken. If the Government had taken the usual course that difficulty would not have occurred. Every Irish Member would be held to strict account for his proceedings in that matter. A score, at least, of Members from Ireland had not yet spoken. He really hoped that, instead of their being met by eloquent silence of right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, as they had been up to that time, they would agree to adjourn. If not, that Motion would be hurried through without proper discussion. He, himself, was an Irish Member, interested in the very order that that Bill was intended to restore. The members of the Land League were entitled to have their principles laid before the House and considered before they were handed over to the tender mercies of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. He did not say that from any personal interest in the Land League, for he was not a member of it, nor had he ever been so; but he felt sure that the country would appreciate the action of that House better if full opportunity were given for discussion.

MR. BIGGAR said, that the question then before them ought to be decided in what he had always held to be the proper way of conducting Business in that House. He had always contended that no Business should be carried on after the hours in which reporters could take speeches, so that they appeared in the next morning's papers. The House ought to adjourn soon after half-past 12. There was a Standing Order to that effect, for one of those Orders said that no contentious Business should be taken after that hour. The Bill before the House ought to be discussed at a time when hon. Members were in physical and mental vigour. It was, also, very important that in such matters the public outside should have the opportunity of seeing what had been said on that question. The Irish Members said that public opinion had been misled with regard to the outrages in Ireland. If so, it was important that opportunity should be afforded for making out the best case they could, in order to combat the misrepresentations that had been made, and to reply to the speeches of Cabinet Ministers. Inasmuch as the Leader of their Party had not had the chance of setting forth his views, it could not be said that reasonable and full discussion had taken place. He could not appeal to the Government, because he had but little confidence in their disposition to do what was fair; and he doubted whether hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench had any authority to come to any conclusion then, or to accept anything contrary to their instructions. There were many reasons why the Government would have done well to have agreed to an adjournment. An Act of Coercion passed by physical force, and by the influences of Party discipline, would not be so passed with the approbation of the people, not only of Ireland, but of these countries. The influence of the Land League was of an entirely moral nature. The hon. Member for North Staffordshire (Mr. Craig) said that the Irish Members had not convinced him that the Government were wrong. The fact was that fair opportunity had not been given for discussion, or the hon. Member would have been convinced. He thought that if the public men in England entered into a physical contest they would make a great mistake. For physical contest men should not be selected for intellect, but for physique. The time might come when men, stronger in body and not so intellectual, would be at the head of affairs. Notwithstanding that, that was a very important Irish question—a very small portion of Irish Members had spoken; Members from Ireland had been crushed out by English Members. So many of their Party had not spoken on the Main Question, that that discussion might be kept up for an interminable time. He did not utter that as a threat; but merely to show that they had not occupied the time of the House. If the time occupied by Irish Members were put together it would not occupy more than two ordinary Sittings. They were an innocent Party, prevented by two others, who were following the Government on that occasion in supporting the vilest conspiracy. [*Cries of* "Withdraw!"] He would say deliberately that there was a conspiracy of Irish landlords to mislead, first the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, then the Government, and then English public opinion, in order to obtain the means of enabling them to continue in the unjust course practised by them heretofore. He did not believe that any Member had got so many valuable Amendments inserted in Bills as his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell), and he was then charged with Obstruction. If the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire were present he should ask him to apologize for bringing so unfounded a charge against his hon. Friend. It was too bad that Members who had done their duty should be attacked in that way, and charged with bringing on clap-trap Motions and talking bunkum. The Bill then before them was one which struck at the root of Irish liberty.

Mr. HENEAGE rose to Order. He asked Mr. Speaker if the hon. Member was in Order in alluding to a Bill which was not before the House?

Mr. BIGGAR wished to apologize if he had exceeded the bounds of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Amendment is, "That the Debate be now adjourned." The hon. Member should address himself to that point.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that, as he understood the ruling of the Chair earlier in the evening, they were justified in criticizing the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary so far as they could bring it within the Motion for adjournment. If they could show that that question for adjournment was desirable because the Bill was so objectionable, he hoped that Mr. Speaker would rule that he was justified in making some remarks with regard to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in introducing the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman made several statements in introducing the Bill. ["Question, Question!"] He wished to be perfectly frank with Mr. Speaker. He wanted to show why time should be given them. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had raised certain points, and those he could, he believed, reply to. The right hon. Gentleman had raised the question whether the Bill was necessary. He had said that the lives and property and liberty of the Irish people had been set at nought by a certain combination called the Land League. He held a different opinion. He held, and he should be able to show when they had adjourned to a proper time, that the contention of the right hon. Gentleman was entirely erroneous. There were no outrages in Ireland that did not occur in all countries, and would occur, to the end of time. They would be able to show that the statements in the Returns were exaggerated.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is making a speech on the Main Question, and not with reference to the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BIGGAR did not care to prolong his speech at the present time. He only wished to show what they would attempt to upset in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman if they had the time to do it. They could, he was sure, prove that the right hon. Gentleman was wrong. The right hon. Gentleman had shown great ignorance as to the real facts of the case. He had told the House that his information was that which came from particular sources. He (Mr. Biggar) thought it desirable that all matters suggested by the right hon. Gentleman should be, in the words of the Prime Minister, "sifted and re-sifted" before a decision was come to. Up to the present, sifting and re-sifting had not taken place. He was not present at the time when the adjournment was moved; but he understood that the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had given no reason why an adjournment was not necessary. He simply said that a decision must be come to before the House could adjourn. That, in his opinion, amounted to coercion in that House. The right hon. Gentleman had a large majority at his back, and he was going to compel the minority to give way. He hoped, however, that the House would agree to the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker:—

Whereupon, Mr. PLAYFAIR, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

[4.50 A.M. TUESDAY, FEB. 1.]

MR. SEXTON said, that the hon. Member who had just sat down wished to refer to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary; but was not allowed to do so. He wished to say a word on a remark which fell from the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington). The noble Lord had stated that if his hon. Friend the Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) wanted to speak he could have done so earlier in the evening. The noble Lord's judgment deserved to count for a good deal; but he (Mr. Sexton) had yet to learn that the hon. Member for Cork City was bound to suit himself to the ideas of Order in debate that might be recognized and received by the noble Marquess. His hon. Friend had many calls upon his time, and could not rise at such time as the noble Lord might think convenient if he were disposed to do so. That debate would be regarded in Ireland as a fragmentary one. Every Member should have full opportunity of placing his views before the House. In the course of the debate the hon. Member for the County of Limerick (Mr. O'Sullivan) informed the House that he was desirous of speaking. No other Member had a stronger claim to be heard. The crime said to be committed in that county had been based upon fictitious evidence; and, therefore, his hon. Friend ought to be given an opportunity of replying to the charge which had been brought against the county he had the honour to represent. The noble Marquess, who had taken up the position of temporary Leader of the House, informed hon. Members that he considered four nights' debate sufficient for discussing the Motion to introduce this measure. That opinion was entitled to a respectful reception; but he was not aware of any Constitutional theory which entitled the noble Marquess to prescribe the duration of a debate, which ought to be left to the honest and deliberate judgment of the Irish Members. It must be obvious to any logical-minded person that this Motion ought not to be pressed forward unintermittingly until the whole of the evidence relevant to the case was in the possession of the House. But the evidence before the House was only of a fragmentary character; and the result of the criticism bestowed upon it had been, he believed, to discredit it in the minds of hon. Members on that side of the House. They were, therefore, entitled to demand that the remainder of the evidence on which the Government rested their case of coercion should be produced, in order that it might be fully and fairly examined before it was finally decided what further time was necessary for the consideration of the question. It had been shown that the evidence produced had been compiled on principles more in accordance with the proceedings of a lawyer striving to convict an individual, than with the principles that ought to guide a Legislative Assembly in its endeavours to arrive at a remedy for the state of things in Ireland. It was within the memory of the House that a Return, proving the decrease of crime within the last fortnight, was only agreed to by the Government after a Motion made by himself and supported by the hon. Member for Cork City. The Government had allowed the Order on his Motion to stand on the Books of the House of Commons, while they placed the name of the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the Papers to lead the public and the House to think that they had produced the evidence of their own accord, and not in answer to the demand of the Irish Members for its production. Again, only yesterday he had given Notice of Motion for a Return of agrarian crimes committed in that month, the effect of which would be to show that serious crime had disappeared, and that the evidence upon which the Government based their case was breaking into fragments; and it might be urged that, as the Government were proceeding with their policy on a weakening case, Irish Members were entitled to say that during the last fortnight that case had been still further weakened. When the Government produced their Bill they were able to say that during the month crime had increased; but Irish Members were now in a position to show that crime had decreased since that time 50 per cent; and, therefore, he was entitled to call upon Her Majesty's Government to give time for the purpose of showing that the decrease of crime proved that the necessity was every day disappearing for any exceptional legislation towards Ireland. Another reason for adjourning the debate was to afford time to make use of their right of appeal to the intelligent and generous feeling of the population of England in favour of the rights of the Irish people. No one could deny that there was, firstly, a slow uprising of popular revolt against the coercive policy of the Government as a cure for the distresses of a suffering people; and, secondly, a feverish mistrust of the indecent haste with which that policy had been forced upon the House. The Government, therefore, feared delay, because they believed it would open the eyes of the English public to the enormity of the course they were pursuing. The arguments he had addressed to the House were intended to show that there was no practical utility in continuing the policy inaugurated by the autocratic speech of the noble Marquess. Irish Members had amongst them sufficient resolution and energy to keep the Question before the House at its present stage until the time went by at which the Government might have hoped to gain anything by the continuance of the debate. The Government had not seen fit to adopt the suggestion offered at the beginning of the Motion for adjournment to allow the debate to conclude to-morrow night. In conclusion, he would add that, in opposing the continuance of the debate, Irish Members were showing their determination that the liberties of a law-abiding and peaceable people should not be placed at the mercy of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Mr. LEAMY had been surprised when the Prime Minister stated that he could not assent to the Motion for the adjournment, because it was only a few days before that he had stated his intention of giving Irish Members an opportunity for the fullest and fairest discussion. But, although it was now evident that the Bill was one of the most stringent measures ever submitted to the House of Commons, no such opportunity had been afforded. It had been said the Irish Members were offering Obstruction to the Motion, as they had to the Motion on the Address; but the fact was that of the Members who spoke on the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork the majority were to be found on the Benches opposite. Again, they were told that English feeling was rising against them; but he would refer to the meetings held at Newcastle-on-Tyne to show there were some parts of England in which popular feeling was in their favour. But how often had English prejudice been unfairly raised against Ireland? He believed that the time would come when the English people——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the subject before the House, which is simply the adjournment of the debate.

MR. LEAMY regretted to have travelled beyond the Question; but he understood that references had been made to English feeling as an argument against the course pursued by Irish Members. It was idle to expect that the Irish Members could come to any decision when they believed the Chief Secretary for Ireland had not made out his case, which was based upon outrages alleged to have been committed during the first 10 months of the year. But they had not received the Returns for the last two months, which it was desirable should be in the hands of hon. Members, if only for the purpose of showing how many more panes of glass had been broken. He pointed out that there was no use in the Government keeping hon. Members any longer. The hon. Member for the City of Cork had said all that it was possible to say when he stated that it was probable the debate would finish to-morrow; but he could not control other hon. Members, who would certainly be wrong in surrendering their rights to anyone. When a Bill was introduced which placed the liberties of Ireland in the hollow of any man's hand, they all felt it their duty to resist the demand to the fullest extent of their powers.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN rose to support the Motion for adjournment. There was, in his opinion, no need for hurrying this Bill forward, nor did he see any occasion for the unseemly haste displayed with regard to this matter by some hon. Members. The Government, he thought, should have time to reflect on their position, and trusted that a better discretion was coming upon them, especially after the discussion which had taken place on their statistics. The House had been recommended to hurry through the discussion in order that they might see what the Government measure really was. Well, Irish Members had seen it, no doubt without the will and intention of Her Majesty's Government; but some good fortune had put it into their hands, and they did not like it at all. The people of England had also become acquainted with its provisions; and, at all events, he thought a large portion of them liked it as little as the Irish Members. For that reason, also, he thought further time ought to be given in order to allow the people of England to express their opinions respecting the Government proposal. It was quite impossible at that hour for English Members also to give the Bill the amount of consideration which it required. It concerned the liberties and happiness of many thousands of the Irish people; and they would fail in their duty did they not obtain for it time for full discussion on the part of the people of this country.

MR. BYRNE rose to support the Motion for adjournment, which, considering the number of hours the House had been sitting, was certainly not unreasonable. He expressed his great surprise and indignation at the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government in trying to force a division on their measure without giving Irish Members a full and fair opportunity of discussing it, and, in the words of the Prime Minister, of sifting and re-sifting it before it was passed into law. He ventured to assure hon. Members opposite that there was scarcely a Member for Ireland who dare allow the opportunity to pass without entering their strong protest against the passing of the measures now proposed to be applied to Ireland. They would lose their seats if they did not do so. With reference to the statement that a full and fair opportunity had been given for discussion, he begged to point out that neither in the debate on the Address, nor in the course of the present discussion, had he and a number of Irish Members addressed the House. If the present measure were accompanied by a measure of reform——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the subject before the House is the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BYRNE would try to confine himself to that subject. He failed to see the advantage which the Government would gain from a series of Motions for adjournment, and trusted that the temporary Leaders of the House would agree to the suspension of the debate.

Mr. NELSON said, from the speeches of hon. Members opposite it might be supposed that the Irish people were the most turbulent in the world, and that their Anglican Friends were just dealing with them as a parent dealt with a child—teaching it by a slap on the head to become better.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I must remind the hon. Member that the Motion before the House is of an exceedingly limited character, and that it is for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BIGGAR: I wish to point out that when Mr. Speaker was in the Chair he laid down the principle——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I have already decided on the point of Order.

Mr. NELSON said, he now understood that he must simply speak on behalf of adjournment, without giving any reason why the adjournment was claimed. It should never be said that the liberties of Ireland were surrendered by her Representatives without a struggle. In answer to the observation of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis), who charged them with being demagogues, with the spirit of the murderer without his courage, he said that when men charged persons like himself with having such feelings they calumniated the Irish people.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER: I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether the hon. Member is in Order in alluding to a speech delivered on a previous Motion for adjournment?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I must again remind the hon. Member that the Motion before the House is simply one for adjournment, and that it is not the Main Question, although I do not think he is intentionally travelling beyond the Question.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN rose to Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I remind the hon. Member that the point of Order is already settled.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN rose to a new point of Order. He wished it to be understood that the Motion he was about to make was one that he should move with the utmost personal respect for the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair—namely, "That the House do now disagree with Mr. Deputy Speaker in his ruling." He had precedent for that Motion, and moved it because on his rising before he had been refused a hearing upon a point of Order. It was within the right of every Member of the House respectfully to address the Chair upon any point of Order before it was ruled, and upon that point he referred to the records of Parliament, and challenged contradiction in saying he was within his rights when he had attempted to do so. He said, with profound respect, that he was entitled to be heard on a point of Order, and that Mr. Deputy Speaker had denied him his right as a Member of Parliament. He therefore moved—"That this House do now disagree with Mr. Deputy Speaker in his ruling."

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I rise to a point of Order.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN: I am already debating a point of Order.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I wish to draw attention to an observation I distinctly heard in my place across the floor of the House, made by the hon. and learned Member who has just been pretending to speak upon a point of Order—an observation which, I think, shows the real spirit which prompted his observations. When interrupted by loud cries of "Divide" and other noises, the hon. and learned Member turned half round to his Friends behind him, and cried in a loud tone, perfectly audible at a considerable distance—"Never mind; this will do as well as anything else."

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN: I rise to a point of Order.

The O'DONOGHUE: I wish to say on the point of Order that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Samuelson) interrupted the hon. and learned Member who was addressing the Chair under the pretext of a point of Order, but brought no point of Order before the Chair.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I beg to explain the point of Order I brought forward——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) called on Mr. A. M. Sullivan to continue his observations.

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN: I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I thank you also for protecting me from eavesdroppers in an Assembly of Gentlemen. Any observation I addressed to you, Mr.

Deputy Speaker, is intended for the Chair; but any observation I address to my Friends is intended for them. I say that my taking my time, and not allowing myself to be disturbed or shaken from the sentence I am about to utter, will answer me just as well as if I attempted to talk in the midst of cries and interruptions. When I was told by my Friends to "Go on," I said that my pauses would do as well as anything else.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): Will the hon. and learned Member come to the point as to what he intends to do, because I think I will be able to explain to him that he is acting quite under a misapprehension.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN: If you tell me, Sir, that I am acting under a misapprehension, I will not continue, as I do not wish for an instant to occupy the time of the House unnecessarily.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): This is where the hon. and learned Member was mistaken. He rose to a point of Order as I myself rose to answer a point of Order, and he had no right to speak until the Deputy Speaker had resumed his seat. That is why I did not call on him.

THE O'DONOGHUE: The ostensible object of the hon. and learned Member was——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) called on Mr. NELSON to resume his address.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN: I think you will find I am in Order in the observation I am about to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that the House will find I wish to extract it from an unfair position. I made a Motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which, on your statement of the case, I wish to withdraw. Until I withdraw that Motion no one else can be heard. I beg to withdraw the Motion I made.

MR. NELSON thanked Mr. Deputy Speaker for his courtesy, and could assure him and the House that he would always receive the smallest contributions thankfully. He was a novice, and was only just learning the Forms of the House, which he should obey as long as he understood them. He had material for a dozen speeches in his hand; but he would just take at random an item from the bundle, to show how necessary it was for the House to adjourn to allow hon. Members an opportunity of going *seriatim* and deliberately through their objections to the Bill, and that the stake was of too much importance for them to hurry over the question at this hour of the morning. All he wanted was that the House should adopt a course of *festina lenti* if Irishmen were to be put into the position of culprits. Irish Members had not come there to obtain a character from English Members, although they were put upon their trial as culprits. They were the equals of English Members in intellect. Some hon. Members had spoken of the head being in one Lobby and the heart in another; but the heads and hearts of the Irish Members went together, and they would not be put upon their trial; and it was said, again, that Ireland had been committing outrages from Lough Mask in the one direction to the Riding School in Dublin in the other, and this statement the Irish Members wished to prove to be without foundation. The shortest way to get rid of such men as they were was to give them rope enough. If they hanged themselves it would only be *folo de se.* As to the battle, they were not afraid of it. They had only been skirmishing, and had not yet entered into the thick of the fight. People had charged them with having the spirit of murderers, and had described them as dissolute ruffians; but these charges he would not reply to. Their cause was rational, and was one of the head and the heart united, and was the cause, not only of the suffering people of Ireland, but, on a fair analysis of the whole subject, of Europe, and probably also would ultimately become the cause of America. ["Question!"] He heard the word "Question," badly pronounced, by some hon. Member, and in reply would observe that he was speaking to the Question — the Question of adjournment—and not at all with a desire to waste time. ["Oh!"] That emphatic "Oh!" no doubt meant that he was telling lies; but he could assure the House that he was speaking conscientiously, and not either as a Pharisee or as a pretended philanthropist of England.

MR. DAWSON declared that the Irish Members and the Irish people were on their trial; but the evidence was not yet complete, and that portion which had been laid before the House was not only incomplete, but insufficient. The present stage was like the first stage in a criminal trial—the finding of a true bill by the Grand Jury; and hon. Members, like members of a Grand Jury, had a right to be conscientious, and should not allow themselves to be guided by those who said—"Bring in a true bill, for if it is found to be not what it ought to be the case can be tried in the Court below." Every conscientious grand juror knew that he took the first step towards a conviction when he brought in a true bill; therefore, he ought not to allow it to be brought in unless there was the strongest *primâ facie* case for it. In the present case there was no *primâ facie* evidence in support of the Bill. ["Question!"] The Question was one of adjournment, and he wished that adjournment to take place, in order that the House might have time to study the Bill, which they had not yet done. If the case had reference to South Africa or Malta, or if it was merely a sugar question, they would see the Blue Books in the hands of every Member, and everyone would be studying the question; but in regard to the matter before the House he had never seen an official document in the hands of an hon. Member opposite. Let the matter be adjourned, so that hon. Members opposite could study the Blue Books. The Irish Members, who had studied the question, were anxious to have further Government Returns—were anxious to have the second Report dealing with outrages in December, because they knew that when it was forthcoming it would be seen by everyone that the case of the Chief Secretary was weaker; in fact, that it was totally incapable of substantiation. He remembered an anecdote of an eminent ecclesiastic who, at an hotel, having, in spite of numerous attempts, failed to attract the attention of the domestics, at last, in sheer desperation, broke something and was at once waited on. The Irish Members were in a similar situation. They had tried every pacific course—had adopted every measure that was mild, persuasive, and logical, but had failed, and now it was necessary for them to do something violent to wake up the Government. They must break something. The hon. Member for the City of Cork had not obtained that opportunity he desired of making an explanation that he was anxious to make. The Prime Minister had attributed to him words which he had not used; but he had not been allowed to clear himself. When the House silenced the hon. Member for the City of Cork, they silenced the Irish Members who were led by him; and when they silenced them they silenced Ireland, for they represented the majority of the people of that country. If there were any Rule that prevented the Prime Minister from making an explanation when occasion called for it, that and all Rules would have to give way. Let the English Members put themselves in the position of hon. Members from Ireland, and suppose that they represented England in a French Parliament, and suppose it was proposed by the French Government to suspend the liberties of the English Members and people——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is not adhering closely to the point before the House, which is the Question of the adjournment of the debate.

MR. DAWSON said, he was saying that if England were in the position in regard to France that Ireland was in in regard to England, English Members would adopt the course which the Irish Members were following. [An hon. MEMBER: No; we would not.] Then they would give up struggling against the French Parliament, and give up the liberties of the English people. ["Question!"] They would, at any rate, ask for an adjournment in such a position as the present——

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The introduction of the word "adjournment" is not sufficient to enable the hon. Member to depart from the Question before the House.

MR. DAWSON thought he had a right to say that if other hon. Members were in a similar position to that occupied by himself and his Friends they would do just as the Irish Members were now doing——

MR. MORGAN LLOYD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member has again transgressed the very Rule you have just laid down.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I have just told the hon. Member that I do not think he is speaking to the Question.

MR. DAWSON said, he would abandon this portion of his speech; and if he had in any way trespassed upon the patience of the Deputy Speaker or of the House he could assure them that it was the necessity of the case that had driven him to it.

MR. O'KELLY said, that if he wished for another argument beyond those already used in favour of adjournment he could not put a stronger one than by pointing to the clock (half-past 6 o'clock a.m.) He regarded the principle underlying coercion as bad under all circumstances, and whether the Bill was introduced to-night or to-morrow night he should oppose it. It would fail to accomplish the object for which it was intended; and it would, therefore, be a waste of time to proceed further with it. Certainly, he did not see why hon. Members should sacrifice their sleep in order to pass the measure; and many of them would be much better employed if they were in bed just now. Nothing that the Government could do would enable the Bill to be proceeded with more rapidly, because, according to the Rules of the House, the minority had a right to prevent any further progress being made; and as the Irish Members intended to exercise that right to the fullest extent, the Government were simply wasting time by prolonging the contest.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY: I wish to ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether the hon. Member is not treating the House with contempt, when he says that he intends to use the Forms of the House, not for the purpose of defeating this Bill, but for the purpose of preventing the progress of Business?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I did not receive the hon. Members remarks in that way. I understood him to mean that, considering the measure a bad one, he will do his best in every way to resist it.

MR. O'KELLY thanked Mr. Deputy Speaker for the fairness of his ruling. The difficulty the Irish Members experienced here was to get anything like a fair hearing, because there were a number of Gentlemen amongst them who were in the habit of interrupting, although no one knew anything about their ideas—if, indeed, they had any at all—and who seriously inconvenienced hon. Gentlemen like himself, who were not very used to public speaking. The opinions of the Irish Members ought to have considerable weight with the House, for they, as much as any English or Scotch Members, were the Representatives of the people, having been elected under the same Constitution and by the same method, and having exactly the same Constitutional standing in the House. His voice had—or ought to have—as much weight as the voice of any other Representative whose ability was not greater than his own; and, therefore, he was bound to say it was of more value than those of a great many Members on the other side of the House. They required an adjournment, in order that the question involved—this question of coercion—might be fully debated, and in order that more time might be given to Members in the House, and to the public outside, to consider what would really be the result of this coercion, if adopted. The House could have no particular object in passing a Coercion Bill, unless, by that method, they achieved some definite end. The Government expected to achieve a definite end; but the Irish Members denied it, and declared that, instead of giving peace to Ireland, it would cause disorder, and, instead of rendering life and property safe, it would render them more unsafe than ever. Being conscientiously convinced of these facts, they could oppose, to the fullest extent of their Constitutional right, the progress of the measure. It was in keeping with the history and antecedents of the Tories that they should look on the opposition of the Irish Members with dislike, if not with anger; and he held that the policy which underlay the measure was essentially a Tory policy.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD: I rise to Order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I submit that the hon. Member is going far beyond the Question now before the House.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (MR. LYON PLAYFAIR): I rose at the same time as the hon. and learned Member to draw the attention of the hon. Gentleman to the fact that he is travelling much further than the Question, which is simply one of the adjournment of the debate.

MR. O'KELLY considered that the debate ought to be adjourned, for the reasons that he had already alleged, and for the further reason that there was nothing to be gained by continuing this debate. He considered that the action taken by Her Majesty's Government this evening was one that was likely to bring discredit not only on themselves, but upon all Liberal Governments; and he, as a man whose sympathies, at least, were with Liberalism, though he might not be able to agree with the Gentlemen at present in power, was anxious that a Liberal Ministry should be saved from itself. The question whether the Bill was justifiable or not hinged on the fact whether the state of things alleged by the Chief Secretary for Ireland had any real existence or not. They had no proof whatever before them that the condition of outrage which the Chief Secretary so theatrically described the other night existed in Ireland or not, for the reason that the Returns on which the facts of the case must rest were not yet in the hands of hon. Members. Until the Returns giving details of these scenes of crime and outrage, which it was alleged had occurred in November and December, were before the House it was not possible for them properly to discuss the Bill. At present they had not sufficient data before them to form such an opinion of the measure as an intelligent man ought to form before lending himself to that which, in effect, would deprive a whole nation of its Constitutional liberty. He held that, without entering into the provisions of the Bill, the proposition of the Government *primâ facie* was not one which ought to be supported by any reasonable man.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 27; Noes 148: Majority 121.—(Div. List, No. 15.) [6.30 A.M. TUESDAY, FEB. 1.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. HEALY said, it seemed fitting that he should now offer some observations on the general question; and, at the outset, he would say that the manner in which the debate had been listened to and the good temper which had been displayed had been a pleasant feature in this discussion, which had been found wanting on previous occasions. He proposed to go through the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and to refute as many of the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman as he thought would show their insufficient character. The right hon. Gentleman had asked them to pass the measure on the ground that they were about to have a Land Bill. That argument had been well referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. C. Russell), who had asked —"Are we so sure that we are going to have a Land Bill?" and had reminded the House of the manner in which the Compensation for Disturbance Bill had been thrown out in "another place" last Session. How could they be sure that the fate which had attended the measure of last year would not wait on the Bill of the present Session? The right hon. Gentleman had then gone on to say that it would be his duty to show that person and property were not sufficiently protected, and that liberty was not secure in Ireland. Well, he (Mr. Healy) submitted that the right hon. Gentleman had failed to prove any one of the conclusions he had set out.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member, so far as I can hear, is speaking to the Main Question now, and not to the Question of adjournment.

MR. HEALY said, that was so. Mr. Deputy Speaker had exactly stated the conditions of the case, and he was happy to recognize the fairness with which the question had been put. He had been saying that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had stated that life and property were not secure in Ireland. Well, he (Mr. Healy) could speak from his own knowledge on this question, having been resident in that country during the whole time the alleged disturbances were going on; and he could say this as the result of his experience —that there were very few countries in which life and property were so secure as they were in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that there had been many exaggerations in the newspapers. Well, this was exactly the position taken up by the Irish Members, for they contended that it was the exaggerations on the question that had caused the panic. He thought he could easily explain to the House how these exaggerations had been got up. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had said that because these statements had appeared in the newspapers there must be some ground for them; but if the House would bear in mind that the chief organ of English opinion, the London *Times*—["No, no!"]—well, the chief organ of London opinion—["No, no!"]—at any rate, an influential organ of opinion, the London *Times*, was represented in Ireland by the Editor of *The Dublin Express*—the "Landlord Daily Express," the paper by which the Boycott expedition had been got up, and into which the landlords poured their daily woe—they would see what little value was to be attached to what they read in that paper concerning the Irish people. The Dublin Correspondent of *The Standard* was a gentleman who had been for many years engaged on the Dublin *Evening Mail*, and it was upon these two gentlemen that the English public had to rely for their information about Ireland. He submitted that if ever a history of any country was written by its enemies, that had been the case with Ireland. It was, therefore, not surprising that they had such bloated accounts of the condition of the country as got into the minds of the English public. That was how he explained the way in which panic was created in this country. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the facts he referred to had been furnished officially; but he characterized that statement as one of considerable hardihood, seeing that at the time the Blue Book was not in the hands of Members, and the right hon. Gentleman was, of course, safe in getting up his Bill, and making any statement he liked about crime and outrage. Irish Members had not had the least opportunity of examining the facts; and the right hon. Gentleman, on the principle that everything in Ireland was horrible, was able to say that everything was, in the highest degree, intolerable. Hon. Members had got the Blue Book next morning, and what did they find the alleged outrages to represent? One case was the breaking down of a few yards of wall; another was the breaking of a window; and another was the cutting of a telegraph wire. He was at a loss to understand how, even in the fertile imagination of the Irish Attorney General, the cutting of a telegraph wire was an agrarian offence; and he invited the right hon. Gentleman to explain how that constituted such an offence. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the entire number of outrages for the last 10 months had been 2,590; but if each of the cases had been committed by a single individual, that would not be a sufficient reason for suspending the liberties of 5,500,000 people; 2,590 outrages did not form a sufficiently large unclean bill of health upon which the House might be asked to give a Lord Lieutenant power to put in prison any person he chose, and keep him there for 18 months. He had considered the agitation in Ireland, the famine that preceded the agitation, the intense state of distress that had prevailed, and the way in which landlords had aggravated the distress by decisions on the bench, and by their general conduct. If this number represented so many individual cases, and each case was a serious case, the argument of the right hon. Gentleman was not a sufficient ground for suspending the Constitution. It was a very weak argument, and could not for a moment hold good. But what were the facts with regard to those outrages? Exclusive of threatening letters, there were only 1,337, and the matter actually came to this—Was the House prepared to suspend the liberties of 5,500,000 people on account of 1,337 outrages? He put it to the unflinching Members of the Radical Party whether, if there were 1,337 criminals in London, they would be prepared to suspend the Constitution? There was in London a standing criminal population of 50,000; and if they were not prepared to suspend the Constitution on that account in London, how could they suspend the liberties of Irish people because of 1,337 crimes? With regard to the threatening letters, the hon. Member mentioned that on Christmas Eve every one of the colonels of the regiments in Dublin had received a threatening letter, which, he supposed, was intended as a grim Christmas-box; and how could members of the Land League be acquainted with the proper names of all the Dublin colonels. These threats, therefore, were sent by someone well acquainted with military matters; and he submitted it was some Government official who wrote these letters. A number of threatening letters had been sent to the Irish Judges, and these were garnished by scraps of French which indicated a certain amount of education; and surely these were not sent by unlettered peasants. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that two-thirds of the entire cases of crime had been committed in the last three months of the last year. But it was strange that it was for two of those months, November and December, that they were asking for details. He made the unblushing statement that two-thirds of the crimes had been committed within the last three months of the year; but had carefully withheld from the House every detail of those crimes. That was not a fair way to treat Members of that House. They must be expected to approach Bills of that kind in a critical spirit; and he did not think the right hon. Gentleman should be surprised if they asked him for a little information with respect to the crimes of the last three months. They had not even the slightest idea when those particulars would be furnished; but in regard to the right hon. Gentleman's statement that the greater portion of the crimes had been committed in the last three months of the year, he would point out one extraordinary argument. The Prime Minister had said that the Land League meetings were dogged by the steps of crime, and he pointed out the great increase in December, together with the fact that there had been a great increase in the number of meetings; but he would point out that winter was the time which afforded the greatest facilities for crime; and it was well known that the number of crimes was greater in London in December than in June. In the same way, although the Land League meetings had reached the highest number in December, the increase of crime had not been caused by these meetings; but by the facilities afforded by the winter season for their commission. The right hon. Gentleman, dwelling on the statistics of crime, said, in Wexford, for the entire year, the crimes were 56, of which 48 occurred in the last three months. It was very disingenuous of the right hon. Gentleman not to have told the House that of those 48 something like three-fourths were threatening letters. The hon. Member read a telegram he had received a few nights ago from Wexford stating that the Grand Jury at the Quarter Sessions had not been sworn because there was no criminal business laid before them, and he also quoted a resolution passed by the Wexford Board of Guardians on the 29th of January, expressing their opinion that the country had never been in a more peaceable, orderly condition than it then was, as instanced by the fact that there had been no criminal business before the Grand Jury, and protesting emphatically against the introduction of coercive measures by the Government, and calling upon their Representatives to use every legitimate means in Parliament to prevent the passing of such a measure. He declared that the entire arguments of the right hon. Gentleman were unstable, and unworthy of being received by a great deliberative Assembly; and, criticizing the case mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman of a man named Peter Keohane who had been visited at night by a party, dragged from his house, stabbed, and otherwise ill treated, he asked that hon. Members should be allowed to see Peter Keohane in the flesh, for the right hon. Gentleman had not stated anything which would enable them to identify the man. Speaking of the alleged outrages on animals, he said that of the 300 or 400 cases given half of them were owing to the accursed Grand Jury system. If a man had a bad stack of hay, which, instead of being worth £3 or £4, was worth only 15*s*., he had only to get a boy to set fire to it and obtain compensation for it under the present system. He contended that if there were some popularly elected magistrates on the Bench who would go into these cases there would not be so many of them occurring as there were under this system. The right hon. Gentleman, to vary his narrative, had dealt with persons, and then with property, and then gone back to persons again, and he had given the case of a man named O'Donnell; but he had given no further clue to his identity than that he lived in Clare. He said that shots had been fired in that man's house, and had ventured to say that, on the following day, O'Donnell had gone and joined the Land League. That was a very safe statement, seeing that he had not said where the man was, in order that they might ascertain whether he had done that or not. If the right hon. Gentleman persisted in giving them such meagre details as that, so long he could not be surprised, even at such an advanced hour as that, that they asked him to produce his O'Donnell just as they had asked him to produce Peter Keohane. The Solicitor General for Ireland had been pathetic over the operations of the Land League Courts, just as though they were some secret tribunal carrying on their operations in the dark; but the fact was that the right hon. Gentleman was able to send one of those eternal policemen to attend any of those meetings at any time, and he submitted that Courts of that kind had been wrongly described. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the tremendous power of those Courts; but he had carefully abstained from giving a single sentence pronounced by those Courts. It had been alleged that those Courts were carried on by a system of terror; but the minds of the people in Ireland were too independent to be controlled in that way. The people of Ireland, in spite of England's conquest over them, had never admitted that conquest; and were they to be told that a people who had not submitted to the British Government for 700 years had succumbed to the Land League within 12 months? They had fought England in various ways, and would again. They had not always been successful, but they had tried to keep their backs straight and their faces to the enemy; and to say that the Land League had been able to subdue these people who had been described as "tameless, frank, and free," that they would yield to the most humiliating terms of submission within 12 months, was like talking of something from *Alice in Wonderland*. The right hon. Gentleman, in fact, had been indulging in a poetic imagination, of which he should not have believed him capable. The right hon. Gentleman had said that Judge Fitzgerald, in his Charge to the Grand Jury at Cork, had alluded to the failure of justice; but he himself had heard Judge Fitzgerald comment in the severest terms on the way in which magistrates sent up trivial cases to be tried, and on the way in which they kept women and their infants and children for months in prison without bail, who were afterwards discharged; and he ventured to think that if the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland was himself performing his usual functions at the Cork Assizes and witnessed these things he would be ashamed of the magistrates. So long as that system was possible in Ireland, so long would the Irish Members risk the censure of that House in trying to get it remedied; and he would be content to be considered a most objectionable person in taking the course he had pursued. Judge Fitzgerald, whenever he got the chance, condemned the land agitation in the blackest terms. Now, Judge Fitzgerald was simply a creature of the Crown, and the Crown overshadowed him and creatures like him in the Four Courts, Dublin, where there was an army of placemen without an independent spirit amongst them. It might be said that Judge Fitzgerald had nothing to expect from the Crown; but all the Judges had something to expect. Judge Lawson got a very nice thing in the Church Temporalities which added some thousands to his income. Baron Dowse had got a very agreeable peripatetic appointment as one of the Land Commissioners. He was well paid for it, and they were all well paid. Everything an Irish Judge or an Irish official did was well paid for, and in that way the Government had a continual pull and influence over its Irish officials; and, if Judge Fitzgerald was not expecting a Lord Chief Justiceship, he was expecting a pension or something else. It had been said that Judge Fitzgerald was an ornament to the Irish Bench. There was one country to which he thought Judge Fitzgerald would be an ornament, and that was Egypt. There was one place in that country which he would particularly ornament, and that was the banks of the Nile, for a greater old crocodile than Judge Fitzgerald never lived.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is considerably wandering from the subject before the House.

MR. HEALY, continuing, said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had also trotted out Judge Barry as having said at the Waterford Assizes that convictions could not be obtained, and that out of 205 jurymen summoned only 118 attended. For 118 out of 205 people to turn up to try men for picking pockets was a very decent proportion, and as large a proportion as would be obtained in London. The right hon. Gentleman said they did not attend because they dared not. Why did they not attend? Why did not a good many Members come to that House at an hour like the present? Was it because they dared not? It was not; it was because they suited their own convenience; and so did the jurymen at Waterford. With regard to the statements that convictions could not be obtained, it was a strange thing that the jurymen, who had come forward at Waterford, were the men who had given convictions; but the men who dared not come forward were the men who, perhaps, if they had done so, the Government would not have been glad to have, because they, perhaps, would have taken an independent view of the situation, and would not have returned convictions. With regard to the allegation that lawlessness prevailed because civil bill processes could not be served, the hon. Member said there was one thing that always put a stop to serving bill processes, and that was that the people had no money and no crops to meet them with. Then, again, the right hon. Gentleman said that no man in Ireland dared do anything against the laws of the Land League; but had the rule of England really placed Ireland in such a condition that the people preferred the rule of the "dissolute ruffians" who, it was said, had obtained a hold over them within 12 months? It was a confession of failure on the part of the Government, seeing that a few unknown nobodies started up in Ireland and, in the space of 12 months, were able to render the ordinary law powerless. If the people of the country did not sympathize with the Land League, how would they submit to the Land League law? It was by reason of this sympathy that the people were able to carry on their agitation. This was the right hon. Gentleman's own admission; but let him base his laws on justice and equity, and he would not find it necessary to ask for coercion. Until he was able to base his laws on the same grounds as the Land League based theirs, so long would they be able to claim that the Land League was a superior institution as a law-keeping and law-making body. The right hon. Gentleman complained that the ordinary law was powerless; there was one ordinary law that would not be powerless in Ireland, yet it was not an ordinary law, because they never got it in Ireland. If, instead of making Coercion Bills the ordinary laws, and Land Bills the exceptional laws, England would reverse the process, the ordinary law would not be powerless; but, based on the affections and interests of the people, it would be looked up to and obeyed. The right hon. Gentleman said—"We must arrest the criminals." That was exactly the position of the Irish Members. Why did he not arrest them? If he knew them, why did he not arrest them? The Irish police were not so nice and delicate like a surgeon handling a dangerous wound. Why did they not try a pot-shot at catching some of those criminals. He had a suggestion to make. The right hon. Gentleman said the police of each district knew the criminals. Well, let him name them in his Bill. And another suggestion he had to make was, that the right hon. Gentleman should name in his Bill the Petty Sessions districts where those criminals dwelt. He was gratified to see, after speaking for two hours, that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had returned to his place, for he (Mr. Healy) should not now have any longer "to waste his sweetness on the desert air." His experience of the country gentlemen and magistracy of Ireland was that they were the real "dissolute ruffians," the "village tyrants," who had nothing to do but to grind the people. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman, who lived within a wall of brass in Dublin Castle, knew nothing of the drunken, dissolute character of those men. He had never even been at the Strawberry Beds.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK rose to Order, and appealed to the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Lyon Playfair) as to whether the hon. Member was not deliberately wasting the time of the House in the course he was pursuing?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Gentleman is speaking to the Main Question, and in doing so has considerable latitude; but he will judge whether he is trying the patience of the House by the very long statement he is making, and whether some of his arguments have not been reiterated. I cannot say that, under existing Rules of debate, he is out of Order.

Mr. HEALY said, he was much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for his ruling. He proceeded to comment on the crass ignorance of the Chief Secretary for Ireland as to the condition of the country. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): Such expressions with regard to hon. Members of this House are not usual.

Mr. HEALY, resuming, disputed the necessity for coercion, and deprecated the retrospective character of the Bill. He strongly objected to it on that, as well as other grounds; for, under its provisions, it would be possible to arrest innocent persons, as, for instance, Sir Charles Duffy. He also doubted whether the Land Bill would ever get through the House of Lords.

Sir CHARLES REED rose to Order, and

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) said, the hon. Member could not discuss a Bill which was not yet at all before the House.

Mr. HEALY: Quite so; but he was referring to the remedial legislation which had been so often mentioned in the course of this discussion. The Irish minority knew they could not pass Bills, but they could prevent bad Bills from passing. That was a very important matter, and in that case they meant to try it.

Sir CHARLES REED asked whether the hon. Member was not now threatening Obstruction?

Mr. HEALY: I am not, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): What the hon. Member said, as I understood him, was that he and some other Irish Members would do all they could to prevent the passing of a particular measure. [Several hon. Members: Bad Bills.] That is not Obstruction. He is not out of Order.

Mr. HEALY said, that if the hon. Member opposite who interrupted was fighting for his people as they were fighting for theirs, he would be ashamed to act as they had done. But, notwithstanding the interruptions to which he had been subjected, he should still go on until he had finished his speech. In the same way the members of the Land League would stand to their guns; and if there were to be any such thing as going to prison, he, for one, was ready to go with them. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland said that if the evils of the Land system were removed, the outrages complained of would be no longer possible. He (Mr. Healy) rejoiced that he could concur heartily in that statement; but if the right hon. Gentleman was of that opinion, why did he not endeavour to remove the evils of the land system, instead of bringing in the present pettifogging Bill? But the right hon. Gentleman had been a contradiction all his life, and he had been elected by the Tories in Bradford.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD: I beg to ask, Sir, whether what has taken place in the career of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland has anything to do with the present debate?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I cannot say he is out of Order; but the hon. Gentleman is trying the patience of the House by his remarks.

Mr. HEALY: Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I will not try the patience of the House any longer, but will subside. I beg to conclude by moving the adjournment of the House.

Colonel The O'GORMAN MAHON: I beg to second the Motion. We have now been sitting for 17 hours, and I think we may now be permitted to retire to rest. There never was a more inquitous, unfounded, and unjust attack made upon a country than that which has been made upon my country; and, therefore, we are perfectly justified in the course we are taking.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Healy.*)

Mr. DALY supported the Motion. The hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. Healy) had referred, in support of his opposition to the Bill, to the Charge of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald. Well, he (Mr. Daly) had only to say that that learned Judge was as much under the influence of the whisperings of Dublin Castle as was the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland himself. There was no person between the four seas who knew better than did that astute Judge that his reading of threatening letters from the Judicial Bench was an advertisement for the writers of them, and a direct encouragement for their repetition. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald knew that such letters could only come from one class, and that was the semi-educated class in Ireland. ["Order!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) reminded the hon. Member that the Question before the House was the adjournment of the House, and not the Main Question.

Mr. DALY went on to say that a cogent and, indeed, one of the primary reasons for the adjournment of the House was to afford hon. Members a reasonable opportunity for considering the weighty arguments advanced by the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. Charles Russell), and of inquiring into and sifting the evidence which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had adduced as the foundation of his Coercion Bill. He (Mr. Daly) did not deny that grave and serious outrages had occurred in Ireland; that a certain amount of intimidation had been exercised; that what was called "Boycotting"—but to a very limited extent indeed—had taken place; but of this he was sure—that the more the Returns placed upon the Table were examined and tested, the more the House would be convinced that they afforded no just ground for depriving 5,000,000 of people of their liberty and privileges. With regard to "Boycotting," he maintained that it was a perfectly legal and Constitutional system, which it was perfectly fair and reasonable to resort to under certain circumstances; while as respected the constitution of the Land League, he would ask hon. Members to give their attention while he informed them as to the branch formed in Cork, of which he (Mr. Daly) was a member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) said, he failed to see what bearing these subjects had on the Motion before the House.

Mr. DALY, continuing, said the Irish Members would be guilty of gross dereliction of duty if they did not use every Form of the House to oppose the introduction of this Bill; and, speaking for himself, he should continue, to the last, to resist, until it had been made plain to him that there was a necessity for such a measure becoming law. It was no desire of theirs that the Business of the House should be suspended to allow that Bill to be carried; and it was a great mistake to suppose that Irish Members were sent to Parliament to obstruct the ordinary Business. He wished to refer to the immunity of the county of Cork from crime; for, in his opinion, it was a strong reason for the adjournment of the debate, so that a careful examination of the statistics should take place in order that the House should see the smallness of the percentage of crime in a constituency so large as that of Cork. In conclusion, he would make an earnest appeal to the House to avoid adding another to the long record of crimes which Ireland had registered against the English Parliament; and he would warn hon. Members who were now flocking in after a night's rest, which was denied to the Irish Members, that though they might resort to the force of numerical strength and continue to pour in fresh relays of hon. Members for a week, they never could, and never would, stifle the voice of the Irish Party, when they wanted to give expression to the grievances of their country.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, that the hon. Gentleman had warned the House against legislating in a panic; but he begged to assure him that there was no panic in the House, or in the Government, or in the country; but, on the contrary, a calm determination to put down lawlessness, outrage, and crime in Ireland. The country was determined that the scoundrels who were the police of the Land League, and who had hitherto carried out its behests, should no longer triumph over, and put violence on, the well-ordered and law-abiding portion of the people of Ireland; and he rejoiced to know that hon. Gentlemen opposite, who claimed to represent the people of Ireland, spoke the language of a small minority only of that people. It was a terrible thing to many Englishmen, who had friends in Ireland that the country was disgraced in the eyes of Europe by the outrages and atrocities that were committed there; and he would ask those hon. Gentlemen, what had they done to discountenance them? Something better might have been expected from hon. Members opposite, some of whom had been well born and well educated. Foreigners were beginning to understand that it was not the English who oppressed Ireland, but the Irish who oppressed one another. The last half-century of English government had done all that could be done to improve the condition of the Irish people. One law after another had been passed with that object. [*Cries of* "What law?"] Well, taxation had been lightened and the sale of encumbered estates facilitated. If the latter measure had not benefited the country so much as it was hoped it would, it was because the owners of estates had not gone to reside in a country where a course was pursued which had the effect of neutralizing the objects which those laws were intended to bestow, by driving capital out of the country, without which it could never be prosperous.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) interposed, and pointed out to the hon. Baronet that the Question was not a Land Bill, but simply the adjournment of the House.

SIR HARRY VERNEY said, he had simply intended to reply to the strictures which had been passed upon English government in Ireland; but he would, of course, bow to the ruling of the Chair.

MR. O'SULLIVAN said, that it was very refreshing to see one of the new relays, the hon. Baronet the Member for Buckingham (Sir Harry Verney), come down so fresh from a good night's sleep to give them his opinions as to how Ireland ought to be governed. The hon. Baronet had said that the Irish Members spoke for only a small section of the Irish people. They knew, however, that they represented not only the majority, but the vast majority, of the Irish people; and he would instance his own election as an illustration of the fact. He was elected by a majority of 3,000 over his opponent, while the hon. Baronet was only elected by a majority of 8 against his opponent.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether the remarks of the hon. Gentleman are applicable?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I do not see how they are in the least applicable.

MR. O'SULLIVAN, resuming, urged that the measure was not required, his country never being freer from crime than at the present moment, and that the game of the landlord party was to keep up terror in Ireland in order to get coercion, so as to enable them to collect exorbitant rack rents.

MR. R. T. REID asked whether the hon. Member was in Order?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I must draw the hon. Member's attention to the fact that he is not in Order.

MR. O'SULLIVAN, resuming, addressed himself to the subject of the Returns, when——

SIR HENRY TYLER again asked if the hon. Member was in Order?

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN: I beg to be heard on this question of Order. I wish to point out that there is a serious difference between Motions for the adjournment of the debate and Motions for the adjournment of the House. It is quite true that, according to the usages of Parliament, the Speaker will hold a Member to a rather strict line on Motions for the adjournment of the debate; but, if necessary, I can show that Lord Palmerston and other statesmen, during the last 40 years, have made speeches about China, Greece, and Turkey, and other subjects, on Motions for the adjournment of the House.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. and learned Member for Meath (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) is right, no doubt, on the Motion for the adjournment of the House as a Main Question, but not on a Motion for the adjournment of the House pending a debate.

MR. O'SULLIVAN resumed, and immediately afterwards——

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK asked, whether the hon. Member (Mr. O'Sullivan) was not disregarding the authority of the Chair?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) said, he thought the hon. Member was speaking under a misapprehension, and was not wilfully disregarding the authority of the Chair. He must remind him, however, that the Main Question was not before the House, but merely the adjournment.

MR. O'SULLIVAN, resuming, said, he would try to obey the ruling of the right hon. Gentleman, and, in conclusion, would merely ask the House to agree to the Motion for adjournment as a matter of simple justice to the Irish people, because it was of vital importance that statistics of crime should be examined before this Coercion Bill was passed.

MR. DILLON pleaded for an adjournment, on the ground that the Irish Members required further time to counteract the horrible conspiracy which was going on throughout the length and breadth of England to inflame the minds of the people of England against Ireland. He found, on the occasion of a recent visit to the North of England, that the greatest alarm existed, infamous reports having been circulated that the Irish intended to blow up the towns and commit other atrocities.

Sir HENRY TYLER wanted to know if such remarks were in Order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) said, that he understood that the hon. Member was asking for further time, in order that the Irish Members might have an opportunity of contradicting misrepresentations, and, in doing so, he was in Order.

Mr. DILLON went on to say that the temper of the country was unjust to the Irish cause, owing to the false rumours which had been purposely circulated. For instance, it was publicly stated in Manchester that the Irish intended to poison the wells of that city. He could not absolve the Liberal Party with respect to this matter. They had taken advantage of the state of public feeling which it excited to pass their coercive measures before the English people understood the Irish case, which they were now, fortunately, beginning to do. It was a sinister omen that while the Irish Members were struggling against a measure intended to strike down the liberties of their country, they should be assailed all over England by these extraordinary rumours of blowing up barracks and workshops. From invitations he had received to address meetings in the Provinces of England, he was glad to say that the English people were anxious to hear their case; and he implored the House to stay the passage of this Bill until the Irish Party had an opportunity of setting public opinion right upon the question, for he had to complain that the speeches of the Irish Members were not reported in the English newspapers, while the speeches of the Prime Minister were fully reported, and read by every man in the country. Members on the other side of the House had now entered into a conspiracy of silence, and no attempts were made to answer the arguments put forward; but a conspiracy had also been entered into to prevent hon. Members, who intended to do so, giving the Irish Members their support. By the course of conduct they had adopted, the Ministers of the Crown were contributing to the disgrace of Parliament, and he thought they were beginning now to see that they were losing rather than saving time in attempting to pass this measure by brute force. All the Irish Members asked was another adjournment.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY urged, as a strong reason why the debate should be further adjourned, that the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had not been able to reply to the attack made on his character by the Prime Minister; and if he had yielded to the wish of the right hon. Gentleman, he would have stood up to do so after 1 o'clock that morning. He (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) asserted that the entire public opinion in Ireland was against coercion, and the Government were acting unwisely in pressing the Bill through Parliament. The merchants, the farmers, the clergy—all were opposed to it, and it was only the land classes, whose opinions were not worth much, who were in favour of it. The object of the Bill was not to put down the outrages which, undoubtedly, had arisen, but to suppress the agitation itself. The magistracy of Ireland would have the execution of the Bill, and that magistracy existed only to put down agitation.

Sir HENRY TYLER: I rise to Order. I wish to know if the hon. Gentleman is in Order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): Order, order! [The hon. Gentleman had just sat down.]

Mr. O'Shaughnessy again rising——

Sir HENRY TYLER: I beg to say that the hon. Gentleman has not sat down——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): Order, order! I do not think the hon. Member was out of Order.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he was only about to conclude by urging on the House that the measure was so unjust and so undeserved by the Irish people, that the Irish Members were, in common fairness, entitled to discuss it at reasonable length. If the Chief Secretary for Ireland's Bill was forced through, the administration of its provisions would be entrusted to Irish magistrates. The Irish magistrates would do everything possible to put down the Land agitation; and if they succeeded in doing so, the Irish people would never get remedial legislation. Therefore, he felt justified in prolonging as long as possible the time when the Irish magistrates would obtain that power; and taking into account the grave injustice and impolicy of the measure, he thought the Irish Members were entitled to demand at least another night for its discussion.

MR. A. M. SULLIVAN said, the course the Irish Members were taking was one of a very unusual character, and would be very censurable if they were raising the issue upon any but a Bill of the first magnitude, and of such an accursed nature as the one before the House. In asking for an adjournment, the Irish Members were fortified by this distinction between the Coercion Bill and any other measure ever heard of—that its clauses were to be taken *seriatim*, and passed through the House at one Sitting with one discussion, and by a suspension of all the stages that mark the passage of ordinary Bills. With regard to obstructive tactics, he would ask the attention of hon. Members to a debate on a Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill, in which English Members resorted to more of what would be called Obstruction than had been attempted in this case; and surely there was no comparison between the suspension of the Habeas Corpus and a Turnpike Act. There was not a volume of *Hansard* in which many like cases might not be found, and where contentions for adjournment, resisted by the Government in an attempt to rush an important Bill through Parliament, eventually succeeded in favour of those who pleaded for deliberation before the liberties of the people were frittered away. In former times men fought for the Bill of Rights at the peril of their heads; his Friends were as great to Ireland as those Noblemen were to England in that hour; his Friends represented in that House the national will and wish of the Irish people as truly as the patriotic Noblemen who fought for the Bill of Rights. The course pursued by the Government looked like pushing through the Bill at one continuous Sitting; and he would, therefore, appeal to the Government for a little time, and not to exhibit to the people of Ireland a hungry avidity for stealing away their rights. He believed that if the House was adjourned, they would return at 4 o'clock in the afternoon with clearer intellects, and that every advantage would result from further deliberation. They might then resume the discussion, and, after debate, a division on the Main Question might be taken. As a further reason for adjournment, he would relate to the House the substance of a conversation he had with a leading member of the Land League, whom he had the honour of defending in the miserable and abortive prosecution in Dublin. He advised that gentleman to use all his influence with every official of the Land League and the people to avoid the slightest conflict with the authorities and the police, or anything that would lead to civil commotion or strife. His friend said that if they had even the usual period of deliberation over the Bill, they would have the people so adjured and so addressed that every vestige of crime and outrage would disappear from the country in a fortnight; but his friend remarked that if this Bill were forced through, the leaders of the Land League could not undertake to be responsible for the conduct of the people of the country. In conclusion, he adjured his Friends to stand out to the last, for he had not read English history in vain; and, though they might be scorned and denounced now, Englishmen themselves would yet do them justice. He had taken part in more than one All-night Sitting, and he felt bound to acknowledge that last night nothing had occurred which was not characterized by that good feeling which he hoped would be continued unbroken.

MR. BIGGAR said, that he had been urged from all parts of the county he was connected with to oppose the Bill; but he had not yet had an opportunity of doing so. The Government had been paying spies to give them information which, if he had an opportunity, he could prove was worthless.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) said, the hon. Gentleman was going beyond the limits of the discussion.

MR. BIGGAR said, he was much obliged for his attention being called to his departure from the subject; but really he was desirous of showing that the Government should make independent inquiries respecting the reports furnished to them. They should not exhibit a want of information with regard to matters of which they should be correctly informed, and he thought that a reason why the House should adjourn. He really thought that the Government should look to their own interest in the matter.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) called the hon. Member to Order, saying that he had already called attention to the fact that he was going beyond the limits of discussion.

MR. BIGGAR proceeded to say that the Government should take time to inform themselves on these outrages. He thought that the House should have an opportunity of knowing the real facts of the case before a Bill was introduced which the Irish Members believed to be unnecessary. As an evidence of the unreliable character of the evidence adduced by the Government, he pointed to the fact that no jury would Convict on it.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS, rising to Order, said: I appeal to the Deputy Speaker whether the remarks of the hon. Member are not entirely irrelevant, and only wasting the time of the House?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I was waiting a little to see if I could observe the relevancy of the hon. Member's remarks; but they now appear to me entirely irrelevant.

MR. BIGGAR: I am sure I apologize to the House; and I only wanted to urge the desirability of not hurrying legislation.

MR. BARRY supported the Motion for adjournment. This was no mere matter of franchise, but a question involving the most cherished right of freemen—the right of personal liberty. The Statements laid on the Table were, in the main, fallacious, and he considered that the Irish Members ought to be allowed to make out their overwhelming case. He had to complain that they had not got the Agrarian Reports for November and December, which formed the foundation-stone of the case of the Government. Before the Government proceeded with the Bill they were bound to give the House full details of what were called agrarian outrages for November and December. He, therefore, asked for time. He had strong reason, too, for believing that the diminution of agrarian crime in Ireland recently afforded good ground for the assumption that a further diminution would take place; and, therefore, it was undesirable and unjust to force this measure through the House, while the minds of hon. Members were excited against the Irish Party.

MR. FINIGAN maintained that the working classes of England, not the landlord interest, not the Whig interest, not the territorial interest, so powerfully represented in the present Whig Government, had the right to demand that the terms of indictment against the Irish nation should be clearly laid before them. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had placed on the Table a most venomous Report, consisting of garbled and erroneous statements. They were entitled to time to examine into these false statistics. He would mention a case which was said to have occurred in County Clare——

SIR HENRY TYLER, appealing to the Deputy Speaker, asked if those epithets were in Order?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) said, he did not think that, though the hon. Member had employed strong expressions, he could rule them out of Order.

MR. FINIGAN proceeded. He used the word "venomous," to which an hon. Member seemed to take objection, in a purely Parliamentary sense. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had presented a most garbled Report, and time ought to be allowed in which to examine the false statistics, false statements, and false issues. The right hon. Gentleman, with that nonchalance of a Minister used to the trickery of debate, exhibited an indignation amounting to Pecksniffian feeling, and had spoken with a depth of feeling which he could "so well assume" when occasion suited him——

MR. STAVELEY HILL: Order, order!

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) ruled that the hon. Member was travelling beyond the courtesies of debate.

MR. FINIGAN said, he was endeavouring to show that the House ought to have more time to examine the false statistics——

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I rise to Order, Sir. You have already ruled that the observations of the hon. Member were out of Order. I put it to you, whether he is not disobeying your ruling?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I understand the hon. Member wishes to make out a case for more time. If he endeavours to do that, without again transgressing the courtesies of debate, he will be in Order.

MR. FINIGAN, resuming, contended that the national gravity of the case demanded that an adjournment should take place. The Government were obstructing Public Business by their obstructive and coercive policy. The Prime Minister prided himself that he had England with him; he (Mr. Finigan) and his Colleagues could congratulate themselves that the whole of Ireland was against the right hon. Gentleman. At an Orange meeting held yesterday in Ulster, resolutions were adopted declaring that no case had been made out for coercion——

MR. GREGORY: We are now on the Question of adjournment. Is any reference to a public meeting in Order?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): If the hon. Member speaks of a public meeting in reference to the question of coercion, he is out of Order.

MR. FINIGAN expressed his surprise at the impertinent interruption. ["Order, order!" *and* "Withdraw!"]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member used an expression which ought not to be applied to any hon. Member of this House. ["Withdraw, withdraw!"]

MR. FINIGAN, resuming, said, he withdrew it with great pleasure. The ordinary law was amply sufficient to cover the whole field of agrarian and other outrages, and what was wanted was to impress on the Government the necessity of putting that law into regular and fair execution. The House could gain nothing by further resisting adjournment. If the Government would not consent to the adjournment, it would prove that they had neither confidence in the people of England nor in their own envenomed indictment. He denied that the Government was the Government of the "three F's." It was rather the Government of the "three E's"—the three errors. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR), interposing, said, the hon. Member was again getting dangerously near being called to Order by the Chair, and he would strongly recommend him to confine his observations to the Question before the House.

MR. FINIGAN said, he felt the difficulty of keeping a safe course and avoiding a hard fate at the hands of a hard House, as he knew he was steering between the Scylla of Whiggery and the Charybdis of Toryism——

MR. HEALY, interposing, said, he had heard an hon. Gentleman opposite shouting across the floor the word "Disgraceful!" He asked whether that was a proper epithet to be applied to any Member of the House?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR) replied, that no such expression as that referred to had reached his ears.

MR. FINIGAN, resuming, said, that until he had heard some better arguments, and until less malice was introduced into the debate, he should feel justified, within the Forms of the House, in withstanding a measure which would better befit a Czar, a Napoleon III., or a Bismarck.

MR. T. C. THOMPSON said, when he left the House last night he left it a Parliament, a House in which men might express their opinions freely; but when he returned that morning he only found it an Assembly guided by physical force. He was afraid that if any future historian wished to describe this Parliament in a word, he must call it "the benighted Parliament." Up to a certain hour of the night reason and order and everything that should dignify the most august Assemblage in the world prevailed; but after they had passed the small hours of the morning, wrangling began, and Parliament ceased. It then became a question, not whether they should conduct themselves like men, but whether they were not to be sent to bed in detachments, and to rise in detachments, like the beasts of the field. The present, however, was not an occasion which, in his opinion, called for such action. In the House generally they were impatient of argument after a certain time. Now, on the one side they were men of nobility of character, of weight; whilst on the other side was a band of young intelligent men contending for what? Contending for the liberties of their country. When he looked at that Assembly, as he entered the House that morning, he was reminded of an old etching of a young man playing at chess with the Evil One for his soul. All the pieces of the young man had been taken but one. And so with this band of young men—on this last debate hung their hope of freedom. If Englishmen were placed in the same position, there would not be a single man who would not feel it his duty to oppose to the last the suspension of the liberties of his country. Then, why not listen to the arguments of hon. Gentlemen opposite? [*Cries of* "Oh!"] The speeches of the hon. and learned Member for Meath (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) and of the hon. Member for Carlow County (Mr. Gray) suggested a great many new views on the question then in debate—new, at least, to his mind—and he, therefore, thought the House did not show a spirit of fair play when it refused to adjourn to give time for a fair hearing of those further arguments which it was proposed to bring forward. An offer had been made to close the debate after another night; and if hon. Members would promise to bring the discussion to a close in a reasonable time, then he thought they were not acting as Englishmen, they were not acting as men, they were forgetting the dignity of human nature, if they preferred their own convenience in order to check those Gentlemen who were speaking for the independence and freedom of their country.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, that the speech of the hon. Member who had just spoken (Mr. T. C. Thompson) was a splendid vindication of Irish Members from the accusations that had been brought against them since the Motion for adjournment had been made. He wished to recall attention to the fact, that whilst the Prime Minister suggested that the debate should close at one Sitting, he did not appeal to the House as to the absolute necessity for so closing it. With regard to the course taken by the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), he must make one remark. When the right hon. Gentleman was in Office he met the opposition to the Prisons Bill in a fair and gentlemanly manner; but now it was amusing to see the interest which the right hon. Gentleman had shown in the matter of checking the debate, and which could only be accounted for on the supposition that he had discovered that the Government had entered on a very unpopular course, and was anxious to help them to work out their own destruction. Her Majesty's Government could not establish the fact that coercion was necessary for the re-establishment of order in Ireland. Whatever social agitation existed there had diminished. It was said that was because there was a prospect of coercion. Whatever the reason, the fact remained. He had always noticed that whenever Parliament was sitting, agitation in Ireland diminished. Perhaps that was because some of the leading agitators had transferred the agitation elsewhere. But, at any rate, there was now no agitation in Ireland, and a Coercion Bill was altogether unnecessary. He would be willing to give absolution to Her Majesty's Government if even now they would, at the eleventh hour, rise and, with a brief apology for their mistake, withdraw the Bill. He could assure them that such a message of peace would do more for the pacification of the country than this obnoxious measure, which was altogether unnecessary. But no Irish Member could justify himself to his own constituents if he did not oppose coercion to the utmost. He hoped, therefore, that his hon. Friends would continue to move the adjournment again and again until the Government consented to it, and allowed a period of repose for reconsidering the question.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he rose to support the Motion for adjournment. He did not see any reason for urgency in the coercion measure, nor for carrying it with an ugly rush. Why not then adjourn the discussion on that measure, and have a turn at the remedial legislation. That was the only legislation that was urgent. Hon. Members were asked to trust to the wisdom and mercy of the Chief Secretary for Ireland that the Coercion Act would be properly carried out; and they had been told that, under its provisions, no man would be arrested without reasonable suspicion. In Ireland, therefore, they were to have "reasonable suspectors." Who were the reasonable suspectors to be? The landlords? [*Cries of* "Question!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is speaking on the Main Question now, and the Question is as to the adjournment.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he would bow to the decision of the Chair. [The hon. Member then proceeded to quote an opinion of Curran amid loud cries of "Order!" and "Question!"]

Lord JOHN MANNERS rose to Order. He wished to know, whether the hon. Member, his observations having been ruled to be irregular, was not now, by continuing such observations, contesting the decision of the Chair?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is now proceeding in the course I pointed out to him as being irregular, and I hope he will take that as a warning.

MR. GILL said, that if it were unusual to debate the introduction of a Bill, it was still more unusual that three such long and acrimonious speeches in support of a Bill of the kind should have been made by right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench. If the debate was protracted, it was owing, in a great measure, to the interruptions to which Irish Members were subjected from both sides of the House, but especially from hon. Gentlemen on that (the Opposition) side, who rose to Order on every possible and impossible opportunity. The result was, that the arguments of Irish Members were not listened to with the attention they deserved; and, as a further consequence, they were not reported in the London journals. There was one hon. Member on the Opposition side who had kept as close and careful a watch on the lips of the Irish Members as was ever kept at the door of a Masonic lodge by any tyler. Another reason why a longer time should be given for discussion was the publication of the Coercion Bill, which was admitted on all hands to be stringent beyond expectation. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Question!"]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (MR. LYON PLAYFAIR) called the hon. Member to Order, saying that he could not discuss a Bill not before the House.

MR. GILL, resuming, said, it was a good reason for adjournment that time might be given the Irish Members for showing that the outrages brought forward by the Government were for the most part of a trivial kind and would not justify coercion. Besides, they had got no analysis of the November and December outrages; while in the first fortnight of January, and still more in the second fortnight, crimes had so much diminished that the right hon. Gentleman would not be justified in bringing in a Coercion Bill. Gentlemen were never in a hurry to press on remedial measures; it was only coercive measures that were forced on, and in that, the Government were always sure of the assistance of the Conservative Party. It was not unreasonable, therefore, to ask for a short adjournment, say, until 4 o'clock.

MR. LALOR said, he had never had much faith in the Government or Parliament. For the last 50 years he had observed that there was always obstruction in passing measures of reform for Ireland, while coercive measures were always rushed through. All the arguments were in favour not only of the adjournment of the debate and of the House, but of dropping the Coercion Bill. Crime had decreased, and no case had been made out for urgency in the introduction of the Bill, or even for its necessity.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR supported the Motion for adjournment, because there were various reasons why such a course was absolutely required. In the first place, Irish Members had not had time to examine the Returns, which the Chief Secretary for Ireland did not produce until he had pledged the House and his Colleagues to a policy of coercion. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) believed one-half of the cases would utterly disappear if time were given to examine them. [The hon. Member then proceeded to cite from the Returns several cases in the county of Galway, remarking on each case, and reiterating at tedious length that he would like to make inquiry whether the persons charged with the crimes were respectable people or not, and what the character of the police who had reported against them was?——]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is within Order in referring, as an illustration, to these Returns; but it is not necessary to go through these details, as the House quite understands the argument.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR remarked, that he had only taken five typical cases out of a total of 35 in the East Riding of Galway; and he would next proceed to point out, with reference to 154 cases in the West Riding, that the same necessity to test each case existed. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had suggested a Select Committee to inquire into the Returns; but even a Royal Commission to inquire into them would not have been unreasonable where the liberties of a people were concerned.

An hon. MEMBER: Really, Mr. Speaker, I must ask whether the hon. Member is in Order in going into all these details of the Blue Book?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is in Order in selecting a few typical illustrations.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR reminded the hon. Member that his own Question was not in Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member must address the Chair.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR resumed. He had, when interrupted, been merely showing cause why the debate should be adjourned. The Government justified that All-night Sitting on the ground that they were backed by the opinion of English and Scotch constituencies; but they did not say they were backed by the constituencies of Ireland, and if time were only granted, the Irish Members would be able to show that they were not backed by popular feeling even in England or Scotland. The only party in Ireland who were in favour of coercion were the magistrates, who were panting for an opportunity of taking away the liberties of the poor people who had, for a short time, been relieved from the thaldrom under which they had so long suffered. The opposition of the Irish Members to this Bill was supported unanimously, or almost unanimously, by public opinion in their own country; and he and his hon. Friends asked for a decent interval—say a fortnight—between the stages of the measure, to enable them to test public opinion in England and Scotland, which, he believed, was not on the side of the Government. In that view, he asked the attention of hon. Members to several letters from miners in the North of England and other bodies throughout the country, as well as from individuals, expressing their sympathy with what they termed the Irish National Party, small as it was, in the efforts to resist the action of the Government which they were engaged in making. He had himself attended several meetings in England composed of English Radicals, at which resolutions were passed pledging those present to the opinion that force was no remedy for the ills of Ireland. Another reason why he wanted time was to enable the Chief Secretary for Ireland, if the right hon. Gentleman could, to convert him into being a supporter of the Government, by showing that the Bill would apply only to the village blackguard, and by scheduling the village blackguard. He wanted time also to allow the Prime Minister to study thoroughly the details of the latest Returns. He wished to know whether the Government were preparing cells at Mountjoy and other Irish prisons to receive that large harvest of prisoners which was about to be placed in them under the Bill?

Lord JOHN MANNERS rose to Order, and asked the Deputy Speaker whether the hon. Member was not practically contesting the ruling of the Chair?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) understood that the hon. Gentleman was abandoning one point, and was about to enter upon a fresh one, just when the noble Lord rose.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker. I abandoned that as I do every point to which you object in your ruling. But I ask that hon. Members will not interrupt me, because I am speaking under considerable disadvantages in consequence of the narrow limits of the discussion, and of the large number of subjects to which I think it my duty to refer. I want more time, in order that the Prime Minister may hear the answers to the questions which I shall put to the Chief Secretary for Ireland. ["Question!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is certainly now going beyond the Question before the House, and I must ask him to take this as the first warning.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I most respectfully and attentively note the warning you have given, and I abandon that point also. Reference has, in the course of this debate, been made to trades unions. ["Order!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair) again interposed, reminding the hon. Member that the subject of trades unions was referred to in the discussion of the Main Question, and he did not see how it could apply to the Question of adjournment.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR explained that his intention was to show what serious misapprehensions were due to the precipitancy of statements made by right hon. Gentlemen on the subject of trades unions. He would, however, content himself with once more protesting against the manner in which the Bill was being hurried through the House, thereby preventing a fair opportunity for the expression of public opinion outside, and a free and frank discussion of the measure in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER returned to the House, and resumed the Chair.

[1.25 P.M. TUESDAY, FEB. 1.]

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. PARNELL: Sir, I wish most respectfully to call your attention to a question of Privilege with reference to one of the Standing Orders of this House which I shall read to you, and which will, I think, substantiate the position I take. I find that the Standing Order of the 20th of July, 1865, provides that—

> "Whenever the House shall be informed by the Clerk at the Table of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means shall perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker in relation to all proceedings of this House, as Deputy Speaker, until the next meeting of the House, and so on from day to day on the like information being given to the House until the House shall otherwise order; providing that if the House shall adjourn for more than 24 hours, the Deputy Speaker shall continue to perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker for 24 hours only after such adjournment."

In pursuance of this Standing Order, the House, I believe, was informed last night that you, Sir, were unavoidably absent, and the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Lyon Playfair), under these Standing Orders, took the Chair in your absence. But I find a distinct direction in the Standing Order that—

> "Having taken the Chair, the Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means do perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker in relation to all proceedings of this House as Deputy Speaker until the next meeting of the House."

My point, Sir, is that the Deputy Speaker, in retiring from the Chair, has infringed this Standing Order. The Standing Order makes provision for the taking of the Chair by the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and directs that he shall perform your duties and exercise your authority in relation to all the proceedings of this House until the next meeting of this House. I think that this declaration is most explicit, and that it is impossible to get over it. I have always understood that the Standing Orders of this House can only be suspended or repealed on Notice of Motion, unless by the entire or unanimous consent of the House. Motions to suspend the Standing Orders have occasionally been made without Notice, but only with the practical unanimity of the House. But in this case the House has not been consulted, and I submit that the Standing Order has been broken through without the authority of the House—without any opportunity being afforded to the House of expressing its opinion as to whether the Standing Order should be suspended or not—and I humbly maintain that, whether inadvertently or not, it is, on the part of the Chair, an exercise of original authority which, with all respect, I venture to submit, does not rest with the Chair. It is not for me to go into what the motives of the House may have been at the time the Standing Order was passed in 1865. I must assume that the wisdom of Parliament in those days felt itself justified in providing that when the Chairman of Committees had taken the Chair, in the unavoidable absence of the Speaker, that he should continue to perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker in relation to all proceedings of the House until the next meeting of the House, and so on from day to day until the House should otherwise order. The only Proviso I find is one at the end of the Standing Order, which provides that if the House shall adjourn for more than 24 hours the Deputy Speaker shall continue to perform the duties for 24 hours only. That is the only exception in the whole of the Standing Order; and I submit, Sir, that if we are to be bound by the Standing Orders of this House, the only course we can adopt is that the Chairman of Committees shall return to the Chair and continue, as directed by the Standing Order to

> "Perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker in relation to all the proceedings of this House, and so on from day to day."

I do not know whether I should be in Order in moving that as a matter of Privilege; but I think I shall, most probably, put myself in Order by moving, as a matter of Privilege—

> "That the retirement of the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means from the Chair is a Breach of the Standing Order of the 20th of July, 1865."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) is not entitled to make the Motion he proposes to make, as a matter of Privilege. I am quite aware of the existence of the Standing Order to which the hon. Member has called the attention of the House. That Standing Order is enabling only, and it provides for the appointment and duties of the Deputy Speaker, during the unavoidable absence of the Speaker. If that absence should continue until the Sitting of the House is closed, it provides for the execution of his duties until its next sitting; but it does not assume to restrain the inherent authority of the Speaker himself, in the event of his resuming the Chair, while the House is still sitting. In that case his unavoidable absence is at an end; he is in the Chair again, and exercises the authority of his Office. Under the present circumstances I do not consider that the Standing Order has any application.

The following is the entry on Votes:—

[And objection being taken to the regularity of the Deputy Speaker leaving the Chair, based upon the terms of the Standing Order of the 20th July, 1855.

Mr. Speaker ruled that this Standing Order is enabling only, and provides for the appointment and duties of the Deputy Speaker, during the unavoidable absence of the Speaker. If that absence should continue until the Sitting of the House is closed, it provides for the execution of his duties until its next Sitting; but it does not assume to restrain the inherent authority of the Speaker himself, in the event of his resuming the Chair, while the House is still sitting. In that case his unavoidable absence is at at end: he is in the Chair again, and exercises the authority of his Office.

Mr. Speaker, under the present circumstances, did not consider that the Standing Order had any application.]

Mr. LEAHY said, he should support the Motion, as he wished to examine the Reports of the outrages which had been, as alleged, committed in the County Kildare.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the Question before the House was that of the adjournment of the House. He must call upon the hon. Member to confine his observations to the Question.

Mr. LEAHY said, he referred to the case in order to show that if the House adjourned, he would be able to obtain proof that the case in question was not one of threatening at all. There was another case in the Return relating to Kildare County, which he would also be able to disprove.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was not in Order in referring to the case.

Mr. LEAHY resuming, said, he wanted an opportunity of proving that some of the magistrates in Ireland ought not to be entrusted with the powers which were placed in their hands. He had several cases which, if the House would adjourn, he could substantiate.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR supported the adjournment, partly because it could be shown that the country was not with the Government, and partly because these protracted Sittings derogated from the dignity of the House, which was made a pattern for Representative institutions. The most obvious reason, however, for adjourning was that they were all in a state of exhaustion after the Night's Sitting. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He maintained that those who had been giving an intelligent attention to the Question before the House must necessarily be wearied after the night's debate.

Mr. SPEAKER said, he would call the hon. Member's attention to the Question before the House.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR, resuming, said, that another reason for adjourning was to be found in the character of the documents laid before them, purporting to represent the amount of crime in the country. He repudiated the charge put forward against the Irish Members of having resorted to obstructive tactics to stay the passage of the measure—they were merely doing their duty, and were not prompted by motives of obstruction.

Mr. BRADLAUGH saw good reason why the House should not adjourn. As he understood the essence of Parliamentary government, it was that a decision should rest with the majority after the minority had had full opportunity of being heard in stating their case. The minority, nevertheless, should be generously treated, and a wide latitude allowed for the expression of opinion on a matter which infringed the rights of those whom they represented. Disagreeing, as he most thoroughly did, with the Government on the Main Question, he felt bound to say that the fullest latitude had been conceded to the minority on this occasion. It was perfectly true, as had been repeated over and over again during that long and weary Sitting, that some hon. Members from Ireland had not yet spoken on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons); but it was also true that though that might be technically pleaded, still, as a matter of fact, every one of the hon. Members who desired to do so had spoken once at least, and some of them many more times, since that Amendment was proposed. He desired to say not one word that would add bitterness to the extremely bitter conflict that would be gone through before these debates were finished; but he thought it right to rise because of words that fell from the hon. Member for Durham (Mr. T. C. Thompson), who said that a physical conflict of this character was a discreditable conflict. He (Mr. Bradlaugh) agreed to that. He agreed to that—it was discreditable; but he would add that the discredit, if discredit there was, attached to those who, disregarding all Rules of Parliamentary government, relied on their physical powers to prevent the majority deciding as they should. He would not detain the House; but he had some right to speak for a large number outside the House. He had heard their speeches quoted from the other side, and felt it right to bear his testimony that, so far as he knew them, while they were against the measure the Government thought it their duty to bring forward, they were still more against what they believed to be the destruction of Parliamentary government and true liberty of speech.

MR. CALLAN considered he had some right to speak on this question, as the Representative of the most intelligent, if the smallest, county in Ireland. As a Member who had sat in the House during the present Sitting for 22 hours, he was forced to interfere in the debate, in consequence of the statements of confident inaccuracy which had just been made by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh). The only object the Irish Members had in view was to get time to discuss the details of crime which had been furnished them by the Chief Secretary for Ireland in an untrustworthy Blue Book, as they were determined to show how utterly fallacious they were. He denied that the Irish magistrates were in any way apathetic. On the contrary, they were active and energetic, straining like hounds in the leash to make an attack upon the poor tenants settled upon their estates. The Irish people had no confidence in the present Liberal Government taking steps to rectify the grievances of the Irish people. It was very unwise, he thought, to force on these All-night Sittings, and to attempt to rush through the House a Bill which would leave behind it evil consequences, and engender discord among the Irish people. He believed that the present deplorable state of things in the Transvaal arose from hurry, and the way in which the question of South Africa was disposed of last Session.

MR. W. CORBET asked English Members to bear in mind that Irish Members were forced against their will to attend the Parliament of England, coming a long journey over sea and land, and when they arrived they were refused a due opportunity of discussing their grievances. He should support the Motion for adjournment, in order that the House might be afforded an opportunity of going more fully into the fallacious Returns, upon which the Government had founded their case—the most fallacious, he believed, which had ever been laid before Parliament. The hon. Member was proceeding further to animadvert on the character of the Returns, when——

MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that his remarks were not strictly relevant to the Question before the House, but would be more in Order on the Main Question.

MR. METGE agreed with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) that a minority ought eventually to bow to a majority, and he would himself abide by the decision of the majority of English Representatives if he were an English Member. He was, however, an Irish Member; but he would submit to the majority of the Irish Representatives, and that majority was with him. The fact was, the Irish people had no confidence whatever in the debates of the English Parliament; and all their Representatives could do was to assume an attitude of protest. He believed the dignity of Parliament was being lowered; but there was something more important even than that, and it was that the dignity and honour of Ireland was in danger of being lowered by the proposals of the

Government. What chance would they have of the promised remedial measures after the Government had obtained exceptional powers? Accidents happened even in well-regulated families. He did not say that that House was a well-regulated family. He did not think it was. The Conservatives would, by-and-bye, be found obstructing remedial measures. ["Question!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's observations have no reference whatever to the Motion before the House.

Mr. METGE said, the interruptions to which he was subjected tended to confuse his mind. He protested against the House being hurried into a decision on a matter which required to be discussed with deliberation and calmness. His object in supporting the Amendment was that the Irish Members might have an opportunity of agitating in the working men's constituencies of England, and informing them of the real state of affairs and the just issues involved.

Mr. BIDDELL thought there was no use in disguising the fact that the minority had defeated the majority of the House in this contest owing to the advantage taken of the Rules of the House, and he, therefore, wished to know the opinion of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) as to coming to terms. ["No!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] He would like to be told whether, supposing an adjournment was now agreed to on the Main Question that night, the hon. Member for the City of Cork would consent to a division, or did he intend to go on during Wednesday?

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he could not permit the observations of the hon. Member behind him (Mr. Biddell) to pass unnoticed. They were entirely disapproved of by himself and by all the Gentlemen who sat on that (the Front Opposition) Bench, and by others near him.

Mr. NELSON said, the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. C. E. Lewis), an Englishman representing an Irish constituency, had called Irish Members "murderers" and demagogues with the "spirit of murderers, without the murderers' courage," and he wished for an adjournment in order to reply to such foul allegations. He repudiated the charge against his hon. Colleagues that they had encouraged crime and outrage. ["Question!" *and* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Question before the House, which is simply that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. NELSON said, that it was nearly impossible within the Forms of the House to argue against the veracity of those Returns on a question of adjournment. He was only beginning to learn a little of the tactics of the House. There would be time enough to contradict the aspersions of men who resided in the Metropolis and talked grandiloquently of the condition of Ireland. He desired to acquit his countrymen of the charge that they had encouraged disorder and dishonesty, ["Question!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is again wandering from the subject before the House, and I must put it to him to address himself to the Question before the House.

Mr. NELSON strictly desired that there should be an adjournment of the debate. [*Laughter.*] He would learn phraseology, he thought, in due time; but he desired that they should adjourn in order that they might more closely sift the data upon which hon. Gentlemen demanded coercion for Ireland. Talk of suspending the Constitution of Ireland by a Coercion Bill! Ireland never had a Constitution but the will of Englishmen. ["Order!"] If this remark were out of Order, all he could do, he thought, was simply to sit down.

Mr. PARNELL said, that before the House went to a division on the Question of the adjournment, he wished to make a few remarks with reference to what had fallen from the junior Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh). He was a new Member; but if he had sat in the last Parliament, he would not have committed himself to the doctrines which he had that day enunciated. He had practically charged the Irish Members with unduly prolonging the debate and obstructing the general Business of Parliament. It was not the first time that such accusations had been made against the minority. For himself, he had never known a single instance in his Parliamentary experience when such accusations were made against them in which the opinion of the vast majority of the House did not afterwards come round to the opinions of the minority. In the last Parliament the minority to which he belonged were repeatedly attacked in the same way as they were that day, and he admitted that they were then, perhaps, more open to attack than they were now. In those days they had a Government in Office which simply desired to retain the position for its own sake, and it brought forward measures some of which were absolutely prejudicial and the rest of which were useless. The sin or harm resulting from obstructing the measures of such a Government was comparatively little; but he frankly allowed that it would be sinful to obstruct the general Business of the House, when they saw that there was a Government in power which desired to bring in beneficial measures for England, even if it did not bring in beneficial measures for Ireland. But the Irish Members were put in this cruel position—that they were obliged to go counter to their own nature because the Government stopped the way by a measure of cruel coercion for Ireland. Let them withdraw that Bill and go on with their measures for England, and then see whether the Irish Members obstructed. Let them abstain from invading the liberties of Irishmen and proceed to the ordinary Business of Parliament. He recollected that in the last Parliament he was, on more than one occasion, a Member of a minority, and he should like to mention a few facts on this point. Take the case of the Prisons Bill. He was one of a minority of 7 who sat up all night, and they compelled the Government of that day to submit to that minority, small as it was, and they succeeded in introducing into the Prisons Bill measures of justice for unconvicted prisoners. Public opinion was not with them then; they were charged in every newspaper in the country with wilful and malicious obstruction; they were hounded down; but, ultimately, they won, as he believed they would win in this case also, if not in the House, at least in the country. Again, take the case of flogging in the Army. [" Question!"] He was speaking of the justification there was for the use of the Forms of the House to gain time for the expression of public opinion. He had the honour of being associated with the present President of the Board of Trade and the present Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs on the question of flogging. They fought the Army Discipline Bill week after week and month after month, and when one of those Gentlemen came to him and said—"I am almost afraid to stand against the public opinion that you are exciting, and I fear that we must stop our opposition," he replied, "No, we shall not stop it for many a day;" and the result of the pertinacity and determination of a few Irish Members was that they now saw the Secretary of State for War bringing in a Bill for the Total Abolition of Flogging in the Army. These were the results of what they called obstruction; and if they could show such results from their action when they had a bigoted Tory majority to contend with, surely now, when the liberties of their country were at stake, and when every man, and perhaps every woman, in Ireland was to be put under the cruel and degrading tyranny of the police, it was not too much to ask that the debate might go on for another day. He knew that the Prime Minister was a man of determined will; but it was not always well to be determined when you were in the wrong. Then, determination sometimes degenerated into obstinacy; and if the result of the present struggle should be to diminish the public respect for the House and to infringe the rights of the minority, it was not their fault. They did not look for an extended sojourn there; they looked forward to possessing at no very distant day the inestimable privilege of making their own laws in Ireland for themselves. [" Question!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now wandering very wide of the Question before the House.

Mr. PARNELL said, he bowed to the Speaker's decision, and would not now pursue that line of remark further. But what they asked for now was time to investigate the Returns; and they denied, on the other hand, that the Government had established their plea of urgency, and it was upon this plea that their whole case rested. If then there was, as he contended, no urgency for the Bill, then the Government were the real obstructors and hinderers of the Public Business, and every day they spent over the Bill was a waste of valuable time. The Chief Secretary for Ireland admitted that the outrages had diminished in the last fortnight; but the right hon. Gentleman asked why they had not diminished before. That question he would answer at the proper time, on the Motion of the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons), and he only mentioned it now to show that there was no urgency. The outrages were still further diminishing within the last few days; but the right hon. Gentleman said, in a vengeful tone of voice, why had they not diminished before; and that Bill was pressed forward from day to day on the plea of urgency, not in order to prevent crime and outrage, which had ceased, but that the Chief Secretary might avenge on the people of Ireland his own failures as a politician. The right hon. Gentleman went to Ireland with great promises, in the hope of conciliating the Irish people. ["Question!"] He had failed, and now he asked them to proceed with that odious Bill to vindicate his own reputation. Notwithstanding all the alarmist and groundless rumours on every side as to intended explosions and outrages by the Irish people in England, he said that there was no intention of committing outrages either in England or in Ireland. He was willing to answer for that with his own head—he would be willing to go to the gallows. The Irish people were determined to rely on the effect of patient suffering, standing their ground, going to prison, and filling the gaols. That would be more potent for the settlement of this question than outrage. He asked the House, with a confidence that it would some day appreciate it, to say that there was no urgency for this Coercion Bill, and that therefore they ought to go on with measures of amelioration for the benefit of the people of England, if not for the benefit of the people of Ireland, and not waste any more time on this miserable, cruel, wretched, and degrading measure.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 21; Noes 225: Majority 204.—(Div. List, No. 16.)
[2.50 P.M. TUESDAY, FEB. 1.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. DALY said, he had to complain that the Irish Members, in standing up for the Constitutional liberties of the Irish people, had been subjected to the great inconvenience of a debate protracted over 23 hours at one Sitting of the House. It was unfair of the Government, after the manner in which their case of "urgency" had been demolished, to ask the House to continue the discussion on the Main Question. It seemed to him that if the Irish Members did not give way of their own accord, they were to be compelled to give way to brute force. The Irish Members would meet that conduct with stolid resolution and unflinching endurance. The question was one of vital importance to the Irish people. The question the Irish Members had just put before the Government was this—that, in an issue so important as this, time should be given to examine the Statistics which had been placed before Parliament by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, with a view to explain to the English people that, by reason of the inaccuracy of those Statistics, no fair case had been made out for curtailing the liberties of the Irish people. It had been urged, and in vain, that remedial measures should precede this coercive legislation; and if the Government took the advice it would redound to their credit, and effect what their Coercion Bill could never accomplish. This would be the 50th measure of coercion passed against Ireland since the Union between the two countries. The little leisure which he had at his disposal for examining the Statistics convinced him that in the county of Cork, which had a population of 514,000, the number of offences or outrages, as they were called, was only 55. And were the liberties of upwards of 500,000 people to be taken away because of the commission of a few crimes which could be dealt with by the ordinary law?

MR. SPEAKER: I must call on the hon. Member to address himself to the Question before the House.

MR. DALY submitted, respectfully, that he was in Order. He was, in dealing with the Main Question, referring to the Blue Book to which the Chief Secretary referred. Now, he maintained that many of the so-called outrages were not of sufficient gravity to warrant them in being submitted to Parliament as a justification for suspending the Constitution in Ireland. No speech during that debate was more disappointing to him (Mr. Daly) than that of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright). The right hon. Gentleman stated that he declined to go into figures, as he had accepted the statement of the Chief Secretary. He (Mr. Daly) submitted that it was a dereliction of duty on the part of a statesman so eminent as the right hon. Gentleman to accept without examination any figures, no matter by whom they were propounded. No doubt, there was a large amount of disturbance in Ireland; but he maintained that it could be suppressed by a vigorous application of the ordinary law. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the last 50 years, during which Ireland had made great progress in freedom, and he claimed for himself and those who went with him a constant desire to do Ireland justice. He (Mr. Daly) arraigned that statement. The allusion of the right hon. Gentleman to the retrospective clause was also singularly infelicitous. Nearly 50 years ago Ireland was endeavouring to resist the same coercive measures she was endeavouring to resist now. In 1833, when a similar measure was proposed, Parliament took a far longer time to meditate over that measure of coercion than it had done during the present Session; and no one could deny that, comparing the number of outrages said to exist then in Ireland with those alleged to prevail now, the condition of the country was more aggravated in that period than at the present moment. Now, he claimed to know something of the hardships that would result from passing a measure of this character, for he well remembered what all classes in the City of Cork had suffered in 1868 from the petty tyrannies of the police. He should, therefore, not hesitate to oppose to the utmost a measure by which a man might lose his liberty on the mere "reasonable suspicion" of the Chief Secretary or the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who would get their information from magistrates and policemen. The Chief Secretary had, beyond all doubt, failed to prove his case. Were it not for the combination between the two Parties in that House, a natural sense of justice would have prevented the contemplated measure from being introduced. It was not denied that this measure would be retrospective as well as prospective. That meant that should, unhappily, information from spies reach the ears of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, and that the person informed upon was known to take a deep interest in the agitation that led to the present troubles, that man's liberty would be sacrificed, his only remedy being a representation from someone on the floor of that House. This measure meant the suppression of the liberty of speech and of public meetings, and initiated a system of police espionage. He was himself a member of the Land League, and had attended some five or six of the meetings of the League, at each of which the parish priest presided. At one of the meetings held at Ballincollig, the Rev. A. Maguire presided. He (Mr. Daly) inquired from Mr. Maguire why it was he presided at the meeting. The answer the rev. gentleman gave was that he had seen a farmer, holding 80 acres of land, breakfasting off potatoes alone at 11 o'clock in the day. That was a breakfast which, he need not tell the House, an English navvy would turn from with horror; and yet this farmer had entered on his farm 15 years before. The rent of the farm was 21*s.* per acre, and if the landlord had chosen to raise it to 30*s.* per acre there was nothing to prevent his doing so, because the poor tenant with eight children would not have been in a position to resist the increase. He (Mr. Daly) maintained that the murders and outrages in Ireland were directly chargeable to Her Majesty's Ministers on the Treasury Bench. The doctrines proclaimed at Land League meetings were not such as came within the law. There was nothing illegal or unconstitutional in advising people not to take a farm from which a person had been unfairly and unjustly evicted. The Land League Courts were simply places of conciliation and arbitration, and if unfair claims were placed before them there was no more reason why they should be shut up than that the Courts of Law in London should be abolished because unreasonable claims were preferred. The functions exercised by the Land League were in principle identical with those of the *Conseils des Prudhommes* in France, that principle being the settlement of disputes by the judgment of neighbours outside the law. There had been published in *The Standard* a letter from an employé in a Cork establishment, stating that the proprietors had been "Boycotted," in order to induce them to join the Land League; but there was no truth whatever in the statement. He (Mr. Daly) felt he had a right to demand to know upon what ground that statement had been made. He should be allowed an opportunity of examining the data upon which it was proposed to rob the Irish people of their liberties. *The Daily Express* in Dublin had published false statements with regard to the state of Ireland, and in the office of that paper was the gentleman who culled the Irish news for the London *Times.*

Mr. SPEAKER said, that had nothing to do with the Question before the House.

Mr. DALY said, he would conclude with the words of Lord Brougham, slightly altered, which had been once spoken in the British Parliament—namely, that a more flagitious and indecent proceeding had never taken place within those walls than the attempt of the Chief Secretary for Ireland to palm off upon the House as correct the statements of alleged crime contained in the Blue Book. He begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LALOR seconded the Motion, remarking that he thought a sufficient justification for the Motion was to be found in the fact that hon. Members were neither in mind or body in a fit state to take into consideration the Question before the House. In his opinion, the Government wished to force through the Coercion Bill, knowing that their Land Bill would not be a measure of relief to the Irish people.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Daly.*)

It being now 4 o'clock P.M. Tuesday, Feb. 1, and no Member rising to speak, Mr. Speaker had commenced to put the Question, when——

Mr. A. M. SULLIVAN, rising, said, that, as it was now 4 o'clock, he would appeal to the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Transvaal—[*Laughter*]—he meant the Under Secretary for the Home Department (Mr. Courtney), who now represented the Government on the Treasury Bench, to state whether the House might not even now be informed what were the intentions of the Government with respect to this protracted debate. The more the discussion was prolonged the more apparent it became that time should be allowed for exposing the utter falsity of the Returns on which English votes were being "captured." Only that day a lying telegram from Westport appeared in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, stating that the steward of the hon. Member for Galway County (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had been fired at, but escaped unhurt. He (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) had, however, just received the following telegram. It was addressed to "Mitchell Henry," from "A.B. M'Alister, Kylemore Castle":—

> "There is no foundation for the report that I was fired at. I have never been on better terms with the people, nor ever felt more content in my situation. The telegram is a gross *canard.*"

This disposed of that report. These were the stories which caused the Irish Members to ask for delay. The discussion was being carried on with indecent haste. Newspapers were full of alarmist fabrications, such as that which he had just exposed. The Chief Secretary showed more anxiety to bring outrages before the House than contradictions of alleged outrages. As to the protracted Sitting, numbers counted for nothing, and 10 men could sit on as long as 100. The Irish Members were ready to meet the Government either in a short settlement or a prolonged debate. He would prefer the former, and hoped the Government would see its way to make a reasonable proposition. The Irish Members had been actuated by no desire to obstruct Public Business; but the Business of the country was being hindered, deliberately and spitefully, by the perversity of the Government.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN could not shut his eyes to the main object of the adjournment. Hon. Gentlemen addressed the House almost in the same terms, and "urgency" was their cry. He knew it was their policy to go to such a length that no one would follow them, and therefore they would be in the front of Ireland. He told them that if they could suppress the Bill in the present Session he was their humble servitor, and would march with them in every division; but he was not a lunatic, not to know as well as they did that they were playing a game of "spoil-five," to show the Irish people how they could meet the British House of Commons in the breach. They were enjoying their accustomed pastime of talk, knowing there was no hope of doing that which they pretended they would perform. He had always denounced the Land League. There were those—he was not alluding to Gentlemen opposite—who made a business of agitation. The hon. and learned Member for Meath (Mr. A. M. Sullivan) had relinquished the trade, and left it to those whom he had established in Dublin by his eloquence. The hon. and learned Member had adopted the *rôle* of mediator between the Irish Members and the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and was willing in a peaceful character to kiss upon both cheeks. He (Sir Patrick O'Brien) had always kept aloof from the Land League. Hon. Gentlemen opposite could not point to any day in his life when he had received a single penny of the poor's money, or when he had asked a Minister of the Crown to give him a place either for himself or anyone belonging to him. And yet hon. Members thought fit to shout him down, and say—"Oh, he has grown old in the practice, and has forgotten his country." ["Question!"] He had been 28 years in that House, and, no doubt, if he liked, he could join the Land League, and would be received with open arms, though he would not say with open hearts, because they would not like to have men in their councils that did not join in their opinions.

Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Baronet that he was travelling away from the Question before the House.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN regretted that he had incurred this reproof; but he must attribute it to the fact that for a considerable time he had been compelled to listen to hon. Gentlemen who more openly and frequently wandered beyond the Question before the House. If these hon. Gentlemen would assure him on their honour that they believed their present course would prevent the measure under discussion becoming law, then he would support them. But he did not think it would.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, that the dramatic exhibition afforded by the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien) had been a great alleviation to the weariness of the debate. The object of prolonging the debate was not the absolute defeat of the Government measures. They were not so sanguine as that. But they wished to place the facts before the House, and in that way they might mitigate the severity of those measures. The people of England had a right to expect that the people of Ireland would not lightly give up the struggle. There had of late been a diminution of outrage; and if the Government would abandon their measures he believed there would be a still greater diminution. He had appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, but without success. He would again appeal to the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland and ask, was it or was it not true that Ireland was thoroughly tranquil, both as to actual outrage and as to social terrorism? He objected to the overbearing tyranny of the enormous majority which supported the Bill. The Liberal Party would be much more worthy of respect, if it were supported by a smaller majority. The present state of things showed violence and obstinacy, and an utter absence of a calm, judicial spirit. One of the most cogent reasons for adjournment was that the House had lost its deliberative character. It preserved that character till 2 o'clock in the morning, but lost it when the wrangle commenced on the first Motion for adjournment. The Prime Minister had said that the House was either a deliberative Assembly or nothing at all. At the present moment, therefore, according to the *dictum* of the right hon. Gentleman, the House was, for all practical purposes, nothing at all. He submitted that the most decent and orderly thing to do would be to adjourn until the House should have resumed its deliberative character. He objected to hon. Members saying that the debate, if adjourned, would end at this or that particular hour. No one had the right to prescribe the limits of discussion upon one of the greatest questions ever submitted to the National Legislature. He contended that as long as the Speaker acknowledged that an hon. Member was keeping within the Rules and usages of debate, no other Member had a right to say that the Forms of the House were being abused. Unless the Motion for adjournment were agreed to by the Government they would still be debating and dividing when the Sabbath morning dawned. Those who were anxious to maintain the dignity of Parliamentary institutions should not hesitate to vote for the Motion for adjournment. His Colleagues would support such Motions by speeches and votes as long as they could drag one leg after another into the Lobbies. Irish Members had been accused of desiring to bring the House into contempt; but he had no sympathy with any of his hon. Friends who had allowed themselves by any possibility to be possessed with such a desire. But there was something even greater than the authority of Parliament, and principles of a deeper stake in the consciences of public men. When the public liberty was endangered, then every other consideration became subordinate. It was possible for a popular Leader of the Irish people to raise the passions of his countrymen beyond the bounds of reason, and so, also, was it possible for a popular Prime Minister to appeal to services rendered by him in the past as grounds for confidence; and he knew that in a contest with English public opinion, and in raising their feeble voices against the Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, they would find themselves considerably beaten. But he was not swayed by this circumstance, and when the passions of the people were aroused it could not be expected that one side would take an absolutely just and equitable view of the whole question. But he asked himself, what would honest and impartial men say of this contest 20 years hence? They would say that the Irish Members would have been cowards and poltroons if they had not exhausted the Forms of the House in resisting the suspension of the Constitutional liberties of the people of Ireland.

Mr. LEAMY, in supporting the Motion for adjournment, protested against the continuance of a squabble which had been forced upon the Irish Members by the Government. He claimed for his hon. Friends and himself the right to express their opinion upon the measure of the Government at a fitting time; and he demanded from the Government an explanation of the grounds upon which they based their claim to suspend the liberties of the Irish people. The Returns of agrarian crime presented to the House certainly did not justify a recourse to coercion. In his own county, Waterford, for example, he found that in a population of 120,000 there were only 11 cases of such crime reported. He would like to ask the Government what they could expect to gain by forcing on the Bill at the present Sitting? It was necessary, in his opinion, as a matter of justice, that the latest Returns on the subject of agrarian crime should be furnished before any further progress was made with the measure.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN thought some concession should be made to the Members who had been up all night. He himself represented a very numerous constituency, and had not yet had an opportunity of speaking on the Main Question. He contended that the Irish Members, instead of being open to censure, were deserving of credit for resisting, as far as lay in their power, any proposal which would destroy the liberties of their constituents, especially as it was now known that the Returns of the last two months would show a very great decrease in crime.

Mr. M'COAN expressed the regret he felt in returning to the House, after an absence of some hours, and finding an acrimonious dispute still being prosecuted, solely owing to the action of those who occupied the Treasury Bench. For one, he must strongly protest against what he could not but characterize as vindictive and indecent haste on the part of the Government in pressing forward a Bill which was one of the most rigorous measures of coercion which had ever been brought forward in that House. Whether agrarian outrage or an insurrectionary rising were feared, the Executive had already sufficient powers to deal with any danger that might arise. The hon. Member proceeded to comment upon the nature of the Coercion Bill, but——

Mr. SPEAKER informed the hon. Member that he was not in Order in discussing the provisions of a Bill which was not before the House.

Mr. M'COAN said, he would, of course, at once bow to the ruling of the Chair, and would put his argument in another way.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that it would not be to act in accordance with the ruling of the Chair to adopt that course.

Mr. M'COAN said, his sole object was to advance reasons why the debate should be adjourned. He put it to the House that Irish Representatives should not be treated with indecent intolerance and Party feeling because they were fighting for the liberties of their countrymen. He assured the House, upon his honour, that the Irish Representatives were merely endeavouring to carry out the daily behests of their constituents. They were conjured by every post to fight this battle out to the bitter end, and they were reminded that they were the mere delegates of their constituencies. He admitted fully that it was the intention of the Irish Members respectfully to oppose and to delay the passing of this measure by every means fairly within their right.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL rose to make a suggestion to hon. Members opposite, which, if adopted, might, perhaps, save both them and the House a great deal of time. Hon. Members opposite appeared to be afraid that the second reading of this Bill might be moved immediately the division upon the present Motion was taken; but it appeared to him, considering the hour at which they had arrived—5.15—and the fact that the Bill had not yet been distributed among hon. Members, that it would scarcely be possible for the second reading to be taken to-day. Hon. Members opposite, he apprehended, were not very much afraid of a Wednesday Sitting, and therefore practically the matter came to this—that, unless hon. Members opposite were prepared to carry on the debate far into Thursday, and perhaps longer, they would not gain anything whatever by continuing the debate. He would, therefore, suggest that, if they would permit a division to be taken upon the Main Question now, the second reading of the Bill would be brought forward on another day, when there would be ample opportunity for discussing its details.

Mr. FINIGAN, whilst expressing his obligations to the hon. Gentlemen for his suggestion, stated the Irish Members would, under existing circumstances, be compelled to persevere with their Constitutional opposition to the introduction of this Bill. He presumed, however, the second reading would not be taken without due Notice. It was to be observed that the Members of Her Majesty's Government had been distinguished by their silence during this debate. The Solicitor General for Ireland sat cross-legged and contented, as though he had no reason to give for the alleged urgency of the measure. For his own part, he should not be disposed to accept any volunteered pledges from a Government which had shown itself so biased and so prejudiced on the Irish Question. Hon. Members had demanded that the Returns of crime in Ireland should be laid before the House before they were asked to vote on this Bill, so that they might see whether agrarian crime in Ireland was so frequent as to justify the introduction of this measure. The Government had not the courage to produce those Returns, because they would show that crime had diminished materially, and that the Land League had encouraged the people to look, not to violence, but to Constitutional reform, for the redress of their grievances. Since this debate was commenced he had received some half-dozen letters begging him to resist the first reading of this Bill until those Returns were laid upon the Table. If they were to permit this measure to be read a first time they would be told, when its next stage was reached, that its principle had been already fully discussed. He desired to point out that there was still another phase of this question of the Land League organization.

Mr. SPEAKER, interposing, said the Question before the House was—"That the Debate be now adjourned." The hon. Member was travelling into matters which were not relevant to that Question.

Mr. FINIGAN thanked the Speaker for that ruling, and expressed regret that he had wandered away from the Question at issue. Urgency, he contended, had not been proved, and, consequently, the main basis of the Government position was taken away. He thought it would be better to have the truth of the so-called outrages discussed, either by the House itself or by a Select Committee, in order that a really statesmanlike view of this important matter might be arrived at. He would suggest that the debate should now be adjourned, with the understanding that the Government, the Opposition, the supporters of the Radical Party, and the Representatives of the Irish people should meet and endeavour to come to some arrangement. This Coercion Bill was a measure which a Liberal Government ought never to have brought in. The Government could save no time by endeavouring to force through the

House by physical pressure an unjust and despotic measure. The Irish Members were bound to resist all attempts to pass the first reading until a just and really liberal case had been made out for the suspension of personal liberty throughout Ireland.

Mr. GILL supported the Motion for adjournment. It was now 25 hours since the debate was commenced, but no progress had been made up to the present time; and he did not believe any progress would be made if they were forced by the Government to go on with the discussion until the same hour tomorrow. The Irish Members wanted a little further time for the discussion of the Bill. Those who were acquainted with Ireland knew that that country did not require coercion. In fact, Ireland was the most peaceful country at the present time in the entire world. There had been a remarkable decrease in the number of outrages since Parliament met. He suspected that the reason for that decrease was that the eye of the Irish Members was now upon the Reports made by the police, who were, therefore, induced to be more careful not to report mere trivial cases, or even to manufacture outrages.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD: I rise to Order. The hon. Member is now discussing the question of outrages, which, to me, appears out of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: In so doing the hon. Member is out of Order; and I am bound to say that for some time none of the remarks of hon. Members have been addressed to the Question before the House.

Mr. GILL said, he was about to give one reason why the debate should be adjourned. It was that the number of outrages were decreasing every day, and that the debate should be adjourned until they had the last fortnightly Returns before them. The result, he believed, would be such that it would be admitted there was no occasion for this Coercion Act at all. The Solicitor General for Ireland stated that a great majority of the clergy in Ireland had been forced into taking part in the agitation. That was a very serious thing which time should be given to disprove, as it had a very serious bearing on the case. Ministers had pushed on this debate to an inordinate length. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had, on the previous night, proposed a compromise which the Government had rejected; but nothing had been gained by its rejection. The Government were evidently actuated by a desire to get up a cry of Obstruction against the Irish Members. Perhaps they might succeed in that; but the Irish Members could not help it. They would persevere with those debates, and try to prevent the passing of those Coercion Acts as long as they could; or, if they could not altogether prevent them from passing, they must do what they could to modify them and strike out their most severe provisions.

Mr. SPEAKER having again called the hon. Member to Order, he resumed his seat.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY maintained that if ever a man was entitled to ask for another day for the continuance of a debate it was the hon. Member for the City of Cork. Grave charges had been brought against that hon. Member, the most striking of which had turned out to be ill-founded; and it was only fair that he should have been granted an ample opportunity of meeting those charges, and also of thoroughly breaking down the case of the Government, which had already shown signs of weakness. That was not a mere personal matter affecting the hon. Member for the City of Cork, because the whole character of the Land League movement was involved in the charges which the Prime Minister had made against that hon. Member. The Bill of the Government involved a far greater issue than any Bill that had ever been brought forward by the late Government; and, therefore, he thought the limit of the patience of Parliament ought to be more extended than it had ever been before. The guiding star of the action of Irish Members at this crisis was not so much public opinion in England as in Ireland, from which they had been sent to the House of Commons, and they were bound to let their conduct reflect that opinion. They had been asked what was the use of opposing these measures, because they were certain to be passed. He fully admitted that they would be passed; but the pressing forward of a measure was such an insult to the Irish people, that Irish Members felt bound to oppose the Bill to the uttermost, and to fight a losing battle as well as they could.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he rose, at that advanced hour of the discussion, to support the plea for an adjournment which had been put forward many hours ago. The Leader of the Government seriously misunderstood the position of the Irish Party. The right hon. Gentleman had grossly, though no doubt innocently, misrepresented the action of the Leader of the Irish Party, and that was a sufficient reason why the debate should be adjourned. The right hon. Gentleman, induced, perhaps, by a feeling of false shame, had not risen to retract the false accusation he had brought against the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), and perhaps a few hours reflection might lead him to see the course that it would be proper for him to adopt in the matter. A compromise was offered last night, which, if accepted, would have prevented all this waste of time.

Mr. SPEAKER observed, that the hon. Member was not keeping to the Question before the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL was afraid that the exact tenour of his remarks had not reached the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair—["Order!"]—or he would have known that he was speaking strictly to the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have informed the hon. Member that he was not in Order, and I must request him to speak to the Question before the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he would appeal to the protection of the Speaker against the continual hum of conversation on the Ministerial Benches, which prevented what he was saying from being properly heard. He asked that the debate should be adjourned until the Returns relating to crime in Ireland were placed upon the Table. It was unfair that while the counsel for the prosecution—right hon. Gentlemen who sat on the Treasury Bench—were in possession of all the evidence, the counsel for the defence—hon. Members for Ireland who sat near him—had had no opportunity of examining it. There was much that was exceptional in the Irish demand; but the English Government was proposing exceptional measures. If the Government would even then grant a respite there would be a great calming down of public opinion and feeling both in England and Ireland. The plea of the Irish people was one which ought to be placed far above Party considerations. Their claims ought to be considered in a broad spirit, such as befitted a question involving the welfare of a whole nation. If, however, the present purpose was persisted in, the Irish people would be justified in believing that the Bill was only carried by voting down the Irish Members after they had been physically exhausted.

Mr. BYRNE rose to support the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, on the ground that, although much had been said on this subject, much more still remained to be said. The Government had commenced their work at the wrong end—they should have begun with remedies for the disease. The Business of legislation required more time, more care, more accuracy, and more information than any other. Any Government wishing to force through so serious a measure as this ought, in deference to their own reputation as statesmen, to give hon. Members full opportunity of discussing it. He might liken the action of the Government to that of the driver of a locomotive resolved to clear everything out of his way, but who was in danger of finding his road effectually blocked, and of getting his engine off the line.

Dr. COMMINS supported the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, on the ground that the Bill was an indictment levelled against the Irish people, who had not been afforded time in which to prepare their defence. He would not go over the long and weary catalogue of offences brought forward against the people of Ireland by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary; but the calendar at any single English Assize would furnish a tale of horrors of almost equal dimensions. Yet upon this he asked for leave to suspend the liberties of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he wished to signalize in his official career an era of goodwill and peace for Ireland; but, instead of so doing, he had simply laid before the House a Bill which would deprive the Irish people, now, unfortunately, committed to his charge, of every semblance of liberty which still remained to them. ["Question!"] The question was whether the Irish Members were to permit this Bill to pass for clothing the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland with despotic power over the whole people, unfettered by any safeguards against its arbitrary use. ["Question!"] He objected to the manner in which the measure was being brought forward, for it foreshadowed the spirit in which the measure would be executed. That was a deliberative Assembly; but the deliberation was forced on in such a way as to deprive the minority of their rights of discussion. He suggested that time should be given for heads to cool, and for the House to resume its proper functions, as a true, and just, and fair, and wise deliberative Assembly, instead of being one which seemed likely every moment to break out into ebullitions of temper which were not to its credit.

MR. DAWSON said, that the Irish nation was on its trial before the House of Commons, and he hoped the House would conduct the trial in a way which would command the respect of Europe. The judges who were to decide the case were not yet in possession of the evidence on which they would have to return their verdict, and the trial was in such an inchoate state that it ought to be adjourned until reliable evidence was before the Court. In the present case one-half of the evidence had been withheld; and that which had been withheld would, had it been produced, have broken down the indictment. If the House judged even according to the evidence, their verdict should be one of "Not Guilty." He assured hon. Members that he was anxious for the reputation of the House of Commons, which was the cradle and shrine of British liberty, but the tomb of Irish independence. If the House had time to study all the facts and figures in this case, which it could obtain only by adjournment, to enable the case to be completed, it was just possible that the Prime Minister, with his mastery of figures, might be able to present the case in such a way as to silence the Irish Members, or he might himself see the matter in such a light as to give way himself. When the punishment was out of all proportion to the crime the sympathy of the people went with the criminal; and if this measure were passed, such would be the position of Ireland in the eyes of Europe. For their own sake, therefore, it would be well if the House of Commons were to agree to the adjournment. If a state of grievance was kept up, there must be a demoralization of society, under cover of which crimes would be committed; but if the grievance were removed, the ill-doer would be deprived of all sympathy. He appealed to the House to adjourn for its own reputation, and for the sake of the last link which, in the person of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, bound Ireland to this country with hope and confidence. He thought that a Government which embraced such a man as the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster could not well refuse to acknowledge the arguments which had been laid before them in favour of an adjournment; and, if for nothing else, they might fairly adjourn in order to allow the Leader of his Party (Mr. Parnell), who was on his trial, time to prepare his answer to the powerful speech of the Prime Minister. Could the Leaders of the great Liberal Party condescend to take advantage of the smallness of the band of Irish Members, and refuse to their Leaders a fair opportunity to meet the case of the Government? The hon. Member proceeded, amidst many interruptions, to compare the treatment of the Colonies and Ireland.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is the adjournment of the debate, and I must say the hon. Member is travelling very wide of that subject.

MR. DAWSON said, he wished to point out that the House generally acted justly when it had time to consider the question before it; and he asked them to give the Irish people the same sympathy and consideration which was accorded to the Colonies. The Leaders of the Liberal Party could not crush the voice of Ireland; and the Irish Members heard that voice telling them that, if they could not avert it altogether, they were to postpone to the last minute a terrible indignity to the nation they represented. He hoped that the threatened fate would be averted; and he believed that if the House gave longer consideration to the subject there would be a greater probability that it would satisfy its own conscience by doing justice.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 23; Noes 163: Majority 140.—(Div. List, No. 17.)

[7.30 P.M. TUESDAY, FEB. 1.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. FINIGAN said, he rose for the purpose of addressing himself to the general question and the proposed Amendment; and he intended entering into these questions, sifting and re-sifting them, in a manner commended to the House by the First Lord of the Treasury. It was a strange thing that no valid, just, or sound reasons had been shown why the ordinary law of Ireland should be suspended. The House, he was afraid, was not very well educated as to what was the ordinary law in Ireland. It was sufficient to cope with all the difficulties with which they were surrounded. If the magistrates of Ireland had done their duty there would have been no occasion for the introduction of this coercive measure, for there were legal provisions already in existence by which the law could be upheld by a strong and just Administration. It would be better, therefore, if the Government wished to maintain their own reputation, that they should utilize the existing Acts instead of depriving a whole nation of its liberty? Why, then, had not the law been used, and why did the Ministry come down to the House and ask that the ordinary law should be suspended, and that a Coercion Act should rule in its stead? However much the Irish Members might respect the principles of justice of the Government, how could the Prime Minister or the House give them a guarantee that the landlords, in whose interests the Bill was introduced, would not use it to contaminate the sources of justice, and would find an echo in affidavits sworn out of malice against the Irish people? He was satisfied that if the Bill was passed in its present form the landlord classes would make use of it to the utmost for the purpose of taking their revenge on the agitation which had stopped their tyrannous hands, and there would no longer be seen in Ireland that state of quietude that now existed. A Bill presented to the House to place in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant, or, rather, in the hands of any malicious person—be it constable or private individual—a power such as this Bill proposed was unworthy of those principles so fiercely, and with so much apparent honesty, enunciated by Her Majesty's Ministers before Parliament met, or rather before the Elections were over. He maintained that there had been no unlawful meetings held in Ireland, although many lawful meetings had been stopped owing to the influence brought to bear upon the magistrates, and through them upon the Lord Lieutenant, by the landlords. It was a sad contrast to compare the professions of the present Government before they came into Office with their action since they had held the reins of power. Right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench were sleeping; they had doubtless had enough of the debate already; but the Irish Members would not, if necessary, be tired of it before Monday night. If it were looked into it would be found that justice and equity were on the side of the unfortunate Irish tenantry, and that cruelty and unfairness were on the side of the landlord. The Irish peasantry were treated worse than the tenantry of the old feudal times, who were, at least, clothed, fed, and housed out of the profits of the land. When the Government asked the House to pass a coercive measure they ought to be told to carry out the existing law, for it was a sorry confession for them to make that the Land League had superseded it. When the charity of England was stretching out a helping hand to Ireland the landlords were evicting in every direction; and they were, in his opinion, the real authors of all the spirit of crime and outrage in the country. He complained that the Irish landlords came forward with a front of brass and said that they were the sole repositories of the interests and prosperity of the country, while nothing could be further from the fact, and England winked at their tyranny, because they were not fully acquainted with the true state of the case. If the Prime Minister had been true to his principles, he would not now have been found doing an injustice to the Irish people, and to those who were sent to Parliament to represent them. It had been alleged that the League induced men to break their legal contracts, and these contracts had been spoken of as sacred. What, talk of sacred contracts when tenants were on the brink of starvation!

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was addressing himself to the subject of the tenure of land, and not to the Question before the House.

MR. FINIGAN said, he wished to show that agrarian crime did not dog the steps of the Land League, as had been asserted, but that it followed the cruel evictions that had taken place. There were three prominent landlords in the county of Clare who had threatened that when the Coercion Bill passed they would be avenged on every tenant who had mixed himself up in the Constitutional organization of the Land League, and it was men like these landlords who were terrorizing Ireland. In the county of Clare, out of 59 outrages alleged, there were but 19; and what became of the case of the Government if this were the case in the other counties of Ireland, as was probably the fact? The whole volume of Returns was undeserving of the smallest trifle of Liberal political sympathy. A Land Committee had been formed in Ireland consisting of landlords, mostly lieutenant-colonels and gentlemen who managed to exist on the sweat of other men's brows. They averred that they represented the interest of England in Ireland. He found in a pamphlet by a Radical that there were 761 persons on the Land Committee, and they were proprietors of 10,364,500 acres. They were the representatives of landlordism, and were not representative of either the interests of this country or of Ireland. The effect of the Land League in Ireland was peace to 600,000 farmers and their families, and terror only to the handful of bad landlords. The Coercion Bill asked for was not to maintain law and order, but to facilitate Irish landlords carrying out their evictions; and it ought to be enacted that no evictions should be carried out in Ireland while the Land Bill was being discussed in the House. He denied that the object of the Land League was non-payment of rents, although it was certainly their opinion that exorbitant rents should not be paid. He wished to draw attention to a speech delivered by the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) at Ennis, which had been alluded to in a manner which did no credit to the Prime Minister, the Chief Secretary, nor the Solicitor General for Ireland——

Mr. MONK rose to Order. He begged to inquire whether a reference to what occurred at a meeting in Ireland had anything to do with the Question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member is diverging from the Question before the House. He has been addressing the House for a long time, and his observations lately have been wide of the mark.

Mr. FINIGAN said, he was not going to allude generally to the speech made at Ennis; but only to that part of it which was noticed by the right hon. Gentleman in his speech at the opening of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already informed the hon. Gentleman that in so doing he will be out of Order.

Mr. FINIGAN went on to comment on the premature publication of the text of the Bill, observing that the Irish Members had not yet had an opportunity of treating the measure on its merits. It was a message of war from the Liberal Party to Ireland. The Government had made out no case of urgency for the passage of this Bill, or, indeed, for coercion in any form. The Chief Secretary had misled the Premier, and the Premier had misled the whole nation. He considered the Chief Secretary the evil genius of Ireland, determined upon a policy of fraud and coercion. He held that the House had no right to go on discussing the Bill until they had before them all the Returns and all the different charges which constituted the indictment against Ireland. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GILL seconded the Motion. There was, he said, no guarantee that the Government would be more successful in carrying its Land Bill than they had been last year in the matter of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. If the Coercion Bill were passed there was no security that several clergymen, as well as other leaders of the agitation, would not be arrested. In what a condition of anarchy would the country be placed if the beloved clergy of the people were put in prison. The hon. Member was proceeding to call attention to the condition of Ireland, when——

Mr. ROWLEY HILL rose to Order. Was the hon. Member entitled to enter into the Main Question on a Motion for adjournment?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member seconded the Motion for adjournment, and he is thereby speaking to the Main Question.

Sir EDWARD WATKIN rose to Order. The hon. Member spoke to a Motion for adjournment a few hours.

ago; was he entitled again to speak to a Motion for adjournment?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am bound to say that the hon. Member, through the great indulgence of the House with regard to Motions for adjournment, is at liberty to second a Motion for adjournment.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. GILL then went on to controvert the statement of the Prime Minister, that crime had dogged the steps of the Land League. In his own county (Westmeath) there had been only eight offences, all of the most trivial character, and none of them deserving to be branded as an outrage, and yet there had been as many as 16 land meetings held within the county. The preparation of outrages had become a regular manufacture in Ireland. A machine was employed for the purpose, which could be set in motion at any moment. The machine consisted of the landocracy, the magistracy, paid and unpaid, and the Constabulary, all of whom played into each others' hands. As soon as agitation was in the air, and the landowners felt that remedial measures would be brought in and affect their interests injuriously, the number of agrarian crimes in proportion to other crimes largely increased. That was the result of the working of the outrage manufacturing machine. He maintained that there was no necessity for this coercive legislation. The Government pleaded necessity; but, as Milton had truly said—"Necessity is the plea of tyrants." He, and those with whom he acted, represented the enlightened public opinion of Ireland. The hon. Member was proceeding to substantiate his opinion by a reference to the circulation of the different Dublin papers.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the Question before the House. He is now wandering very widely from the Question.

Mr. GILL resumed. Coercive measures would never eradicate from the country the evils that afflicted it. That result could only be brought about by the enactment of a just Land Law, and the introduction of a Bill for that purpose would have been the true course of the Government. He seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Finigan.*)

MR. FAY said, he had abstained from voting during the last 27 hours, because he did not wish to see his name written down as voting for coercion. At the same time, he regretted that the unfortunate tenants of Ireland should be affected by the procedure pursued by their indiscreet or false friends. In order that the Government should pass a good Land Bill they should be sustained by Scotch and English Members, and by a strong public opinion. He, therefore, thought that the Irish Members were wrong in carrying on these contests, in which no victory could be gained, and in which everything was to be lost in order to gratify vanity or a desire for popularity. If the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government would only say the one word to the Irish tenants, that he wonld give them security of tenure, he would paralyze the tongue of the agitator and do more good than could be accomplished by a thousand Coercion Bills. What object could be gained by provoking the hostility of the English Members by these absurd proceedings, which could only end in securing the antagonism of the English mind? The English people had a great reverence for their great National Institution; and whatever views the Irish Members might entertain of the possibility of obtaining what they wanted from it, the English people would resent its being turned into a pantomime.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, that he had always avoided conflicts with his Colleagues holding Home Rule opinion, and that he would not now be tempted into a conflict with the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Fay). He would, however, say that the opposition to the Bill and the length to which it was carried was determined by this principle, which he held, that whether opposition was to be successful or not, it was the duty of Irish Members, as long as the Rules of the House permitted it, to offer unceasing opposition to the proposal of coercion. He had often seen appeals for adjournment made, to enable public opinion to express itself on a proposal; and why were Irish Members not to make that appeal? The public opinion of Ireland counted for little in that House, and no doubt it was considered daring to set it up as the guide in Irish matters; but it was the solemn duty of Irish Members to sustain it, to represent it fully, and to strain every Form of the House to give it effect. He had within the last few minutes received a telegram from his constituents which ran thus—

> "From the Mayor of Limerick.—Strong protest against coercion passed unanimously at large meeting of the Corporation to-day."

That Corporation consisted of Tories, Whigs, and Home Rulers, and there was not a man in it that did not know that the proposal of coercion was not in the real interests of peace or tranquillity, in his own city and the rest of Ireland. They were, indeed, fighting a losing battle; but it was their duty to fight it as long as the Forms of the House and their physical strength permitted them to do so.

Dr. COMMINS said, there might in future be Coercion Bills; and, if so, he hoped there would be hon. Gentlemen who would consider the question with cool heads and kind hearts. Though the present Coercion Bill might be necessary, he did not see the necessity for the indecent haste of the Government in passing it. He had to go back very far—200 or 300 years—to find a precedent for this proceeding. When remedial measures were in question there was plenty of consideration and Commissions of Inquiry; but when it was coercion it was done in hot haste. He compared this haste to that of a Judge who ordered prisoners to be hanged first and tried afterwards. ["Question!" "Divide!"] He wished delay in order that hon. Gentlemen might have time to consider and study the Question. ["Divide!" "Question!"] Were hon. Members aware that Lancashire was seething with riot? ["Question!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is introducing matter that is quite irrelevant to the Question before the House.

Dr. COMMINS accepted the ruling of the Speaker, but would not yield to clamour. There was a story told of the great Napoleon. ["Question!" "Divide!"] He was told that he might save 20,000 men by a particular movement. ["Order!"] But Napoleon said —"Forward! don't delay the game;" and he won the battle half-an-hour earlier at the sacrifice of 20,000 men. Here Ministers were pushing on the triumph of coercion at a greater sacrifice—the sacrifice of the confidence of a nation. So long as hon. Members only contributed clamour to the debate, so long would he be convinced of the need for delay.

Mr. HEALY: I rise, Mr. Speaker —["Oh, oh!" *and* "Divide!"]—to support the arguments—["Oh, oh!" *and* "Divide!"]—for the adjournment —["Oh, oh!"] — of this debate. ["Divide!"]——

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I rise to Order, Mr. Speaker. I have listened —[*Cries of* "Speak up!" *and* "Order!"] —I am addressing the Chair; and I beg to ask you to rule, Sir, whether the hon. Member, being in possession of the House, is not entitled to be heard without interruption?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, being in possession of the House, is entitled to be heard without interruption, and I would advise him to address himself to the Chair, and not to any particular section of the House.

Mr. HEALY said, he would endeavour to obey the ruling of the Chair. The noble Lord who had spoken on behalf of the Government last night (the Marquess of Hartington) had admitted that the Irish Members had a perfect right to resist this Bill to the utmost, and he should make the noble Lord's words the charter of his action in regard to this Bill. It was within their rights and within their duty to move the adjournment of the debate, so long as there were Members of their own Party who had not been able to speak on the Main Question. When they had arrived at a time in the evening when hon. Members were incapacitated from fatigue and other reasons, that of itself constituted a sufficient reason for Motions of this character. Opposition of this sort was practised by the Prime Minister. ["Question!"]

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was not confining himself to the Question before the House.

Mr. HEALY explained that he had not concluded his sentence owing to the interruption. The House required an interval of rest—["No, no!"]—at least some Members did. ["Name!" *and cries* *of* "No, no!"] He did, at any rate. It had been said that weariness was the great ally of Ministers. ["Question!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I must warn the hon. Member that he is not keeping to the Question before the House. He is adverting to matters which have nothing to do with the Question before the House; and if he continues in that line I shall be obliged to call the attention of the House to the matter.

MR. HEALY said, that if the observations he had been making did not meet with the Speaker's approval it was useless for him to proceed. He had endeavoured to do his best to bring forward in a reasonable and rational manner arguments in support of the adjournment which seemed to him to be strong, basing those arguments on the exhaustion of the House and the Members.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR admitted that the position taken by the Irish Members had alienated from them the sympathies of a large number of fair-minded Liberal Englishmen, and a considerable number of English and Scotch Members; but, still, he could not admit that he and his hon. Friends were to be blamed for that alienation, which he believed had been brought about by want of appreciation of their motives, and the difficult position in which they stood with regard to this question. English Members must see that very little progress had been made for several days. ["Divide, divide!"] He could assure them that to call out "Divide" was not the way to make him go on. ["Divide!"] He appealed to the Speaker to be protected against these interruptions. He had a right to address the House, and a right to the protection of the Chair. If he wandered from the Question it would be altogether against his will. ["Question!"] There was not a man in that House more anxious to keep to the Question than he was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR, continuing, said that the ill-feeling which had been manifested against the Irish Members would have the effect of placing in the hands of Ministers more and more, day by day, a power which was virtually despotic. The minority had taken up the position they were now occupying, entrenched within the Forms of the House, with reluctance and against their will. That position had been forced upon them by the action of the Government in contumeliously rejecting the suggestion made last night by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) for terminating the debate to-night. If that proposal had been accepted they would have had an interval of rest, and could with calmness, and without rancour, have come to a decision on the first stage of the Bill. What had the Government gained by the course they had pursued? Absolutely nothing. The only result had been to show that it was their determination to ride rough-shod over the Irish Members, in which, however, they had failed. Another argument in favour of the adjournment was that many Members opposite were disposed to support the postponement of coercive legislation until remedial measures were introduced. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *and* "Name!"] When he saw the want of conciliation on the part of the Government he felt he had no option but to act with his fellow-countrymen and support the Motion.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he should support the Motion for adjournment. It was not his practice to trespass at great length on the attention of that Assembly. He had always received a patient hearing—["Oh!"]—but the length of his remarks would depend, to a great extent, on the patience with which he was heard now. [*Great uproar, the Strangers in the Gallery standing up.*] There seemed to be a spirit of hilarity afoot.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I rise to Order. I wish, Sir, to ask you for an authoritative ruling from the Chair upon one of the Standing Orders. We passed a Standing Order, not very long ago, to the effect that whenever any hon. Member was named by the Speaker or Chairman of Committees as disregarding the authority of the Chair, or wilfully and persistently obstructing the Business of the House, he should be named from the Chair and suspended. I wish to ask you now, Sir, what is wilful and persistent Obstruction of the Business of the House? It seems to me that this is a matter which cannot be decided by an actual individual speech, but by the whole course of the debate, which must be present to your mind.

Hon. Members will remember that in the course of the debate a suggestion was made last night by Members who represent Ireland——

Mr. CALLAN: I rise to Order. ["Order, order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman is in possession of the House.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: The suggestion was made last night by hon. Members who represent Ireland that if the debate were then adjourned, in all probability, after a fair discussion to-night, a division might be taken, and the Irish Members would be satisfied. What has been the consequence of our refusal to accede to that suggestion—a suggestion which the Government had not the smallest reason to suppose would have been thoroughly acted upon by the Irish Members? In the first place, words were dropped by one of the Irish Members that if that suggestion were not acted upon the House must take the consequences; and we have seen what those consequences are. The result has been that from that time to the present we have wasted the whole time. ["No, no!"] We have not been attempting to discuss the actual Question before the House, or, if we have been discussing it, it has been at the rarest intervals. We have been discussing Questions of adjournment which are of no practical use whatever, and in the course of these debates we have had this extraordinary state of things. Although it is quite true that the same Member cannot speak twice on the same Motion, yet the same Motions for adjournment have been submitted over and over again, the same Members have spoken often, the same speeches have been made, the same arguments have been reiterated; and I put it to you, Sir, whether that has not been done in the open face of the House, for the express purpose of wilfully and persistently obstructing the Business of the House? I have listened from the beginning with the greatest attention to the arguments of the hon. Member who has just been addressing the House (Mr. T. D. Sullivan), in order to see whether they tended to anything fresh or not; but I put it to you, Sir, whether all these speeches, if they be taken, not one by one, but in combination, do not show that there is a decided combination for the purpose of wilful and persistent Obstruction? ["No, no!"] I would ask further, whether, under this Order of the House, you have not the power of putting a stop to these proceedings? I would venture also to suggest that under your inherent power as Speaker you have the absolute power of dealing with the matter. I am quite aware that that power has not been exercised, I am thankful to say, for a great number of years; but the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) will recollect that he not long ago raked up a precedent 200 years old, used it as a precedent, and insisted upon it, and, therefore, if I go back to the same date, he, at all events, has no right to complain. I now beg to ask you, Sir, whether, by your inherent authority as Speaker of this House, you have not power to put a stop to these proceedings; and also, whether you have not, under this particular Order, the power of saying, taking in combination the speeches of hon. Members and the whole course of the debate, that this mode of carrying on the debate is not, in the terms of the Rule, persistent and wilful Obstruction of the Business of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The principal question which the right hon. Gentleman has put to me I understand to be this—What is wilful and persistent Obstruction of the Business of the House, so as to bring a Member wilfully and persistently obstructing within the operation of the Standing Order to which reference has been made? Now, I will say this. I can well understand that although Members speaking to the Question before the House may speak altogether in Order with respect to that Question, still, I can well understand that Members may enter into a combination to effect a purpose which would bring them within the operation of this Order; and if I found that there was a distinct and clear combination on the part of Members of this House wilfully and persistently to obstruct the Business of the House by combination, I should consider that this Standing Order would apply. I am bound to say that the course of this debate has brought before me evidence of that combination, in so far as to bring Members wilfully obstructing within the operation of the Standing Order. I call on the hon. Member who is in possession of the House to resume.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN and MR. PARNELL rose together.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Westmeath is in possession of the House, and is entitled to proceed.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that when he was interrupted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross), he was pleading for more time for the consideration and discussion of the proposals of the Government. He desired to keep strictly in Order, and he had no intention of controverting the Standing Order referred to. He would soon bring his observations to a close. He wished to show that a false impression had been created against Ireland by means of exaggerated statements and cooked Returns.

MR. R. N. FOWLER: I wish to appeal to you, Sir, whether the hon. Member is in Order in repeating what has been so frequently said by himself and other Members in the course of the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, by repeating the same thing over and over again, is sorely trying the patience of the House; but I cannot say that there is any Standing Order against repetition. I only wish there was.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that if there had been no interruption he should have brought his observations to a close long ago. The proceedings which had taken place in that debate would have an historical interest. He was stating that a false impression had been created by exaggerated statements from the Treasury Bench, and by the publication of fallacious Returns.

MR. A. H. BROWN: I rise to Order. I wish to put this question plain. Is not the hon. Member wilfully and persistently obstructing the Business of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not prepared to say that the hon. Member is out of Order, although, no doubt, he is greatly trying the patience of the House.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN resumed. He was within half a sentence of finishing when the hon. Member rose to Order. He wished to say that if the debate were to be continued in a spirit of levity, and with the interruptions which had characterized it so far, it would not, in his opinion, redound to the honour either of the Government or of the House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Whereupon MR. PLAYFAIR, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, again took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order. [11.35 P.M. TUESDAY, FEB. 1.]

MR. DILLON believed that if the people were given ample time to consider the Bill their antagonistic views would inevitably lead to the breaking up of the Ministry. The Government believed that this would be the case, and, consequently, they attempted to rush the Bill through the House. The hon. Member proceeded to quote from *Hansard's Debates* passages from the speeches delivered by the present Prime Minister on the occasion of the introduction of the Divorce and Matrimonial Bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR), interposing, said: I am bound to say that the hon. Member is travelling beyond the Question before the House.

MR. DILLON remarked, that, during the last two or three days, an attempt had been made in that House to use physical force, and reason would no longer be listened to. ["No!"] Since that was the case, it was useless for the Irish Members to address further arguments to the House.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is certainly not confining himself to the Question before the House.

MR. DILLON continued. The feeling in Ireland was intensifying to an extent which the House did not comprehend. Meetings were being held all over Ireland.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD: I wish to ask if the hon. Gentleman is in Order? It appears to me that the hon. Member is proceeding with observations which have no bearing upon the Question, in spite of your ruling, Sir.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is travelling beyond the Question before the House, and I must again desire him to restrict himself to it.

Mr. DILLON said, he had not heard the ruling of the Deputy Speaker in consequence of the uproar that prevailed; and if hon. Members chose to roar the Chair down, he hoped he (Mr. Dillon) would not be held responsible if he failed to catch the remarks which fell from the Chair. He thought it was only respectful that the House should observe silence while the Chair was addressing it. He had been endeavouring to point out what was the state of feeling in Ireland in opposition to the measure. That feeling was becoming stronger and stronger every day. The meeting to which he had been making reference——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I have already ruled that any reference to meetings in Ireland is out of Order.

Mr. WARTON: Three times.

Mr. DILLON could only say that the accounts the Irish Members were receiving every day from Ireland strengthened them in the belief that the House was acting in entire ignorance of the feeling of the Irish people on this question. He was in the receipt daily of letters from Ireland urging him to oppose the Bill by every means in his power. He also received newspapers from all parts of Ireland denouncing the Bill in every form of language. Even newspapers like *The Londonderry Standard*, which objected to the policy of the Land League, denounced in the strongest language the provisions of this Bill. ["Question!"] It seemed to him that he was speaking to the Question. ["No!"] He was endeavouring to show reasons why the Irish Members were justified in asking for more time for the consideration of this measure. He believed they were in a position to bring under the notice of the House, when the House was in a temper to listen to them, and when they could meet together as an Assembly of reasoning men.—["Order!"] Several hon. Members called out a short time ago that they were not prepared to listen to reason at all. He was only, therefore, taking them at their own word. Fully nine-tenths of the people of Ireland were opposed to the policy of the Government Bill—["Question!"]——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The Question before the House is not the merits of the Bill at all, but simply the Question of adjournment.

Mr. DILLON said, he had no intention of discussing the merits of the Bill. He was simply trying to persuade the House that the Irish Members had at their command a mass of evidence as to the feeling of Ireland on the merits of the Bill, and that, therefore, they had a right to ask for time to place this evidence before the House, before the House came to a decision on the merits of the Bill. That was all he was endeavouring to do. He was not expressing any opinion of his own as to the merits of the measure, but simply pointing out that there was a quantity of evidence for the House to consider before it came to a vote. He did not think it was in the least degree unreasonable that the Irish Members should press for an adjournment; and the wisest thing the Government could do was to grant their request, and put off the second reading of the Bill until Monday. That would afford an opportunity for approaching the second reading with some knowledge of what the real opinion of Ireland on the subject was. He could not understand what the Government expected to gain by resisting the application for adjournment. When he considered what it was that the Irish Members asked, he was at a loss to understand what the Government wanted. If they wanted to save time, had they saved time? And there was no prospect that they would save time. Did they want to humiliate and put down the Irish Representatives? They could do that; but it would be a barren victory, for they could only do it by wasting a great deal of time and legislation. Then, what was the object of the Government? ["Question!"] With the permission of the Chair, he thought he was entitled to canvass the object of the Government in resisting the Motion for adjournment. ["Question!"] It was a very serious question what the view of the Government was in entering into a struggle like this, which put all reason in the back ground, and simply aroused prejudice and passion. Was it their object to trade on the public feeling which they were arousing by these scandalous scenes in the House? for which scenes the Irish Members were in no degree responsible. Were they trying to excite the anger and prejudice of the people of this country against the Irish Representatives in the hope that when once they had fairly aroused a storm of indignation they might be able to guide their measure into a haven of safety? He thought the Government were endeavouring unfairly to influence the further progress of the Bill by entering into this unseemly struggle at this stage of the measure. They wanted to say that the Irish Members were unreasonable now, so that they might be able to say, when the further stages of the measure came on for consideration, that no further discussion was necessary.

Mr. MILBANK: I rise to Order. You have four times, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ruled that the hon. Member is out of Order. ["No!"] I now beg to move that he be no longer heard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I have not ruled, as the hon. Member supposes, that the hon. Member for Tipperary has been four times out of Order, although I have directed his attention to the irrelevancy of his remarks.

Mr. DILLON said, it was quite apparent that the hon. Member for North Yorkshire had not paid attention to the ruling of the Chair. He submitted that he was perfectly in Order in canvassing the reasons of the Government in refusing to concede to the Irish Members that which they demanded. They were placed in that House in a most invidious and certainly in a most difficult position; and it was not only in Order, but fair and reasonable, that they should be entitled to defend the position they had taken up without being held up to public odium and abuse. The Members of Her Majesty's Government, and hon. Members opposite below the Gangway, attributed to the Irish Members very bad motives indeed; and some hon. Members did not seem disposed to extend the ordinary courtesies of the House to them. When the hon. Member for North Yorkshire called him to Order he was about to show that the Government would do wisely if they had granted an adjournment when it was asked for at the usual hour for adjournment on the previous night, and when they would do wisely to grant an adjournment now. If they did not it would only be because they had two motives. First, to hold up the Irish Members to the contempt and odium of the country; and, secondly, to facilitate the further stages of the Bill by arousing such a heated temper in the House that the arguments of the Irish Members would no longer be able to obtain a hearing, hon. Members being prepared to back up the Government, no matter how arbitrary their proceedings, in forcing the Bill through the House. ["Hear, hear!"] He saw plainly that that was the general feeling of the House in regard to the policy of the Government; and he was glad that the House was more frank than the Government in accepting that proposition. At the same time, he had no hesitation in saying that it was a policy unworthy of a Liberal Government, and a policy that would end in disaster for the Government, and cut short their lease of power.

Wednesday, 2nd February, 1881.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if it is the destiny of this House again to go through another of those nights which we have passed, with no very great satisfaction either to the House or to the country, I think it would be but right that while the House is still full I should call, in a very few words, the attention of hon. Members to the position in which we stand; and I wish especially to refer to what passed a few minutes ago, on the observations made by my right hon. Friend the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross). We have listened with patience to every argument that has been brought forward; but we have listened to a great deal more. We have listened to the same observations repeated over and over again; we have seen the same speakers rising over and over again, and we have been told, even in the last observations of the last speaker, that if the proposal that was made by some hon. Gentleman sitting below the Gangway some 24 hours ago—that proposal having been to the effect that the House should then adjourn—had been accepted we might now have been dividing on the Main Question. Well, under these circumstances, and having reference to the great number of times upon which the same Members have risen two, three, and I do not know whether some hon. Members have not risen even four times, to speak upon the mere Question of adjournment—looking to that fact, and looking, also, to what is obvious to the whole House and to almost every Member of the House, the meaning and the spirit in which this debate has been carried on, and reading it by the light of the declaration we have had—that if the proposal of the hon. Member below the Gangway (Mr. Parnell) had been adopted it would have saved us many hours' attendance in this House, and we should now be ready to divide—it is impossible, I think, that the conclusion which forced itself on the mind of my right hon. Friend should not also have occurred to the minds of a great many other hon. Members. You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my right hon. Friend asked the Speaker while he was still in the Chair whether a debate carried on in that manner and under those circumstances did not amount to something in the nature of Obstruction. The Speaker, feeling, no doubt, the very great delicacy of the position, stated, as nearly as it was possible for him to state, that he agreed with the general views of my right hon. Friend, and that he was ready to say that, at all events, the debate which had gone on had come very near indeed to the limits of Obstruction. Now, Sir, I want to know, if it then came near to those limits, at what point may we expect that those limits will be reached? The speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Dillon), and especially the questions which I have quoted—that if the proposal made last night had been accepted we should now have been dividing—strongly, I think, confirm and carry further the observations made by my right hon. Friend, and which were so observed upon by Mr. Speaker. [Mr. DILLON: Not at all.] I do not know whether the House can in any way be convinced that the debate is being carried on in that spirit, even if Members who have spoken three times should speak six times on the same Question of adjournment. I feel—we all feel—the very great delicacy and the difficulty of the position which is occupied by the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker on this occasion; and I think it is the duty of the House, and I may say it is especially the duty of Her Majesty's Government, to support Mr. Speaker in the exercise of his discretion. I was sorry, I must say, that when my right hon. Friend made his observations just now there was no indication on the part of the Government of their views. I am not proposing, and I am not attempting, to cast any blame upon them for not having done so; but I do think I am entitled, in the name of the independent Members of this House, who, at the request of Her Majesty's Government, have given up a large portion of the time usually allotted to private Members, for the conduct of this particular measure, which Her Majesty's Government have pressed on us as one of an urgent character, and who have also supported the Government in every way, both by speech when it seemed to be the best course, and by silence when silence seemed to be the best course, and by remaining here in sufficient numbers to support them throughout the long hours of the night—I think I have a right, in the name of the independent Members, to ask for some expression of opinion on the part of the Government which may strengthen the hands of you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in endeavouring to put a stop to that which we are fully convinced is of the nature of Obstruction—"No!"—and which Mr. Speaker, while he was still in the Chair, admitted, at all events, had come, even at that time, very near to that limit.

MR. CHILDERS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) addressed the Speaker a few minutes before you took the Chair I was rising to follow him and to support his appeal, when I was told that the right hon. Gentleman had risen to a point of Order, and that I should be guilty of disorder if I interposed between the right hon. Gentleman and the Chair. But the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair gave an explicit warning, not only to the hon. Member who had been speaking at the time (Mr. Dillon), but, by implication, to other hon. Members who had addressed the House three, four, or five times in the course of these debates during the last day and a half; and I must say that I expected the warning then given by Mr. Speaker would have been effectual, and that the debate might have been brought to a close by the present time. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that appeal by the right hon. Gentleman on the point of Order did not, in point of form, succeed at the moment, because, in the opinion of the Speaker, the line had not been overstepped. And it did not practically succeed, because we have had since repeated repetitions of what I may call these Parliamentary offences which led to the intervention of the right hon. Gentleman. I am very glad that the right hon. Gentleman who leads the Party who sit opposite to us has now again appealed to you, Sir, not merely on a technical point of Order but referring generally to the character of the debate, and that he has pointed out the violation of the recent Rule, and of those principles by which the debates of this House have been guided for so long. And I, Sir, answering his appeal, do emphatically say that if you should think fit, and I hope that you will think fit, to put a stop to this obstruction, which is no novelty, because we had experience of it some years ago, when we had to sit up for 26 hours, in order to meet the obstructive proceedings of certain hon. Members opposite, you will have, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, the most cordial and determined support.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are now, I think approaching something like a crisis in this debate. We have certainly heard some very remarkable, some very novel, and, I think, some very dangerous doctrines laid down on both sides of the House. The Speaker, before he quitted the Chair, had ruled that certain hon. Members were not out of Order. ["No, no!"] The Speaker, and the Deputy Speaker, had again and again ruled that certain Members were not out of Order, although it is true that the Speaker accompanied that ruling with an intimation on his own behalf that one or two Members of whom he spoke were trying the patience of the House and approaching a violation of Order. The doctrine which I now understand to be laid down by the right hon. Gentleman, who, for the moment, represents Her Majesty's Government (Mr. Childers), is that the Government can, with the assistance of the leading Members of the Opposition, create a principle of *clôture* for themselves and call on the majority of the House to close the debate at any moment they please. Although I have not been for a long time a Member of this House, I have long and closely watched its proceedings and debates; and if the right hon. Gentleman can tell us of any authority in the House which has laid down that it is within the power of Her Majesty's Government and of the majority to close a debate by an arbitrary act of their own, I shall be glad if he will refer to that authority. The right hon. Gentleman talked to us of repetitions in the course of the debate. Did he ever hear a debate in which there were not repetitions? The right hon. Gentleman talked to us of Members having spoken three or four times in the course of a very protracted debate. Since when is it a new thing for Members to speak more than once in the course of a debate when three or four seperate Motions have been successively before the Chair? I protest most strongly against this doctrine of a constructive violation of the Rules and Orders of the House. Her Majesty's Government have lately been trying their hands at the device of constructive conspiracy, and they have totally failed to establish their case. Their failure will be still more conspicuous, if they attempt now to cram the same sort of theory down the throat of the House in the shape of constructive violation of Order. I, myself, in the course of these debates, have only spoken twice. This is the second time I have risen since the debate commenced. I have not repeated anything that any other hon. Member has said, and I shall endeavour, as far as possible, not to repeat any observations of my own. But I would ask on what principle is the right hon. Gentleman to make me responsible for the imaginary offences, or even for the real offences, of others? This strange doctrine, this gigantic innovation, is suggested to you, Sir, on the spur of the moment, at the instance of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War, as one by which he, and his triumphant majority, are, forsooth, to start a *clôture* of their own, in order to bring a debate to a close at any moment. At the same time, I am glad to have heard anything from the Treasury Bench—any contribution whatever to the debate. We have had the pleasure of seeing throughout these long debates some Member or other of the Government sitting upon the Treasury Bench; but all alike maintained all through the same policy of silence. ["Question!"]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): It is customary for the House to allow the responsible Minister of the Government and the Leaders of the Opposition to explain their views in regard to questions of Order which may be brought before the House, and I allowed the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) to rise, because I thought it only fair that hon. Members in that part of the House should have an opportunity of explaining their views on the same subject. I must now remind the hon. Member that the Question before the House at the present moment is the adjournment of the House, and that he is not in Order in speaking upon other topics. Perhaps the hon. Member will continue his remarks in reference to the Question immediately before it.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY: I was addressing myself simply and exclusively to the Question of adjournment. I am supporting the Motion for adjournment, and, in supporting that Motion, I am appealing to the Members of Her Majesty's Government to consent to the adjournment. If, as I suppose, they have made up their minds not to consent to the adjournment, I ask them at least to favour the House with some reason why they oppose it? What particular reason is there why, on the first reading of this Bill, the House should be forced into a premature decision? We have given reasons, over and over again, to show why we should not be compelled to arrive at a premature decision, and I have, myself, referred to several instances in which, on the first introduction of a measure, a longer discussion took place than we have yet had. I want the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to explain to the House why the introduction of this Bill should differ from all others, and why Her Majesty's Government refuse to allow to it the same amount of discussion which has often been given to the introduction of other measures? At the present hour we could not possibly hope for a fair discussion of the Question before the House. I, therefore, appeal to the Government, if they will not agree to the adjournment, at least to state their reasons for their refusal.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he had voted for the Motion for the adjournment of the debate for a simple reason which, he believed, would commend itself to every friend of fair play. When the House of Commons was asked to come to a decision upon a question of suspending the Constitution throughout Ireland, its Members ought to be in possession of all the evidence upon which that request was made. If, therefore, anybody in that House was showing disrespect to Parliament, it was those ill-advised Members of Her Majesty's Ministry who asked the House to come to such a decision without supplying them with the statistics alleged to exist, but which the House had not been permitted to see. An instance was afforded by no less a person than the Chief Secretary for Ireland himself of the necessity of fuller and more accurate information upon the subject before the House. If the right hon. Gentleman had had the opportunity that would be afforded by this reasonable delay, for which Irish Members pleaded, he would never have placed in the hands of the Chief of the Government the utterly false report of a speech of a Member of that House. He was satisfied the Chief Secretary for Ireland could not in any willing manner be guilty of placing in the hands of the head of the Government a speech falsely attributed to the hon. Member for Cork City.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I fail to see that the observations of the hon. Member are relevant to the Question before the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL was simply pointing out that if the House was allowed time for reflection and for obtaining more accurate information, the most distinguished Members would not be guilty of mistakes arising from the want of statistics. It was because the House needed further information upon the state of Ireland that the adjournment was asked for. Why, he asked, did not a Member of Her Majesty's Government rise and put an end to the complaints of Irish Members, thereby shortening discussion and allowing the House to come quickly to a decision, by simply undertaking to place in the hands of hon. Members without delay the vast mass of statistics which were not in possession of the House? In any Court of Justice an adjournment would be granted on the demand of counsel for the defence, in the absence of evidence absolutely necessary for the elucidation of the pleas before the Court. Now, there were accusations before the great Court of Parliament all depending upon evidence which was kept back. If the Government forced on a decision immediately and in hot haste, in the absence of necessary evidence, they would be guilty before Ireland of snatching a verdict from an uninformed jury. Therefore, he asked for the evidence which was withheld from hon. Members. The high authority of a Speaker of the House had decided that it was most legitimate for Members of the House to make use of the Forms of the House, in order to obtain delay, on all questions of importance which happened to be before Parliament. The present question was one of great particular importance, and not one of general Business. It was the question of the coercion of the Irish people. They asked for adjournment in order to enable Her Majesty's Government, even out of mercy to their own reputation, to lay before them the facts which they said they could produce, which they had not produced, and which, very possibly, they never could produce. One right hon. Gentleman of Her Majesty's Government relied upon another, and each in his turn relied upon the next. He called upon Her Majesty's Government to produce forthwith the statistics on which they asked the House to establish despotism in Ireland. Her Majesty's Government told them there were the statistics for two months of such a terrible character that, although statistics for the other months had broken down, they would be sufficient to prove their case. Then, why did they not allow the House to adjourn until hon. Members knew that those statistics were in existence? He had come to the conclusion that Her Majesty's Government were the dupes of the officials at Dublin Castle, who had told them that statistics existed which did not exist, and therefore he claimed an opportunity for testing whether his view, or that of Her Majesty's Government, was correct. They asked nothing more than the adjournment of the debate, for the production of evidence, or an open confession that the evidence did not exist. One word from the Treasury Bench would dissipate the doubts of hon. Members, and the manuscript of the quarter's statistics would put an end to Irish opposition at that stage of the discussion. It was, however, very easy to silence the minority in that House. Nothing more was necessary than that an agreement should be entered into between the heads of the majorities.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is travelling beyond the Question before the House.

MR. O'DONNELL expressed regret, and concluded by assuring the House that any hasty, unspontaneous vote, any inconsiderate and rash act, would cause the decision of Parliament to be estimated by the people at the same value as the opinion of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire.

MR. DODSON: The hon. Member who has just sat down has made a demand for statistics, in addition to those already presented to the House. I am not about to enter into any argument with the hon. Member on that question, for I feel satisfied that the preponderating numbers of Members of this House are of opinion that sufficient grounds have been shown for coming to a decision upon the preliminary question of introducing the Bill upon which we are substantially engaged. But we are met once more with Motions for adjournment. Now, in every practical Assembly there is a time when discussion must cease and a decision be taken. Speaking generally, that time may be said to have come when it is made apparent by the constant repetition of the same objections to a proposition that the stock of arguments against it has been exhausted. I ask the House whether it is not evident that that period has been reached in this debate; and whether the arguments against the proposal of the Government have not been, not only stated, but iterated and re-iterated, till it has become abundantly demonstrated that its opponents have no fresh matter to adduce? I put it to hon. Members opposite whether they would not best support the interests of those whom they represent, best advance the cause for which they plead, and best consult their own dignity, by desisting from a barren discussion? Hon. Members opposite must feel that they have long since done all that in them lies in defence of their views upon this stage, at all events, of the question; and, in that sense, I think it will be acknowledged that this debate should be no longer protracted.

MR. GORST did not intend to imitate the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, by making any appeal to the

Irish Members. Neither would he make any appeal to the majority of the House, because the majority of the House was at the moment powerless. It appeared to him that the Standing Orders of the House had armed the person presiding over the discussions of the House with ample power to put an end to the unhappy and disgraceful scenes to which the House for so many hours had been compelled to submit.

Mr. DILLON rose to Order. The Deputy Speaker had ruled a few moments ago that it was customary to allow the Leaders of the House to address the Chair on the Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. and learned Member for Chatham is speaking to a point of Order, and is in possession of the House.

Mr. GORST: He was about to say that the Rules and Standing Orders of the House which were placed in the hands of the person presiding over the House gave ample power to put a stop to the unhappy and disgraceful scenes they had lately witnessed. He would not refer again to the terms of the Standing Order; they had already been spoken of by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Opposition, and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. The terms of that Order would be in the recollection of the House; but he would put before the House two short propositions, the first of which was——

Mr. PARNELL: I rise to Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. and learned Member is speaking to a point of Order, and is in possession of the Chair.

Mr. GORST: I am about to state two very short and simple propositions, and the first is, that the Main Question before the House—the Question whether leave should be given to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland to introduce his Bill—has been discussed by the House *ad nauseam*, and that there remains nothing more to be said upon the subject. My second proposition is, that, therefore, any hon. Member of this House who now rises to prolong this discussion, already exhausted, by moving the adjournment of the House, or the adjournment of the debate, is abusing the Rules of the House by persistently and wilfully obstructing its Business; and I submit to you, Sir, that if you agree with these two propositions which I have laid down, and to which it is obvious the majority of the House agrees, it becomes your duty—as the person now presiding over the Business of this House—to Name any hon. Member who persists in obstructing Business. I invite you, Sir, to exercise your authority under that Standing Order, by Naming any Member who so offends; and I think I can promise you that your ruling, on your Naming a Member, will be followed by the Order being put in force by an enormous majority.

Mr. PARNELL: It appears to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just addressed you has rather taken on himself the functions of the Chair. Certainly, it appeared to me that the latter part of his speech was an implied censure on the Chair for not having put in force a Rule which it is solely within the competence of the Chair to put in force.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): Does the hon. Member rise to address me on a point of Order?

Mr. PARNELL: Yes, I am addressing you on the point which has been raised by the hon. Member, and I say that it is solely within the competence of the Chair, and not of any hon. Member, to put in force the Rule referred to. Had it not been for the occurrences of this evening, I should have thought that any debate upon the application of a Rule, or any proposal as to such application, would have been strictly out of Order; but, under the circumstances, and as a definite proposal has been made to you, Sir, with reference to the application of that Rule—as you have been formally asked to apply it—I claim the right, as a Member of this House, to say something in opposition to the views which have been placed before you by the hon. Member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member can only rise to address the Chair on a point of Order. I am perfectly prepared to act upon the remarks made by Mr. Speaker before he left the Chair. They were—

> "Although Members speaking to the Question before the House may speak altogether in Order with respect to that Question, still I can well understand that Members may enter into a combination to effect a purpose which would

> bring them within the operation of this Order; and if I found that there was a distinct and clear combination on the part of Members of this House wilfully and persistently to obstruct the Business of the House by combination, I should consider that this Standing Order would apply. I am bound to say that the course of this debate has brought before me evidence of that combination, in so far as to bring Members wilfully obstructing within the operation of the Standing Order."

But Mr. Speaker left the House without considering the time had come to give immediate application to that Rule; and, agreeing with Mr. Speaker that what has occurred in the debate would go far to bring some of the Members who have taken part in it within the scope of this Standing Order, if they individually persist in obstruction when called upon by the Chair to desist, I shall watch with great care that no waste of the time of the House takes place on Motions for adjournment.

Mr. PARNELL: Well, I presume that the subject is now closed—at all events, for a time—until some further appeal is made to you on the subject. But, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman———

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): Does the hon. Gentleman speak on the general Question?

Mr. PARNELL: Yes, on the general Question of adjournment. I do not think that four days is sufficient time to debate this question. We have been able to point to the example that was set to us in 1845, when the first reading of the Bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act occupied seven Evening Sittings of this House; and we say that public liberty ought not to be held so much more cheaply in these days; that whereas the House of Commons allowed seven days for the discussion in 1845 of the Bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, on this occasion it will allow only four. Now, Sir, we consider that this time has been too little. We ask you for more time, in order that we may have an opportunity of testing the accuracy of the Returns of the Government. This is very important. The Returns of the outrages and agrarian offences refer to districts scattered over the greater portion of Ireland. It must necessarily take considerable time to investigate these different cases. We are at present engaged in these investigations. We have taken, and are taking, the greatest possible pains to obtain information from the different localities with a view of testing the Returns. This investigation must take considerable time, and we are desirous of laying the result of it before the House before these debates have came to a conclusion. I think we have good ground for asking for further time——

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I rise to Order. The hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork is one of the 11 Gentlemen who have spoken 33 times on Motions for adjournment of the House. I have listened carefully to the arguments which he has used, and I appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite, and to hon. Gentlemen behind me, whether he is not now re-stating word for word statements he himself has made during this Sitting of the House, and which have been repeatedly urged by other hon. Gentlemen?

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: What is the point of Order?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether such conduct on the part of the hon. Member for Cork City does not bring him under the Rules of the House that have been quoted? I ask you whether he is not abusing the Rules?

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER. What is your point of Order?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I ask whether the hon. Member has not wilfully obstructed the Business of the House; and whether, therefore, the time has not come when it is your duty, as Deputy Speaker of this House and charged with the maintenance of its authority and dignity, to Name the hon. Member?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member for Cork has hitherto very shortly stated that he is taking measures to investigate the accuracy of the Returns in different parts. That has been frequently stated before; but he has only gone a very short way in his statement, and I do not yet think that there is a case for Naming him, for, under the Standing Order referred to, wilful and persistent obstruction must be brought home to each individual Member before the Chair Names him to the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: I rise to a point of Order. Your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has been repeatedly called by distinguished Members of this

House to an alleged violation of the Standing Orders. Now, I wish to call your attention to the persistent obstruction to Public Business on the part of these right hon. Gentlemen who have alleged points of Order that were not points of Order at all; and I appeal to you to exercise your authority to put down this obstruction by Naming these right hon. Gentlemen and inflicting upon them the consequences of their disobeying your Ruling four times within the last quarter of an hour.

MR. PARNELL: I feel very much obliged to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your indulgence. I can assure you that I shall never desire to trespass upon the Order of the House, and I believe that I shall never unnecessarily obstruct the Business of this House. It is not my intention, on the present occasion, to obstruct the Business of the House; but I wish to oppose the progress of this particular measure. I believe I am perfectly within my rights in so doing, and in using the Forms of the House for the purpose of obtaining more time for the *bonâ fide* discussion of the present stage of the Bill. I regret exceedingly—I deeply regret—that this opposition should be accompanied by a loss of public time. No hon. Member can regret this more than I do.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is not now speaking to the Question of adjournment, and I must call his attention to the fact that he is travelling beyond the Question before the House.

MR. PARNELL: I shall conclude very shortly.

MR. MILBANK: I rise to Order. ["Order!" *and* "Question!"] Members opposite may say what they like, but I am determined to speak. ["Order!"] Oh! shout away. I stand here and call on Her Majesty's Government——

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: What is your point of Order?

MR. MILBANK: The hon. Member (Mr. Parnell) has been called to Order four times. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) has appealed to the Chair to Name the hon. Member, and I now call on Her Majesty's Government to support the right hon. Gentleman's appeal.

MR. PARNELL: In conclusion, I merely wish to observe——

MR. MILBANK: I rise to Order. An hon. Member sitting opposite—the hon. Member for Cavan—has called me a "b——y fool!"

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): Such an expression would be entirely out of Order; but it did not reach my ear, and I understand that the hon. Member for Cavan denies having made it.

MR. BIGGAR: I beg leave to make an explanation——

MR. PARNELL: In conclusion, I merely wish to say that we desire more time to investigate these Returns, and that the result of that investigation will throw new light upon the Question before the House.

MR. LEAMY very much feared that, in rising to support the Motion before the House, he was exposing himself to the danger of repeating something that might have been said by someone else. He would endeavour, as much as possible, not to repeat anything that had been said before; but he could not help stating the reasons why he asked for an adjournment at the present moment. The Irish Members had given just and fair reasons when they asked for it some 24 hours ago; but he had another sound one to offer—namely, that upon the Motion which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary he had not been afforded an opportunity of expressing his opinion or the opinion of his constituents. Under the circumstances, he thought it only fair that he should ask for an adjournment, so that he might be afforded the opportunity he desired. One of the difficulties with which they had to contend was, that many hon. Members, especially many on the Benches opposite, who had always been opposed to propositions such as that involved in the Motion of the Chief Secretary, and who were generally opposed to coercion, would not examine for themselves the figures of outrages upon which the case of the right hon. Gentleman was founded.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I must point out to the hon. Member that he is beginning exactly the same arguments which have been already advanced. I must, therefore, call attention to the obstruction that is now taking place,

MR. LEAMY resuming, said, that he was under the impression he was making a statement that was not made before. He was stating that hon. Members would not examine for themselves the figures upon which the case was made out—that they were taking it for granted that a case had been made out. He had not made that statement before, nor, to the best of his belief, had he heard it made. He did not want to obstruct; but he asked that he should be afforded an opportunity of speaking at the proper time to express the opinion of his constituents that the proposal was wholly unnecessary. Many hon. Members opposite might, perhaps, think it was perfectly immaterial——

MR. BORLASE: I beg to ask you, Sir, now, whether this is not absolutely obstruction?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I am listening with attention to find whether the hon. Gentleman proposes to repeat the arguments which have been so constantly heard.

MR. LEAMY said, he did not blame hon. Gentlemen for making those objections, or inviting attention to his arguments; but the effect of the interruptions had been to make it difficult for him to remember whether what he was saying had been stated by other Members before. He did not wish to occupy the attention of the House at any great length, and should content himself with stating that he hoped, if it was not too late, that the Government would even then consent to the proposal before the House. He knew the Government might feel that by yielding they would be giving way to a small minority; but he would ask them to bear in mind that the Irish Members represented a majority of the people of Ireland, and to consider who had a better right to say whether a full and ample discussion had taken place than those who represented the people of Ireland. He hoped even yet the Government would see their way to withdraw their Motion. They had challenged the resistance of the Irish Members, and they could not be surprised if the challenge was accepted. [*Cries of* "Name!"]

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he knew the object of hon. Gentlemen who interrupted was to try whether what had proceeded in the House was obstruction or not. He ventured to think that the question had got to be tried in the presence of his hon. Friend who had just sat down; but he believed that his hon. Friend was as incapable of offering obstruction as any hon. Member. If they were about to try the big question of Obstruction in that House, let them try it with a big man. Let them try it with the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The Question before the House is simply one of adjournment.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, they were on the question of Obstruction, and he thought on that question arose a larger question, and that was, whether they were to have Obstruction tried or not? There was not an hon. Member on either side of the House, putting technicalities aside, who did not know that he was addressing himself to the Question, and if it was to be tried, let them have the hon. Member for the City of Cork as the Leader of the Party, and try the question with that hon. Gentleman, and not with any other hon. Gentleman. It was idle to talk of trying individual Members.

MR. JOHN BRIGHT: I have a few words to offer to the House. I was struck with the questions that were put to this Bench by the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and the hon. Member for Tipperary, and by my hon. Friend the Member for Longford. Questions were asked why it is that we object to an adjournment? Now, I will give an answer to the demands of the hon. Gentlemen, and keep strictly to the Question. I understood the hon. Member for Tipperary to say that if, last night, the Government had accepted some kind of proposition as to the procedure in regard to Business, the House might have adjourned at a reasonable time last night, and that it might have resumed the debate at 5 o'clock to-day—that is yesterday now—and that by this time the House might have divided on the Main Question. That was said by the hon. Member for Tipperary if I understood him aright. I am not sure by whom that proposition was made; whether in private or in public. But, in any case, it was not acceded to. Now, if the proposition that was then made had been adopted, the debate would have ended at 12 o'clock last night, resumed at 5 o'clock to-day, and have ended by about this time (1 o'clock). If that be so, hon. Members for Ireland have no ground for complaint, for they have had 17 hours of discussion of this question—

more than, they themselves were prepared to admit last night, was necessary. If I am not mistaken in this, surely the Government have a right, and the great majority of this House have a right, to ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to consent to a division now; and I think they might have consented to one at an earlier hour than 1 o'clock. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, and his Friend the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, have spoken with great warmth on this question, and have endeavoured to throw upon the Government the responsibility of the present state of affairs. [Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: No, no!] Well, perhaps, that is not quite a fair statement. At any rate, they have thrown the responsibility on the Government of making some proposition. [Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: No, no!] Then I am under a mistake. I understood that was the purport of it. If I am not mistaken, and if that be the view of those right hon. Gentlemen, I think I am at liberty to say that the Government do not by any means reject that responsibility. The House must know, everybody must know, that it is not easy, probably it is not possible, to make any considerable change in the Rules of our procedure without a large unanimity on the part of the House. It may be that, until this time, the case has not been such as to compel that unanimity. I hope the case now presented to us, as it is to-night, has arrived at that point when it is possible to make some change, perfectly consistent with freedom of discussion, which may save the House of Commons from the discreditable scenes which have been exhibited within these walls within the last few days. I know not if I am too sanguine in this matter; but I believe it is the intention of my right hon. Friend at the head of the Government to make some proposition to the House, and the House will have a fair opportunity of discussing it; and if the House is not willing to assert its own right in circumstances such as these, the blame must rest on the House, and they must bear the consequences that may ensue. I will make one other observation only. The hon. Gentleman who sat down just now spoke of the majority of the Irish Members as representing the majority of the Irish people. There has been no division during this Session, I believe, in which hon. Gentlemen opposite have been supported by the majority of the Irish Members, and in all divisions except the first they have only been supported by about one-third of the Irish Members. Do not let them suppose I am asserting that they are not representing a large opinion in Ireland. [An hon. MEMBER: A majority.] An hon. Member says "a majority." I will not say that it is so or not. I admit perforce much that they say on that point; but I am perfectly certain that the time must come—I hope it will come—when the Irish people—all that is thoughtful and all that is sensible amongst them—will find out that the way to do good to Ireland is not to degrade this House of the Imperial Parliament. Further, I am greatly mistaken if it be not the fact that this Imperial Parliament will know how to defend itself from the grossest case of insult and obstruction which, in my opinion, has ever been exhibited here. I cannot promise myself or flatter myself that anything I can say will have any influence with some Gentlemen on the opposite side; but I cannot believe that they all in their consciences approve the course which has been pursued, and although I believe that in that course many persons—many of them and many of their supporters—disapprove of what I am doing now and condemn it, I can assure them I am not less a friend of free discussion and not less a friend to Ireland than I have ever been for nearly 40 years that I have been in Parliament.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, he naturally felt some embarrassment in rising after the right hon. Gentleman, because he always appealed to the House with so much force. He would not refer to the evident signs of combination on the part of hon. Members in other parts of that House, not only to override the opinion of the House, but to override the opinion of the Chair. He wished to address himself to the main argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. The right hon. Gentleman called attention to the fact that they had been discussing the Motion for adjournment for the last 17 hours, and, by a process of logic very unusual to the right hon. Gentleman, he arrived at the conclusion that the House had, therefore, had a sufficient opportunity for discussing the Main Question. The right hon. Gentleman forgot the circumstance that hon.

Members were obliged to confine themselves to the Question of adjournment, and that upon such a Motion they were precluded from discussing the Main Question. The right hon. Gentleman made a strong point of this; but where was the force of his reasoning? Hon. Gentlemen within the last 17 hours, during the time the House had been engaged in discussing Motions for adjournment, had made various attempts to discuss the Main Question, and had been precluded by the Chair from doing so. They were thus prevented from discussing the Main Question, and had really had no opportunity of entering into it. In the second part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, he deplored the exhibitions which had taken place in the House during the last two or three days, and referred to the probability of an alteration being made in the Rules of the House as an argument to induce hon. Members to refrain from making Motions for adjournment. The only reply he (Mr. O'Connor Power) had to make to this was that if the House of Commons made up its mind to alter its Rules, having in its wisdom decided, after deliberation and discussion, that the present Rules regulating the proceedings of the House were imperfect, it would be time enough then to act in accordance with any new Resolution, when it should have received the sanction of the majority of the House. But the right hon. Gentleman appeared altogether in the wrong when he invited the Irish Members to assent to the passing of the Bill, and held over them a threat of coercion within the walls of Parliament if they declined to adopt his suggestion. These were the two branches of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, and, for one, he (Mr. O'Connor Power) was not convinced by that speech that his Colleagues were generally exceeding the fair limits of debate, taking into consideration the importance of the Bill for the introduction of which the House was asked to grant leave. Under all the circumstances, he should feel inclined to make an appeal to the Members of the Government and the Leaders of the Opposition who, from their opposition, were able to influence the future character of the debate. He would say, in the first instance, from what he knew of the feeling of his Colleagues, that it was not in the power of Her Majesty's Government or the Leaders of the Opposition, or of both of them combined, to bring the discussion to a speedy close. From what he knew of the feeling of his Colleagues and of his own feeling, the Question would be fully debated, even although some hon. Members might have occasion to regret their language and demeanour, and the sins they might probably have committed in not being able to address themselves to the Question with that solemn dignity which befitted the magnitude of the issue raised. He trusted that as the action of the Chair had been repeatedly invoked for the purpose of repressing the action of the Irish Members, he might also invoke the authority of the Chair against hon. Members who had so little respect for the House that they declined to go to the trouble of rising from their seats to declare their opinions in an audible and respectful manner, but were content with making and uttering unintelligible and inarticulate ejaculations. A large part of the obstruction complained of proceeded from these Gentlemen who, if they had convictions, did not seem to have the intelligent courage of them. He did not understand the courage of hon. Gentlemen who got as far back as they could upon the back Benches and deliberately interrupted every speaker. ["Order!"]

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is going altogether beyond the Motion before the House.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, he should be very glad to go back again to the Question of adjournment. He had only been led into this criticism upon the character of their proceedings because three-fourths of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had reference to the character of the debate, and he was simply following in the right hon. Gentleman's footsteps.

MR. RITCHIE rose to Order. The Deputy Speaker had called the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that he was out of Order, and he (Mr. Ritchie) wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman, in proceeding with the observations he was now making, was not disregarding the authority of the Chair? He wished, also, to direct the attention of the Deputy Speaker to the fact that before Mr. Speaker left the Chair he declared, in response to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross), that the time had almost arrived when hon. Members on the Benches below the Gangway would be guilty of obstructing the Business of the House. Since that time appeals had been made to the Deputy Speaker from the Front Bench on that side of the House upon the same point. ["Order!"] More than that, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had stated that what was going on was, in his opinion, the grossest case of insult and obstruction he had ever seen. He (Mr. Ritchie) would ask, therefore, whether, seeing that the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) was disregarding the ruling of the Chair, in pursuing remarks which had been ruled to be out of Order, and that the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had spoken of the entire debate as a gross case of obstruction, the time had not now arrived for putting in force the Standing Orders passed last year?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I think the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) could not have heard the concluding observations which the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) was addressing to the Chair. They were an apology for having been out of Order.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER thought he might now retire with honour, and he thanked the Chair for vindicating the character of his speech.

MR. BIGGAR wished to call attention to two of the speeches which had proceeded from the Treasury Bench. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Dodson) had made a short speech, in which he had objected to the conduct of an hon. Member for having repeated the same arguments over again. Nevertheless, the right hon. Gentleman, during that short speech, repeated himself at least 10 times over. ["Question!"] He was only following the example of the right hon. Gentleman. With regard to the speech of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, that right hon. Gentleman appealed to the Irish Members to withdraw their Motion for adjournment on a particular ground—namely, that a suggestion had been been made on the first day of the debate that an adjournment should take place at 12 o'clock at night, and that the House should divide at 12 on the next night.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member is not speaking to the Question.

MR. BIGGAR said, the ground for the Motion for adjournment was that the Irish Members had not, as yet, had an opportunity of discussing the original Question. He himself had personally intended to make a speech upon the original Motion before the Chair—namely, the Motion for leave to introduce the Bill. He had had a speech prepared on the subject; but he had not had an opportunity of delivering it, because the adjurnment did not take place at 12 o'clock last night—the time suggested; and during all the succeeding time Motions for adjournment had precluded him from offering his opinions in regard to the Main Question. The result was that the time of the House had been wasted, but not through the fault of the Irish Members, who were perfectly reasonable in their demands. Twenty-four hours had been occupied in Motions for adjournment, and the Main Question had made no progress whatever, the only effect having been to prevent him and other hon. Members from saying what they had intended to say.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Gentleman is altogether out of Order, and I must remind him that this is not the first time I have called his attention to the necessity of confining himself to the Question before the House.

MR. BIGGAR said, he would not pursue the subject further, because he was exceedingly unwilling—in fact, he was determined, as far as lay in his power, that he would never challenge any ruling the Speaker might lay down, knowing, as he did, that the ruling of the Chair was always given with thorough impartiality. If he were willing to set the Chair at defiance, he should feel satisfied that he was wrong, and that the Chair was right. He would, therefore, not pursue the subject further. At the same time, he would appeal to Her Majesty's Government to agree to the Motion for adjournment. When he used the word "appeal," he did not mean it is an appeal for mercy or favour; but the reason which induced him to make it was that he thought an adjournment would be more conducive to the interests of Ireland, so that the discussion might be re-commenced at a time when hon. Members would be in a better condition to approach it. Although he had no authority to make any proposition on behalf of his Colleagues, he thought he might safely say that if an adjournment took place, the discussion would be finished before 6 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, in a manner satisfactory to all parties concerned, and with no substantial waste of time. If, on the other hand, they were to continue sitting for the discussion of Motions of adjournment, the only practical result would be that hon. Members would lose their temper. A very great amount of time had already been occupied; and if the Government would now consent to some arrangement by which the discussion upon the Main Question should be brought to a close, they would be able to spend the time of the House much more profitably than they were doing at present.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 22; Noes 197: Majority 175.—(Div. List, No. 17.)

[1.35 A.M., WEDNESDAY, FEB. 2.]

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. BIGGAR begged leave to bring to the notice of Mr. Deputy Speaker a question of Privilege upon which he desired to have his ruling. During the division which had just taken place, the hon. Member for the North Riding of Yorkshire (Mr. Milbank) came across the floor of the House, and said to him—"Mr. Biggar, you are a mean, impudent scoundrel!" The hon. Member seemed to be rather proud of what he had done; but he would like to know whether, in the opinion of the Chair, he was justified in his conduct? He would, as a matter of personal explanation, say that the hon. Member had charged him with using an expression which he had not used. With regard to the question of Privilege, he might remark that in the last Parliament the late Dr. Kenealy, then a Member of the House, used offensive expressions towards the hon. Members for Meath and Durham, and, on both occasions, was reprimanded and had to apologize.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): It has been decided that all offensive words used by one Member towards another Member, even in the Lobby are against the Rules of the House. I must ask the hon. Member for the North Riding of Yorkshire whether he admits having used the words imputed to him by the hon. Member for Cavan?

MR. MILBANK would only say that, as he was sitting down, he distinctly saw the lips of the hon. Member for Cavan moving, and heard him use the words "b——y fool!" All that he could say was that he deeply felt the offence which he believed the hon. Member had been guilty of, and, as soon as an opportunity presented itself, he walked across the House and called him an "impudent scoundrel!"

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member having admitted that he used that expression with reference to another hon. Member, it is his duty to apologize not to the hon. Member, but to the House.

MR. MILBANK would apologize to the Deputy Speaker and to the House. At the same time, he thought the hon. Member for Cavan ought to apologize to him for the expression used towards him.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The hon. Member having apologized to the House, the incident is now terminated.

DR. COMMINS objected to the introduction of the Bill on several grounds. It was unnecessary in fact, inexpedient in policy, and unjust in principle. It gave certain powers of arrest to the Lord Lieutenant, or the Chief Secretary for Ireland acting as his Secretary. That power of arrest was supposed to be a measure for the protection of person and property; but it was quite unnecessary to confer such powers on the Chief Secretary for Ireland or anybody else. The law in Ireland was the same as the law in England; it gave ample powers of arrest to the persons who would cloak themselves under the provisions of the Act, and who could now arrest in every case in which it was proposed to give powers of arrest to the Chief Secretary. He had been astonished when the right hon. Gentleman sent that remarkable letter to the magistrates in Ireland, because it was well known that both they and the police were only too willing and ready to exercise those powers if called upon to do so by the authority of the Executive of Ireland. It ought to be familiar to every magistrate, and even every magistrates' clerk, that any policeman could arrest upon his own suspicion in every case of felony, although he could not arrest on his own suspicion in every case of misdemeanour. In the catalogue of agrarian offences, there was not one single case which did not come under the description of felony or misdemeanor; and the crime so much relied upon by the Chief Secretary for Ireland, of writing threatening letters, was, in some cases, a felony punishable by penal servitude for life. A policeman could arrest, on reasonable suspicion, in almost all cases; and in cases of misdemeanors, where he could not arrest upon his own suspicion, he could always get a magistrate's warrant empowering him to arrest, upon laying a proper information. So far as the powers of arrest were concerned, they were at present as freely vested in the Irish Executive through the police and magistracy as they would be vested in them under the provisions of the proposed Bill. But, it was said, this power was not enough. We were bound to bring people to trial. According to the law of the country as it stood the magistrate was bound to assign the cause of arrest in the warrant of commitment. Well and good. So, in order to prevent parties continuing in their illicit course, the Government felt bound to detain them, and demanded powers to do so for a period of 18 months. Then, again, the Act was absolutely and entirely unnecessary, for this further reason. There were well known processes put in force every day in England, and there were powers vested in every justice of the peace by his commission to take security from evil-disposed persons for keeping the peace, and for good behaviour. If such evil-disposed persons existed in Ireland, and were well known to the police—as alleged by the Chief Secretary—who could lay their fingers on their names and places of abode, he asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland how it was that in no single instance, as far as he was aware, had the magistrates in Ireland put the power vested in them in full operation, and how it was that the men suspected of incendiary fires, the houghing of cattle, &c., had not been arrested, while if there was the slightest case or ground of suspicion a policeman could go before any justice of the peace exercising his office in the district, and lay an information against the suspected person charging him with a breach of the peace, or with being a person of disorderly conduct or evil reputation? Such suspected person might be arrested, and bound over to keep the peace; and if he happened to be one of the persons described in the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, he could get no person to give bail for him, and could, consequently, be locked up for 12 months, in default of securities. Precisely the same power was vested in the magistrates, acting on their own motion, according to the 5th volume of *Burn's Justice of the Peace*—a book which ought to be in the house of every magistrate, and on the Bench, and wherever a justice exercised jurisdiction. On page 759, they would find set out in detail the number of offences for which, or rather on suspicion of which, for proof was not necessary, a justice —not even two justices, but one— could have a person brought before him and oblige that person to find security for his good behaviour. There was no limit to the amount of recognizances the justice might fix. If £10 was not enough, the magistrate could oblige a person to give £20 or £40, £50 or £100, or even £1,000; and, in fact, it was possible for a magistrate to fix the recognizances at such a sum that no village ruffian would be able to find the necessary amount, and, as a consequence, the offender could be locked up and kept in such perfect security that he could no longer cut off the tails of horses, or burn turf, or commit any of the other outrages complained of. He would not go through the list; but there were 24 classes of offences the magistrates could deal with in this way, and amongst them were included nearly every one of the offences these so-called "village tyrants" were supposed to commit. The offences were given one by one, and every justice wishing to put the powers vested in him in force, could find them out for himself; and the Executive Government, if they thought fit, could, in the short space of 24 hours, have every one of the well-known, dissolute ruffians and village tyrants on whom the police had their eye, locked up and kept in imprisonment for 12 months. For this reason he opposed the introduction of this measure, because it was absolutely, entirely, and palpably unnecessary; and he could not, under the circumstances, help mistrusting the Government and the Executive which asked for such powers. It was all very well to disguise, or to endeavour to disguise, powers of coercion by calling them provisions for the protection of life and property. That disguise would not do for the Irish people. They saw through it easily enough, and they had had a little too much of that kind of protection. They failed to see that life and property were any safer in spite of the 47 coercive measures which had been passed against Ireland since the Union. He put it to the House how much better it would have been if, instead of the Coercion Bill before the House, measures of redress, of remedy, had been proposed, because these measures, interfering with the liberties of the people, failed to bind the disorderly portion of the people, and only galled, annoyed, and rendered discontented the well-disposed and the law-abiding. He entirely opposed the introduction of a measure of this kind as unnecessary and inexpedient. If they examined into what had been the result of previous experiments of this kind, he thought the conclusion would be forced upon them that it had never, in one single case, been satisfactory. If they were to guide their conduct by reference to the past, they certainly were not encouraged to begin anew by adopting the never-ending process of coercion first and bringing in remedial measures afterwards, because coercion prevented remedial measures from ever having any effect, even if those remedial measures were ever introduced, and sometimes they were not, although they were promised. They found that in no single instance had coercion been followed by any permanent good. He would not go over the statistics that had been so often referred to, and he would endeavour to avoid repeating not only any observations he might himself have made on a previous occasion, but any remarks made by other hon. Members to which he had listened. Some of the hon. Members now present had already heard of the discussion which had taken place with regard to the statistics on which this measure was supposed to be based; and he would, therefore, confine himself to this general observation, that every one of the 47 Coercion Acts which had been passed by this country had proved inoperative, that every one had only served as a prelude to one to follow, and that the severity of one only served to intensify that of the next. The taking of such powers as Coercion Acts seemed to have been very much like dram-drinking and opium-eating, for each recurring dose seemed to render the dose that came after still more necessary. Every dose seemed to increase the appetite for the unwholesome medicine; and he would ask the Government once and for all to cut away the evil and do as the dram-drinker and the opium-eater had to do, if he wanted to cure himself. He would urge the Government to show some strength of mind, and instead of taking refuge in the last resource of weakness and incapacity—namely, coercion—boldly say—"We will rely on the powers given us by the Constitution; we will put them vigorously in force, which no Irish Executive has done yet." And if they acted in this way, he would promise them that they would find the powers at present vested in the hands of the Executive, and at present conferred on the magistracy, sufficient to suppress any disorder that existed in Ireland. And he might say that he regretted as much as any hon. Gentleman who sat on the Treasury Bench, as much as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, or the learned Solicitor General for Ireland, whose duty it was to look after these matters legally, that there were any disorders in Ireland. If there were disorders, they were to be attributed to a very different cause to that which Her Majesty's Government seemed inclined to attribute them. He also opposed the introduction of the measure as unjust, and had given some reasons why he considered it should not be introduced; but he had offered only a few reasons, because at this late hour it appeared to him desirable to make a selection of them, and to spare hon. Gentlemen from listening to more of his arguments than he felt it absolutely necessary to address to them. The measure was unnecessary—worse than unnecessary; it was grossly unjust, and seemed to possess all the evils of its predecessors. It was an aggravation of the evils of all Bills of a similar character, because it began by substituting suspicion for proof. If there was any one thing that distinguished this free country above every other country in Europe, it was the openness, the publicity of the method, and the rigid rules upon which its criminal procedure was conducted. Secret tribunals were unknown to us here. Secret accusations were unknown, not only under the ordinary law of the land, but were entirely against the spirit of the Constitution. Secret deletion and the mysterious terror of the "Lion's mouth" may have suited the tyranny of a Venetian oligarchy; but in free and happy England we were entirely unacquainted with it. Ireland was supposed to share the benefit of all the laws passed for England during a comparatively recent period; and so she did, except when Coercion Acts were introduced. There was no secret accusation here; and it was one of the greatest guarantees for the freedom of the people that their criminal procedure was open to the public. The accused was permitted to know what he was accused of. He was arrested, and brought face to face with his accuser, and had an opportunity of examining the charge, and the evidence on which that charge was supported. Moreover, in every case of the slightest importance he could appeal—and some of the cases in which an appeal could be made were very trivial indeed—he could appeal "to the judgment of his country," as the venerable phrase of the old Common Law had it. A person accused of a crime could put himself on his country, and appeal to its judgment, which judgment had to be given openly by 12 impartial jurors, sworn to judge between the Crown and himself. This was the one great protection for the liberty—aye, and the property—of the people of England; but this protection the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary sought by his Bill to take away from the people of Ireland. He proposed, with a stroke of the pen, to cancel these open proceedings, which were the crowning glory of the Constitution of England; which were the guardians—the palladium—of British liberty; which stood between the Sovereign and the subject, the strong man and the weak, the rich man and the poor. And what did he offer in their place? He offered secret procedure, which deprived a man of the guarantees he possessed by the ordinary law, and by which a man's liberty might be taken away, his wife and family, as a consequence, reduced to beggary and misery, and a sense of insecurity introduced into the whole neighbourhood to which he belonged. Under the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman, without being brought face to face with his accuser, without being allowed an opportunity of making a defence, and without bail, a man might be sent to prison for 18 months. Nay, a man might be sent to prison without knowing what he was accused of, and without being able to put himself on his country; and there he might lie and there he might rot for 18 months, which was the limit the Government seemed to intend. But this oppressive and tyrannical power was like the taste of blood to the wild beast. Once the wild beast tasted blood—once the lion's cub tasted blood—no matter how he might have been tamed, learning the ways of his sires of the forest, he never forgot it; and Her Majesty's Government, once they had tasted of the blood of Irish liberty, would, long before the 18 months which was the period proposed for the duration of the Act, follow the old evil precedent, and renew the Bill—as so many Bills of a similar kind had been renewed during the recent history of Ireland. The measure was absolutely unjust, because it substituted suspicion for proof, and left every man at the mercy of the spy and the informer. It would put a premium on private malice and spite; it would give private malice an opportunity of making itself felt without exposing itself to publicity, and without submitting itself to the wholesome check of cross-examination and of public trial. It would give an opportunity to private malice and malevolence; and all this in the name of freedom, and in the name of the protection of person and property. Now, if these unholy, these dangerous powers, were only to be exercised upon criminals, upon men who committed the crimes about which they had heard so much, he, for one—notwithstanding his love of liberty, notwithstanding all his respect for personal rights—would not raise his voice against the proposal. If there were any rule by which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, or his subordinates, were able to distinguish the guilty from the innocent, and exercise an infallible discretion which told them who was justly and who was innocently and falsely accused, he should not oppose the measure. But there was no such rule, there was no such power. No such power ever existed in the human mind, and no man was ever wise enough or good enough to be entrusted with powers like those contained in the Bill. He was quite willing to give the Chief Secretary credit for all the conscientiousness he claimed, and he was also ready to give the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright) credit for all the conscientiousness and love of liberty that he claimed; but he maintained that conscientiousness—even love of liberty—would be no protection in this case, and no guard against an extensive abuse of the powers such as were contained in the Bill. No human being who merely acted on suspicion—on other peoples' suspicion—could be trusted to exercise these powers. If he acted on his own suspicion merely, there might be some chance of his acting right; for he might guess right in a certain number of cases. But no man could act fairly on the suspicion of other people, grounded he did not know how or on what. Suspicion might have had its origin in private malice, in family disputes, or in the thousands of uncharitable motives sometimes actuating the human heart which only God could know. No man—whatever his industry, his ability, or his capacity might be—had knowledge enough to be trusted with powers such as these. No man could take such precautions as would be requisite to prevent the misuse of those powers; therefore, no man ought to be entrusted with them. The possession of the highest industry, the largest experience, the deepest conscientiousness, could not justify the House in giving such powers to any human being; and even if it could be proved that strong grounds existed for giving such power, it would be grossly unjust, and he would oppose it as unjust, so long as any other remedies were possible. There was another and a still more serious objection to the proposed measure. The Act proposed would establish new and indefinable criminal offences; but even if it were an Act dealing with well-known and well-defined offences, which could be limited by legal phraseology and legal definitions about which neither magistrate nor Judge would be in doubt as to their extent or meaning—even if it were of that description, and the persons who were to be amenable to it should understand what they might be accused of, the proposed Act was still grossly unjust on another ground, for it was retrospective. It went back in its action, and made people liable to be severely punished—for imprisonment under that Act was severe punishment—for some offences not at present defined, and which were at present undefinable, and for offences which might have been committed some years, and which, indeed, could have no existence before the passing of the present Act. It would be unjust if it dealt with known offences, and dealt with offences before the passing of the Act; but it went further than that. They knew what treason meant—the history of the country had too many illustrations of the meaning of the word, and the Constitution had plenty of precautions against any person being unjustly convicted of that tremendous offence—but he would like to know what was meant by "treasonable practices"? He knew something about the Criminal Law of England and of Ireland, and he was not aware that there was any such crime as "treasonable practices" recognized in England. He knew what treason was, he knew what every offence in the Blue Book was. He could define every one, and every magistrate could define them; but he would like to know how treasonable practices would be defined. He would like to know what they were. He would like to know whether in the history of Ireland, or of England, anybody had ever been tried or convicted on an indictment for treasonable practices in England or Ireland. What was meant? It was left open to every policeman's imagination, to every magistrate's imagination, to every ignorant magistrate's clerk's imagination, to say what were treasonable practices. One might consider that firing with a popgun was a treasonable practice, another might consider that the putting of a laurel leaf in the coat was a treasonable practice. There were many other things. He had heard of a man carrying a green flag; that was another extraordinary thing that figured in the reports of the police. He would like to know whether that would be a treasonable practice? The existing law contained no definition of treasonable practices; no man was ever tried or convicted for treasonable practices. Many had been tried for treason, and been hanged, drawn, and quartered. Treasonable practices did not mean treason, or any offence that could be defined or understood, or any existing offence at present on the Statute Book, because treason itself was mentioned; and yet any man might be confined on the suspicion of a policeman, and placed at the mercy of any village constable. That was not the only new offence——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is discussing a measure which has not been officially before the House.

Dr. COMMINS said, he was not discussing the Act, but the description of it given in the speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. He had not a copy of the Act; but his knowledge of it was derived from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, and if that did not give him a sufficient notion of the Bill about to be introduced, he was perfectly willing to bow to the ruling of the Chair. The Chief Secretary had said—

> "We propose to take power to enable the Lord Lieutenant by his warrant to arrest any person whom he may reasonably suspect of having, either before or after the passing of the Act, been guilty as principal or accessory of treason, felony, or treasonable practices, or of any act punishable by law in a prescribed district, being an act of violence, or intimidation, or inciting to any such act, or tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order."

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is quite in Order in referring to that description. I thought he was referring to the Act.

Dr. COMMINS said, he was dealing with the injustice of an Act answering to that description. The present discussion would have its effect, and probably the Act might prove to be a different thing from what he had been obliged to anticipate. What he was pointing out was the injustice of these new offences; the injustice of making people liable *ex post facto*. Those were not the only indefinable and vague offences created by the Act. There was another still more indefinable, and still more vague, and still more dangerous point, because the more vague powers were, the more dangerous they were. One advantage of the law was that a man could not be charged with an indefinable outrage, and the introduction of any indefinable offence was a most serious innovation on the liberty of the subject and on the Constitution of the Realm; and he warned hon. Gentlemen that such inroads on liberty would not be confined within geographical limits. Of all the widespread nets to catch innocent people, of all the instruments of indiscriminate tyranny that ever were invented, the power of committing a man for 18 months, or for 18 minutes, for such an indefinable offence, or suspicion of it—for it was not necessary that the offence should be committed at all, but only that there should be a suspicion in the mind of a policeman—that was the most extraordinary——

Mr. OTWAY: I observe that the hon. Member is not only discussing the provisions of the Bill on the statement of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, but the details of the Bill; and I submit that those are fitted for discussion in Committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is going beyond the description of the Chief Secretary, and is discussing the Bill. That is clearly out of Order.

Dr. COMMINS said, he was confining himself to the imaginary offences which the Chief Secretary proposed to make punishable. They were to be left to the discretion of the policemen. Supervision by Dublin Castle would be impossible, and the whole thing must lie with the person who put the Act in motion and originated the arrest. But what was the offence?—

> "Any person whom he may reasonably suspect of having, either before or after the passing of the Act, been guilty as principal or accessory of high treason, treason-felony, or treasonable practices, wherever committed, or of any crime punishable by law committed in a prescribed district, being an act of violence or intimidation, or the inciting to an act of violence and intimidation, or tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order."

Under the Lord's Day Act it was punishable for boys to play pitch-and-toss on Sunday. He was just putting a case, and not at all a case that was beyond the possibility of occurrence. Pitch-and-toss was one of the offences which was punishable as much in Ireland as in England——

SIR EDWARD REED: Mr. Deputy Speaker, have these remarks any bearing on the Question before the House?

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): I think the mode in which the hon. Member is proceeding is a waste of the time of the House.

DR. COMMINS, continuing, said, any offence punishable by law might be considered by an officious sub-constable as "tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order," and so become one of those indefinable offences. He opposed the proposal of the Chief Secretary on the ground that it would be exceedingly dangerous and unjust to intrust magistrates with such arbitrary powers. He objected, also, to the introduction of the measure on another ground—namely, the way in which the public mind had been prepared for it. The state of the public mind had been referred to over and over again; but if these extraordinary powers were to be conferred upon the Irish Executive their exercise would be all the more dangerous, because of the way in which the public mind had been prepared for it, and on account of the condition in which the public mind would be after the Act passed. He fearlessly asserted that the public opinion of England had been deliberately led astray by a conspiracy to propagate false and dangerous news. He had read false accounts of outrages by the hundred, of men's ears being cut off, men being carded, and other offences, every one of which were afterwards contradicted. The House had already been told of an hon. Member who was said to have been driven out of his county by actual fear of personal violence. The hon. Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham) had himself contradicted the report; but he (Dr. Commins) had seen no contradiction in the paper which published the false news in the first instance. The public mind had been deliberately and intentionally debauched by persons who, for purposes of their own, wanted to see the exceptional powers now asked for vested in Her Majesty's Government. The public mind had been intentionally and wickedly led astray upon the subject. An impression had been produced that Ireland was in a state of insurrection worse than ever Bulgaria was in, or America during the Civil Wars. This false information was industriously circulated for the purpose of preparing the public mind for the Act the Government now sought to pass; and the debauched public mind had been worked to such a pitch that, notwithstanding all the exertions of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, it would be impossible to prevent the commission of gross acts of injustice and tyranny. And that was not all. Those who were in favour of the measure had not only debauched the outside public opinion; but the measure had been introduced into the House with a certain amount of rhetorical garnish such as seldom made its appearance in the House of Commons. The Chief Secretary, in his very able speech in introducing the Bill, indulged in language which was not often used in Parliamentary debates. Indeed, it was employed so very seldom that he did not remember a previous instance, and he did not believe that any other hon. Member could, in which a debate had been ornamented by such flowers of speech as "low ruffians," "dissolute blackguards," and so on. ["Question!"] If it were necessary, he would read the expressions from the right hon. Gentleman's speech. He strongly objected to such a mode of bringing a question before the House. He was, however, willing to withdraw these expressions if called to Order by the Chair; but, until he was called to Order, he must say that, although his experience of the House was not large, he had never heard of a private Member, much less a Cabinet Minister, introducing a measure with such rhetorical flowers. It almost seemed that the resources of Billingsgate were scarcely sufficient, for the right hon. Gentleman fell back upon a foreign language, and gave a kind of French polish to his vituperations by calling the objects of his wrath *mauvais sujets*. With regard to these *mauvais sujets*, the right hon. Gentleman said he knew every one of them, and was able to place his finger upon them. He certainly could not congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the circle of his acquaintance; but, if it was the case that the right hon. Gentleman could place his finger upon them, he (Dr. Commins) was at a loss to know why these *mauvais sujets* and dissolute blackguards had not found a place in the county gaols long ago. He strongly objected to the House being led astray, or the public mind prejudiced and debauched in the way he had described.

Sir EDWARD REED: I rise to Order. I wish to ask if the hon. Member is in Order in accusing the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary of having debauched this House?

Dr. COMMINS: I did not say that the right hon. Gentleman had debauched this House.

Sir EDWARD REED: The hon. Member used the term "debauched," and applied it to the speech of the Chief Secretary.

Dr. COMMINS: What I did say, if it is necessary to explain, is, that the public mind had been debauched.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): I did not hear the words which the hon. Member for Cardiff takes exception to; but I cannot say that they could be ruled as un-Parliamentary.

Dr. COMMINS proceeded. If any objection were taken to the words he had used, he had not the slightest objection to leave hon. Members who possessed a more select vocabulary to find more fitting words to express what he could only express by this common term. Being unable to find another word, he would either withdraw it, or leave it to the imagination of hon. Members, or to their more copious vocabulary, to find another. He hardly thought the House had been dealt with in an open manner by the Chief Secretary. It had been shown how unreliable the newspaper reports were, and how fictitious outrages had been reported. He objected to the phraseology in which these offences were described. It made its appearance first in the newspapers. They knew very well what crimes were. According to the language of the law, it was quite sufficient to designate ordinary transgressions of the law as crimes, misdemeanours, or offences. That was the classification which was given by *Blackstone* and some of the oldest legal authorities. But the use of words that were simple and intelligible, and that appealed to their intelligence, was not sufficient for the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary; and, therefore, he had adopted the inflammatory vocabulary of the newspapers, which had aided in debauching the public mind out-of-doors. God knew the offences themselves were bad enough; but the right hon. Gentleman did not consider it sufficient to describe them as "manslaughter" or "offences," but insisted on calling them "outrages." Very bad crimes and offences were often committed in this country as well as in Ireland. He made no invidious comparison, because no good would be done by it; and he should not say a word to impute anything to the administration of justice in this country, or the moral and social condition of the people. But it was a notorious fact that in this country they had to deal in their Courts with grave offences against the Criminal Law. They were content to describe them as crimes or misdemeanours; but when they had to deal with such offences as cutting off the tail of an Irish donkey they were described as "outrages." He could not mention the number of times the right hon. Gentleman used the term "outrages." In fact, if he (Dr. Commins) were permitted to say so, the continued use of the word was an outrage on good taste. In one sentence the right hon. Gentleman used the term three times. The use of this sort of sensational language, which was not the result of any Act of Parliament or the description of any offence or crime known to the law, in a great debate imperilling, as this did, the liberty of more than 5,000,000 people, was in itself a most undesirable proceeding, and one which must have operated to a considerable extent in producing that heated state of feeling in the House, of which they had had but too many examples, when the audacity of an humble individual like himself stood up and opposed the measures of the Government. But that was not all. Having prepared the mind of the House for what was to come by the copious use of this phrase, the right hon. Gentleman fell back upon certain classes of offences to prove his case and establish the necessity of the Government measures. One class of offence relied upon by the right hon. Gentleman was the sending of anonymous letters. Of all the offences that could be appealed to, either in a Court of Justice, or in a public discussion, or in any other way, the evidence of anonymous letters was certainly the most fallacious and the least to be relied upon. It had been said that "the tale that comes guarded against all means of proof convicts itself." So far as anonymous letters were concerned, who could attach the slightest importance to the evidence the letters contained? Yet a large part of the case made out by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was based on these anonymous letters. No doubt, many of them were highly sensational, and gave accounts which purported to represent the state of the mind of the supposed writers; but he could not accept them as good for anything at all. If the right hon. Gentleman wished that he, or any of those who distrusted the tales they told, should place the slightest reliance on them, they ought to know who the writers were, so that they might know whether the persons they were dealing with were entitled to credit or not. The right hon. Gentleman felt that these anonymous letters were scarcely sufficient to sustain his case, and he fell back upon what he characterized as irresistible evidence, and that was the private Reports of the Irish Constabulary. Now, he (Dr. Commins) thought that that was evidence even less to be trusted than either the newspaper reports or the anonymous letters. If they were to place any reliance upon these newspaper reports, they ought to know who the policemen were who made them. It surely could not be said, as it was said about the anonymous letters, that the police were afraid of their names getting into the newspapers. They were certainly not in such a state of abject terror that they dare not reveal their names. Again, the tale came guarded against all means of proof, and, as a matter of fact, could not be relied upon. Such was the character of all the charges referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland in the opening of his elaborate speech. He believed there was only one instance in which the right hon. Gentleman gave the district from which the policeman made his Report. Such cases were liable to the suspicion that the policeman himself had been imposed upon by the Report made to him, which, after all, might rest on nothing but hearsay. It was necessary to know the source of his information; whether the case happened in his own district, or occurred 12 miles away. There was a Circular in existence, issued by the Duke of Wellington, when Chief Secretary for Ireland, warning the magistrates, and pointing out that Reports of this kind were generally exaggerated, both in numbers and character. It also pointed out that the same charge, founded oftentimes on vague rumour, was frequently repeated from three, four, or five police stations at the same time, and entered in the Returns as so many different outrages. In order to test whether the Returns were of any consequence, the House should have been favoured with the names of the person who made the charges, the district in which he was, and the locality in which the so-called outrages were perpetrated. It might be said that this was asking too much; but he thought it would not be asking too much of the Chief Secretary for Ireland that he should descend to particulars, and give the House that guarantee of authenticity which was wanting in all the Returns which had been placed in the hands of hon. Members to prove the correctness of the Reports. Everyone was interested in the Returns; and he thought, in justice to all parties, that particulars should be given to enable them to verify the grounds on which the alleged cases rested. There was another ground of objection to the proposal of the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had told the House in so many words that the Act was intended to put down the Land League, and he traced the so-called outrages to the operation of that body. But he would like to know where there was one single instance among the 2,590 outrages that had been traced to the operation of the Land League? Yet the right hon. Gentleman had told the House, and the tenour of his remarks was intended to carry hon. Members to the conclusion, that all the outrages perpetrated were the result of the operations of the Land League, and that the Land League was responsible for them. There was not a single instance in which the Land League had been proved to be guilty of exciting to, or the abetting of, outrage. No doubt, some of its supporters on the platform had indulged in language which he condemned as much as any Member of that House; and, no doubt, some of its lower and more indiscreet adherents had said things which he was not there to defend. But he denied that they expressed the sentiments of the Land League, and that the offences committed in Ireland could be proved to be the result of its operations. It was true, as the Prime Minister had said, that crime dogged the steps of the Land League. He was willing to admit that it had done so. He admitted that where the meetings were frequent the crimes had been frequent too; but he utterly dissented from the conclusion derived from that fact by the Prime Minister. He was astonished that the right hon. Gentleman, with his wonderful powers of mind, should have drawn such a conclusion; but the fact that he had done so proved that the brightest minds were sometimes clouded by prejudice, imposed on by opinion, and agitated by public feeling. He held the argument of the Prime Minister on this point to be utterly fallacious, and enough to put the House on its guard against legislating in a hurry, and introducing measures of the kind now proposed. He did not want to shrink from any fact that, provable or capable of being stated, was fair and substantial evidence. But, granting that crime had dogged the meetings of the Land League, it did not follow that it was the result of those meetings. Had it not occurred to the Prime Minister that both were the result of the same causes, and that, although agrarian offences occurred in districts where the meetings had been held, they were in no shape or form related to each other as cause and effect? Could the right hon. Gentleman not look to the causes which produced those frequent meetings of the Land League, and to the struggle for life which had taken place in the autumn and winter months, as well as to the black distress which existed where the offences were committed, and which, if the Land League had not acted as a safety valve, would probably have found vent in crime of a more malignant character than any that had been found to exist? Both these things were the result of a common cause—the residuum of terror existing in the minds of a people just escaped from death, and who had been rescued not only by the kind offices of that House, but by the charity of the world. The tenant farmers in Ireland had only gathered an average crop last year, and that had been fought for between themselves and the landlords. Surely the right hon. Gentleman could see that there was enough in that state of things to account for the state of feeling which had produced the crimes that had been committed for the purpose of frightening the landlords. Again, he objected to a measure like that proposed being brought in for one object while it aimed at another. The Bill was aimed at the Land League, while it professed to aim only at agrarian crime. The proposition put forward by Her Majesty's Government was that the Land League was the immediate cause of agrarian crime. There was one proof of this, which would have been most conclusive, which could have been produced in that House and published throughout England and the world, had Her Majesty's Government succeeded in establishing it to their satisfaction — namely, the test of the trial as to whether the Land League were accountable for any one of these offences or not. That question had been put to the test of sworn evidence and judicial interpretation of the law, as well as to the test of witnesses, supported by the able advocacy of the Attorney General for Ireland. It had been put to these tests, and it could not stand them; and so far from the country declaring, by its verdict on that trial, that the Land League was accountable for any one of the offences committed in Ireland, the result was entirely the reverse. Again, it was said there was a reign of terror in Ireland. That statement was of the same kind as was made with regard to outrages and atrocities. It was simply a falling back on a rhetorical form of expression which might mean anything or nothing, and which was certainly calculated to excite feelings of alarm and terror in the minds of those who heard it, and to induce them to legislate in a hurry and without consideration. He wondered at what period in modern times Ireland had been without its reign of terror. The present was only an alternative of terror, for Ireland was always either under terror of the landlords or terror of the law. It would be admitted that this was an unfortunate position for the people to be in, and he trusted that before long it would be remedied. He would now appeal to the Deputy Speaker with reference to a remark that had just fallen from the hon. Member for King's County who said, "in his humble opinion, he

(Dr. Commins) must be a b—— humbug."

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: Permit me to explain that when I came into the House I found the hon. Member making a long speech upon a subject which had been exhausted; and I gave expression to an hon. Member who was sitting beside me that I thought it was great humbug to hear the hon. Member going on so.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR): The expression applied to the hon. Member is an improper expression.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: Then I withdraw it, Sir.

DR. COMMINS said, he should like to know when the day was that there was no reign of terror in Ireland. Ever since he had known the country there had been a reign of terror in it—terror arising from the state of the law between landlord and tenant.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: I rise to Order. I ask that the hon. Member will express himself so that we can all hear what he says.

DR. COMMINS was quite indifferent whether the hon. Baronet heard him or not, because, in his present state, it was doubtful whether what he heard would reach his intellect. There had always been a reign of terror in Ireland, and the law of landlord and tenant was such that the latter was always in a state of insecurity. The landlord could exercise his legal powers, and subject him to punishment and inconveniences which it was unnecessary to describe. The unfortunate tenant in Ireland had always lived under a great reign of terror.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: I rise to Order. As I am told the hon. Gentleman has spoken for a certain time upon the adjournment of the debate—["No, no!"]—Oh! then I ask the hon. Gentleman's pardon for interrupting him.

DR. COMMINS wished to call the attention of the House to the fact that the existing law of landlord and tenant—which he did not propose further to discuss—had been such that the tenant had always been in terror of a notice to quit, in terror of a notice of ejectment, of a notice from the bailiff or driver, or from the 101 officials with strange names which hon. Gentlemen living on this side of the water could never understand. Under this law—a law which was admitted by everyone to be cruel—600,000 families in Ireland were always in a state of terror, and, in many instances, in a condition of abject terror. That terror had been removed, and its removal had been clearly traced to the beneficial operations of the Land League. The Land League had given to the Irish tenant what trades unions gave to individual operatives in England—had given him a kind of back that enabled him to stand upright and proclaim himself a man. Owing to the work of the Land League, it was no longer necessary for the tenant to stand, hat in hand, as he had often seen him, disgracing his manhood, cowering before the bailiff, or what was called the "driver." The terror had been removed, undoubtedly through the agency of the Land League, and they could not disguise from themselves this—that people who had been accustomed to exercise extraordinary powers, however legal, and were in the habit of having people standing all round them hat in hand—yes, and on bended knees—for he had seen the miserable tenantry of Ireland on their knees before these people in the driving snow—when they saw these poor tenants, who hitherto had not dared to call their souls their own, lift themselves up in the dignity of manhood and say—"We will submit to this no longer," they themselves became terrified. When the driver and the bailiff saw the tenants audacious enough to themselves propose the amount of rent the landlord should receive from them, the terror was rolled back on those who used to inspire it. He was willing to admit that this class of persons did feel a certain kind of terror in Ireland just now; but it was a terror that would soon cure itself. Certainly a Coercion Act was not necessary to cure it. Even the most despotic "driver" would soon find out that the men who formerly used to submit to him with such abject cowardice, and who now stood upon their manhood, meant nothing worse than to be allowed to live and to keep their families from starvation, and were willing to pay their legitimate debts and their rent. Though the tenant would not, perhaps, take off his hat to the "driver," there would be no harm done to him, and there would be peace in the country without the interference of a Coercion Act. To his mind, the Bill before the House, which was now entitled "An Act for the better protection of Person and Property in Ireland," would be much better described as "An Act for the better protection of Landlordism"—and by Irish landlordism he meant neither more nor less than that relation between the cultivators of the soil in Ireland and the owners of it, which was, admittedly, the cause of all the wretchedness, or nearly all the wretchedness, existing in the country. No doubt, the Act was intended, by those who cried out for it, as an Act for the protection of landlordism, and a guard against the reforms that had been promised, and which, presumably, were coming. From that point of view, he objected to the Motion before the House, and supported the Amendment, which also objected to the Motion and the spirit of the Bill. Any measure affecting Irish landlordism should not mean the protection of Irish landlordism, but the alteration of the system, so as to make it more in accordance with the wants and wishes of the people and the interests that were forcing themselves on the attention of the House.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether the hon. Member is applying himself to the Question before the House?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is trying the patience of the House to a very great extent; but I cannot say that as yet he is out of Order, as he is now speaking on the Main Question.

Dr. COMMINS was very sorry if he was wearying the patience of the House; but the gravity of the subject, and the amount of ground it was necessary to go over, rendered it necessary that his speech should be a long one. He was very sorry for it; but if this discussion had not, by an unfortunate circumstance to which he did not wish to refer, been protracted into a third day, probably no hon. Member would have objected to the length of his speech, and there would have been ample time—indeed, he believed there was ample time yet—for those who took an opposite view to answer him.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether the hon. Member, by his explanation, has not brought himself within that arrangement—within that Rule which has been referred to?

Dr. COMMINS said, he should be glad to see agrarian crime diminished in Ireland; in fact, he was as anxious as anyone that an end should be put to it; but he looked at it as only a symptom of the condition of the people which could only be satisfactorily dealt with by removing the cause. It was not the disease itself, but a symptom of the disease; and instead of its being removed by the Bill before the House, the measure would render its extinction more difficult in rendering more difficult the cure of the disease. He had seen a great deal of the desire on the part of hon. Members on both sides of the House——

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether the hon. Member, in referring to this, the general Question, is in Order; the Motion before the House being for the adjournment?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member is not speaking on the Question of the adjournment, but on the Main Question before the House.

Dr. COMMINS declared that the Bill would not have the effect of suppressing that which was the real disease of Ireland. He should be delighted to see agrarian crime done away with, and trusted that the Bill, if it passed, which he hoped it would not, would have some effect in doing away with it. But Acts of this kind had never had the effect of diminishing crime, for they only intensified the feelings that found their illegal expression in acts of violence and crime. The real remedy could only be provided by attacking the root, and that was what the hon. Member for Dublin proposed to do in his Amendment—to let remedial measures have precedence over this repressive measure. They might, to some extent, suppress such exhibitions of ill feeling as the firing of shots or the houghing of cattle; but it was possible for these exhibitions of feeling to become more dangerous and take an intenser form. It had been remarked, over and over again, that the number of attempts at life and serious crimes which had lately occurred was comparatively small as compared with the number that took place in 1846 and 1847. One result of this Coercion Act might be that instead of the trifling exhibition of popular discontent and popular terror, the discontent and terror might be increased — the anger of the people might assume a more deadly form. The Land League might be suppressed by the Bill. If it was, its popular feeling would evaporate, and that was a thing which no one would regret more than he should, because he believed that a more intense form of agrarian crime would show itself, and that the assassinations, the burning of houses, and attacks on property, that were so numerous in 1846 and 1847, would be repeated. In hundreds of ways the anger of the people would show itself; and, although these crimes would be a disgrace to society, and more disturbing to the people who lived in the midst of such a state of things, they would be only the more difficult to deal with. The condition of things after the passing of this Act would be worse than the condition of things antecedent to it; at least, there was every reason to fear so. There was great eagerness to pass the Act; no doubt, hon. Members, all round, being actuated by a desire to manifest their sense of indignation at what they considered abominable exhibitions of crime. With that desire he did not quarrel at all; but when this Act was passed, containing the provisions he had attempted to discuss—provisions imperfectly calculated to remove the object in view—the eagerness of hon. Members that was for some time apparent to deal with the chronic evils and the chronic discontents of Ireland would be satisfied, and the remedial measures which he had advocated, which only could cut out the cause, would be lost sight of and forgotten. As soon as the Coercion Act was passed no assistance would be given to the Government by the Tories, and very little by the back Benches on the Ministerial side. They would find that the remedial measures, which were the excuse, in the first instance, for passing these repressive measures, would suffer the same fate as the unfortunate Compensation for Disturbance Bill last Session. He thanked the House for the kindness with which it had listened to him, and could assure Mr. Deputy Speaker that, however much Irish Members tried his patience and that of the Assembly, they only did so because they felt that they were bound to do it. They did not do it willingly. They acted as they did from a solemn sense of responsibility, believing that the Bill would create mischiefs far greater than any it proposed to remedy, and believing that if they did not use all the privileges they had in that House—and he hoped they would be availed of to the fullest extent in the course of the discussion, however long it might last—they would be neglecting their duty. He trusted, however, that whatever course they found it necessary to take, they would give every consideration, not only to the feelings of the Speaker, but to those of hon. Members who differed from them in opinion. They only acted, as he had said, under a sense of solemn responsibility, believing that the passing of the measure would be the greatest blow that had ever been struck at the peace and prosperity of Ireland.

MR. BARRY rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. BARRY, resuming, said, that at that late hour he was very glad of an opportunity of placing on record his protest against the coercive provisions of the Government. He must also protest against the deliberate attempt that had been made, during the progress of the debate, to fasten the stigma on the Irish Members that they had no higher motive for the course they were pursuing during that protracted Sitting than to waste the time of the House. Speaking for himself, he was moved by an overwhelming sense of duty; and, in view and in face of the greatly mistaken public opinion which had been created by a cannonade of calumny, to adopt the course he was following. His first contention was, that there was nothing whatever in the condition of Ireland to justify the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. There was not more than 200 cases that came under the head of serious crimes; and he contended that that was nothing more than the normal condition of things in Ireland, and that there had really been no increase of agrarian offences in Ireland at all. He admitted that these 200 cases were serious offences; but they could quite easily be dealt with by the ordinary law. There were several cases of murder, two or three cases of manslaughter, and a number of cases of incendiarism. Putting the darkest complexion upon these serious cases, there was nothing whatever in them but what might be dealt with very easily by the ordinary process of law. But it was urged that although many ordinary offenders might be made amenable to the ordinary law, yet such was the state of terrorism in the country that it was impossible to secure evidence that would result in conviction. He admitted, in the case of threatening letters, that it was impossible to bring convictions home; but with regard to all other descriptions of agrarian crime, there did not exist, at the present moment, a larger percentage of acquittals than at any other ordinary period of the year. ["Oh!"] Some hon. Members seemed to be sceptical about that statement; but he would refer them to the Government Returns for the proof of the assertion. No doubt, there was a great amount of terrorism in Ireland. He had been much struck some time ago by the able and instructive letters upon the state of Ireland contributed by the hon. and learned Member for Dundalk (Mr. C. Russell). The hon. and learned Member stated that in commencing his inquiries in the county of Kerry, whenever he endeavoured to elicit information from a poor struggling tenant, it was with the utmost difficulty that he could ascertain anything about the state of things there. The tenants were terrified, and were afraid to give information. It was not the terrorism of an intense agitation, but a permanent and standing terrorism exercised by the landlord system in Ireland. That was the terrorism that prevailed; and, in his (Mr. Barry's) opinion, it produced effects far more disastrous and widespread than any result that could be forced on by a popular agitation. He had listened attentively to the arguments which had been adduced in opposition to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dublin (Dr. Lyons), and the whole of them seemed to be exceedingly weak. The Irish Members had never attempted to justify the outrages that had occurred. Hon. Members sitting on that side of the House were as anxious as Her Majesty's Government to stop them; and the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) was labouring under an extraordinary misapprehension when he said that the Irish Members had attempted to justify them. The same hon. and learned Member charged the Irish Members with pursuing a course that only tended to light up afresh the old animosities between Englishmen and Irishmen. If that were true it would be a very serious matter; but he utterly denied that it was the case. It was not the Irish Members sitting on that Bench who were trying to light up the old animosities between the two nations; but it was the Liberal Government who were giving encouragement to the old and blood-stained practices of the past by proposing fresh measures of coercion. It was they who were responsible for any heat, bad passions, or animosity that might arise, and the Irish Members were only doing their duty in resisting any unconstitutional attempt to abridge and circumscribe the liberties of the Irish people. A warm defence of the policy of Her Majesty's Government had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. He (Mr. Barry) had fondly hoped, until the last moment, that the right hon. Gentleman would have taken a different course, or that, with a view of maintaining his political consistency, he would, at least, have avoided any attempt to bolster up the Government in the policy they were pursuing. He could not help contrasting the speech made now by the right hon. Gentleman with the speech made by the same right hon. Gentleman in 1866, when, although the state of the country at that time was far different from what it was now—when there was danger of open insurrection—when there were foreign emissaries in the country instigating the people to revolt—when, in some parts of the country, the people had actually arms in their hands, and the flag of revolt was freely flying—at a time like that, when there appeared to be, on the part of a considerable section of the Irish people, a fixed determination to offer armed resistance to the authority of the British Crown—the right hon. Gentleman, standing in his place in the House of Commons, used arguments in defence of popular liberty, which were noble in sentiment, and which expressed very accurately indeed the position taken up by the Irish Members in the course of the present debate. The right hon. Gentleman made a speech on the 17th of February, 1866, when there was a proposal before the House to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act. He had referred to a chapter of English history, and he had pointed out the different Ministers who had filled the Office of First Lord of the Treasury since he entered the House, and he proceeded thus—

> "I say, that with regard to all these men, there has not been any approach to anything that history will describe as statesmanship on the part of the English Government towards Ireland. There were Coercion Bills in abundance; Arms Bills Session after Session; lamentations like that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) that the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was not made perpetual by a clause which he laments was repealed. There have been Acts for the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act like that which we are now discussing; but there has been no statesmanship."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxi. 689.]

That was precisely the position which the Irish Members took now. They contended that the proposals of Her Majesty's Government when they desired coercion always took precedence of remedial legislation. Instead of giving a radical reform of the Land Laws, they preferred the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. The Irish Members said that this was no statesmanship. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> " Men the most clumsy and brutal can do these things; but we want men of higher temper—men of higher genius—men of higher patriotism—to deal with the affairs of Ireland. I should like to know whether those statesmen who hold great Offices have themselves comprehended the nature of this question. If they have not, they have been manifestly ignorant; and if they have comprehended it, they have not dealt with it; they have concealed that which they knew from the people, and evaded the duty they owed to their Sovereign. I do not want to speak disrespectfully of men in Office. It is not my custom in this House. I know something of the worrying labours to which they are subjected, and I know not how from day to day they bear the burden of the labour imposed upon them; but, still, I lament that those who wear the garb, enjoy the emoluments, and, I had almost said, usurp the dignity of statesmanship, sink themselves merely into respectable and honourable administrators, when there is a whole nation under the sovereignty of the Queen calling for all their anxious thoughts, calling for the highest exercise of the highest qualities of the statesman."—[*Ibid.*]

That, again, was precisely the position which the Irish Members took up. They said that it was not the exercise of the highest qualities of statesmanship to bring forward coercive proposals. It was once said—by Count Cavour he believed—that anybody could govern in a state of siege; but it was the very last proposal expected from a Liberal Government, whose name was associated with liberty and freedom, that they should recommend the adoption of brute force, instead of bringing forward proposals to show they were really making efforts in the direction of reform, worthy of the highest efforts of statesmanship. In 1866, when the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster protested so eloquently against the imposition of coercion upon Ireland there was an insurrectionary movement in the country which, while it had the general support of the people, had received no endorsement from recognized public opinion. The clergy were universally against it, the corporate public bodies, the Poor Law Guardians, and the various channels of independent thought and opinion in the country were opposed to the movement. The very contrary was the fact now. Every channel of independent opinion in Ireland was ranged on the side of the Land League. The clergy of all denominations, he was happy to say, and all the corporate bodies, were not only passively in favour of it, but had passed strong resolutions in support of it. Non-political bodies, like the Poor Law Guardians, moved by the extraordinary consensus of opinion in the country, had also passed resolutions couched in the strongest terms, and protesting against coercive legislation. Bearing in mind, then, the difference of circumstances—that in 1866 they were in the presence of an open insurrectionary movement, having nothing more behind it than the general sympathy of the people, while, at the present day, they had a movement endorsed by the public opinion of the country, supported by all the recognized public feeling of Ireland, as far as it could be ascertained; and yet they found the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, now a Cabinet Minister, and supposed by many like himself (Mr. Barry) to form the strength and the prop of that Cabinet—they found the right hon. Gentleman getting up now to defend proposals, under these altered circumstances, which he emphatically and eloquently denounced 14 years ago. It was impossible to point to a more remarkable instance of political inconsistency. Probably, on further reference to the language of the right hon. Gentleman in 1866, they might find the key to this political profligacy. In the speech he had just quoted, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We who ask Parliament, in dealing with Ireland, to deal with it upon the unchangeable principles of justice, are the friends of the people and the really loyal advisers and supporters of the Throne."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxi. 693.]

That, again, was precisely the position taken up by the Irish Members. They contended that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who were supporting coercion were not the loyal advisers and supporters of the Throne. They contended that the proposals of Her Majesty's Government would not only fail to accomplish the object for which they were intended, but would create a wider gulf between the two nations, and it would take years to undo the mischief that would be done if the proposals of Her Majesty's Government were passed into law. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "All history teaches us that it is not in human nature that men should be content under any system of legislation and of institutions such as exist in Ireland. You may pass this Bill; you may put the Home Secretary's 500 men into gaol. You may do all this and suppress the conspiracy and put down the insurrection, but the moment it is suppressed there will still remain the germs of this malady, and from those germs will grow up as heretofore another crop of insurrection and another harvest of misfortune."—[*Ibid.*]

That was the result which all those who knew the country well, and were best acquainted with its social and political condition, anticipated from the present proposals of Her Majesty's Government. The right hon. Gentleman proceeded thus—

> "And it may be that those who sit here 18 years after this moment will find another Ministry and another Secretary of State to propose to you another administration of the same ever-failing and ever-poisonous medicine."—[*Ibid.*]

It was not yet 18 years since the right hon. Gentleman addressed the House so eloquently against coercion—only 14 years had elapsed—and it would be seen with what prophetic force the right hon. Gentleman was addressing the House on that occasion. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—and this was the portion of the right hon. Gentleman's speech which would probably explain his extraordinary political inconsistency now—

> "I say there is a mode of making Ireland loyal. I say that the Parliament of England having abolished the Parliament of Ireland is doubly bound to examine what that mode is, and, if it can discover it, to adopt it. I say that the Minister who occupies Office in this country, merely that he may carry on the daily routine of Administration, who dares not grapple with this question, who dares not go into Opposition, and who will sit anywhere except where he can tell his mind freely to the House and the country, may have a high position in this country; but he is not a statesman, nor is he worthy of the name."—[*Ibid.*]

It was a remarkable coincidence that almost every position which the Irish Members contended for from those Benches formed the position held by the right hon. Gentleman in 1866. They declared that the statesman, no matter how high his position, who came before the House of Commons, in the last quarter of the 19th century, with all the failures of the past before him, to submit proposals of this kind was no statesman, and that he had altogether misunderstood the occurrences of the time. A fierce and almost irresistible agitation was sweeping over Ireland. Every indication of the time pointed to the conclusion that the one thing to remedy the mischief and restore peace, order, and prosperity to Ireland was immediately to apply radical changes in the existing Land Laws of the country. The Irish people felt extremely indignant — he might almost say that considering the promises made by Her Majesty's Government — considering the position taken up during the last Session by the Government—when, by their own admission, the state of things in Ireland demanded prompt attention, the only measure the Government should yet have brought forward should be one of coercion. He remembered when the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland was introducing the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, and when he was offering explanations or apologies to the House for introducing it at the time he did, the right hon. Gentleman said the Government were compelled to bring in the measure by the accumulated evidence that was forced upon them day after day of the condition of Ireland by the privations and misery and starvation which existed in the country, by the increasing number of evictions, and by the terrible consequences which fell upon the people if the evictions were carried out. If such a condition of things influenced the action of the Government last Session, then he would say that there was no alteration in the position of things which would justify them now in their change of front. He said, advisedly, that if this Coercion Bill passed into law, as probably it would within a short period, the very consequences from which the Government shrank last Session would inevitably follow in Ireland, and that there would be evictions on a large and terrible scale. Not only would 15,000 run the chance and risk of eviction with all its dread consequences, but there would be 30,000 or 40,000 subjected to that terrible curse. Therefore, he contended that if the Irish Members could show to the House sufficient reasons for concluding that evictions would follow in Ireland on that large scale, and that some 30,000 or 40,000 people would be thrown out upon the highway without a home and without a refuge, it was the duty of the House to pause before endeavouring with such indecent haste to pass these coercive measures. The Amendment submitted by the hon. Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons) afforded a most excellent opportunity of meeting the feeling and wishes of the Irish people in some slight degree, under the exceptional circumstances in which they were placed in the present hour. He objected to the proposals indicated in the speech of the Chief Secretary. Rather than leaving the liberties of the people of Ireland at the mercy of a sub-constable, who might have a personal grudge against individuals, he thought he was justified in calling on the Government to pause, and take the golden opportunity they had within their grasp, of offering to the Irish people a real message of peace. In 1871, after the passing of the Land Act, there were only 391 agrarian offences; and this was not the result of any Arms Act or Peace Preservation Act, but the immediate and direct result of remedial measures. It could be shown from the figures supplied by the Government that in every case where coercive legislation was resorted to it was immediately followed by an increase of agrarian crime. He warned the Government that the same result would inevitably follow the passing of these coercive measures. The people would be driven once more into the secret and devious paths of conspiracy; and in the heated state of the public mind, with hopes largely aroused by the utterances of Liberal statesmen at the last Election, what could be expected from any course of secret conspiracy in Ireland, but the same unfortunate and unhappy results which made so many dark pages in Irish history? History would only repeat itself, and, instead of Her Majesty's Government securing the object they aimed at, there would be an increase of agrarian crime. The consequence would be that, instead of being able to proceed with their Land Bill, they would probably be compelled to come down to the House to ask for further coercive legislation. Was that a prospect which at all captivated the intelligence of the English Liberal or Conservative Party? Was it always to be the case that when public agitation had reached a certain point in Ireland it must be met by everlasting acts of repression? Such was not the history of England. It was not the custom in this country to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, and place the liberties of the English people at the mercy of any sub-constable in the country; but when a popular agitation reached a certain point, Parliament wisely came to the conclusion that concession should be made to the people, and the popular excitement and feeling allayed. The same result would follow in Ireland if the same Constitutional course were adopted by the British Parliament. There was another reason why this proposed coercive measure should not be allowed to pass into law, and it was this:—That the ground upon which the Government established their case was rapidly melting away from under their feet. There had been this year, with only a month of the year gone, an extraordinary diminution of agrarian crime in Ireland. A diminution amounting to something like 33 per cent had taken place within a fortnight. It was, therefore, only fair on the part of Her Majesty's Government, before rushing in so hastily to abridge popular liberty, to give time to see if this satisfactory and most gratifying diminution of agrarian crime was going to continue. If it was going to continue, why coerce the Irish people while law and order were maintained? It was only when the Irish Members succeeded in demolishing that portion of the case of the Government that they came into fair view of the real object of Her Majesty's Government. Their idea was not so much to deal with outrages and violence, because they knew that they existed to a limited extent only; but the mainspring of their action and their real object was to suppress and put down the Land League in Ireland—in point of fact, to grapple with Constitutional agitation in Ireland. Having failed by the ordinary law to suppress the League, or to find the chief supporters of the League guilty of any offence—after a full and fair trial in the highest Court of Justice in Ireland, and having failed to convict them of any illegal act, they now wished, by carrying this Coercion Bill, to suppress the League altogether, and to arrest its leaders. There could be no doubt that that was the chief object of Her Majesty's Government. Their Returns had utterly broken down, and there was not the ghost of a case for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. Their chief object was to suppress the Land League; and no course more unwise or more unstatemanlike could be adopted by any Government of this country, Liberal or Tory; because by openly suppressing the free expression of opinion they would drive the people away from the open paths of Constitutional agitation into the far more dark and dangerous paths of secret conspiracy. It was necessary that time should be given for cool reflection and deliberation on the subject; and there was no reason why the matter should be hastily determined. There were strong reasons for believing that a change was coming over the English mind, and that the great pulse of this country was beating rather on the side of remedial legislation than of coercive and restrictive proposals. Seeing that that feeling was growing and enlarging every day, he thought the Irish Members were justified in appealing to Her Majesty's Government again to consider their position, and to meet them with proposals to remedy the existing state of law in Ireland, and not to insist on forcing coercive legislation down the throats of the Irish people. He sincerely trusted that Her Majesty's Government would withdraw this hateful proposal for circumscribing the liberties of the Irish people.

Mr. SEXTON regretted, considering the heavy responsibilities which rested upon him, that the conditions under which he found himself obliged to address the House were so unfavourable to an adequate consideration of the question. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland asked for leave to bring in a Bill for the better protection of life and property in Ireland. It was no exaggeration to say that many months had passed since the Government abandoned the care of life and property in Ireland, and since the important function of taking care of life and property in Ireland was taken up by the National Land League. The position of the Government on the question was one that was extremely irregular. Last year they were sensible of the need of approaching the protection of person and property in Ireland in a very different spirit from that which marked their present efforts. They brought in a Bill to relieve the poorest class of tenants in Ireland, if not from the exactions of their landlords, at least from the exercise of landlord tyranny. That Bill was rejected in "another place," and the Government tamely accepted the rebuff, and allowed the Session to close without making any further effort to pass into law a measure for the relief of the Irish tenants. Even the Chief Secretary for Ireland confessed that he could not continue to administer the agrarian laws according to the demands of the landlords. His mind had undergone a considerable change since; and although he and his Government condemned the use to which the agrarian laws were put in Ireland, and alleged that they could not, with a good conscience, continue to administer them, they now found him continuing these laws in operation, and, instead of reforming them, actually bringing forward a measure to restrict the liberty of the Irish tenant, and to place him more than ever at the mercy of the Irish landlord. He regretted that he was obliged to address the House at a time when Her Majesty's Government were absent, and when every one of the Cabinet Ministers to whose speeches he desired to make allusion were not present to hear his observations. With regard to the speech of the Solicitor General for Ireland it demanded only a casual observation. If delivered in a Court of Law, it would, no doubt, have been considered able and appropriate; but the House of Commons, in considering the present state of Ireland, especially with a view to the question whether coercive legislation should be applied, had a right to expect from those who expounded the question on the Treasury Bench much larger views than those which applied to the legal application of criminal cases. He could only say that the House, by giving urgency to coercion, decreed a sort of landlord carnival, in which the rich landlord class might run riot, and the tenants, divorced from their homes during that period, might practically he said to have no hope for the future. There had been a remarkable diversity in the treatment of this question, as appeared by the speeches delivered upon it by Members of Her Majesty's Government. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had prided himself upon not quoting newspaper reports, and attached considerable value to his own statement, on the ground that it was based entirely, or almost entirely, upon official records. On the other hand, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster turned his back upon official records altogether, and appeared to base his case a great deal upon unauthorized, and, in many cases, grossly exaggerated reports of the state of Ireland, which, for many months past, had deluged the British Press. After the great experience of the right hon. Gentleman it might have been expected that, in dealing with a case of such gravity, he would, at least, have taken care beforehand to consult authentic records, and not rely on those which were to be found in the columns of British newspapers, with reference to the state of Ireland. But the right hon. Gentleman had another kind of evidence, and referred to numbers of private letters sent to him during the last three months. He did not, however, allow the House to form any opinion as to the value which ought to attach to those private letters, although he admitted that they did not all condemn the Land League. Upon the general question he would say that, as the proposal was to take away, for so long a time, the primary liberty of a whole people, without which the comforts of life were lessened, and the advantages of civilization might be said to disappear—when such a proposal was before the House, it ill became the right hon. Gentleman to attempt to justify it by reference to private letters. Such a proceeding would better suit a Richlieu or a Mazarin. England had been for many a long day the home of those who found themselves uncomfortable in other lands; and the name of refugee had been given to them in England, because they were not allowed to have a home in their own country. But the case was entirely different with regard to the Irish landlords, who came to London because they could no longer, with the same impunity and ease, exercise at home that despotism which in the past had proved so destructive to the welfare of the tenant farmers in Ireland. He would say that while some of the poorer tenants in Ireland had been suffering hunger, their landlords had not passed so melancholy a time during their exile in the London Clubs and hotels, especially as they could occupy part of it in pouring their woes into the ears of Cabinet Ministers. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster endeavoured to justify his support of the Government, of which he was a Member, in introducing this measure, by saying that he would not support it if it were not to be followed by a measure of remedial import to Ireland. But it was clear that if coercion was to be made the initial letter of the alphabet of legislation for Ireland the remedial measures of the Government would be pushed into the future. There was but one course open to Irish Members, according to an intelligent view of their duty. They found the liberties of the people of Ireland subjected to wanton and unprovoked attack, and they had no choice but simply and resolutely to resist that attack by every means in their power; and when they were told they ought to retire and allow it to be successful, because there would be measures of remedial legislation, he said that proposal was corrupt, because it was calling upon the Irish Representatives to sell the liberties of the Irish people.

Notice taken, 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. SEXTON, resuming, said, Her Majesty's Government had brought forward a measure of repression, and in the first stage they found themselves confronted by the full strength of the Irish Party in the House. It would not be possible for them to relax their opposition, which a sacred duty pledged them to make to this measure; and it could not, therefore, be supposed that the Bill would be speedily passed into law. But when the Bill was passed, and its place was taken by remedial legislation, the arguments and opposition given to it by hon. Members below the Gangway would be so prolonged, that it was easy to see that the progress of remedial legislation through the House would be very uncertain. The result of the Session, therefore, would appear to be the Coercion Bill, and nothing else. One remark of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster showed how little of serious care he had applied to the consideration of the details of this subject. The right hon. Gentleman said that an hon. Member had complained that meetings were suppressed, and yet he said that 460 meetings had been held; and he did not know how one fact could be reconciled with the other. But the explanation was that these meetings were held before the Government began to interfere with free expression in Ireland. Could the right hon. Gentleman see any inconsistency in that? He would only say that it appeared the right hon. Gentleman had addressed the House without having bestowed that care upon the subject which had always marked his speeches on English politics. The Chief Secretary for Ireland made it the basis of the demand for coercion that person and property were not protected, and that liberty was not secured in Ireland. But the Government appeared to confine their protection to the persons and property of one especial class. Irish Members did not yield to them in their desire to protect person and property and to secure liberty in Ireland; but they said that the person and property of every class, and the liberty of the whole community, had an equal claim upon a statesmanlike Government; indeed, a greater claim upon them than the liberty, property, or life of any particular class. Now, the Irish Land League devoted itself to the protection of property and the security of liberty in Ireland. But the charge made against it in that House was that it had preferred the rights and happiness of the many to the liberties and privileges of the few. There were 10,000 landlords in Ireland, many of whom had hitherto exercised their rights in such a manner as to inflict grievous suffering and hardship on the community; and there were 500,000 tenants-at-will the supporters of the Land League. Her Majesty's Government claimed protection for the landlords solely on statistics which did not justify this attempt on the liberties of the people. He submitted that neither of the years 1845 or 1869 offered any strong analogy to the case of Ireland in the year 1880. A just analogy was to be found in the year 1831, at which time Earl Grey was willing to wait two years before recommending Parliament to pass a Coercion Bill. It had been said there had been a considerable increase of crime during the last three months of the year. But it was well known that crime increased with distress; and an official statistician of the Government had acknowledged that there was a permanent relation between the amount of distress and the amount of crime in every country. When it was remembered that the second portion of rent became due in the winter quarters, and how an harvest, exceptionally good, but not equal to that of some former years, excited the cupidity of the landlords, and how they held writs of ejectment over the heads of their serfs, it was not a matter for astonishment that crime had increased in the latter portion of the year. But the Return which he had of the agrarian crimes for the first fortnight of the present year revealed a total absence of crimes of the gravest class. If they took the agrarian crimes of all descriptions, it would be found that in the first fortnight of the month of January, a period of great distress, the total of agrarian crime was less than three in each of the counties of Ireland. Her Majesty's Government were, therefore, pressing on their Coercion Bill in the face of a decrease of crime. He believed that this was the first time such a policy had been persevered in by any Government, Liberal or Tory; and he was able to say, with reference to the Coercion Act of 1870, that the Government of the day, before the Bill left the House, were able to show a continuous increase in the class of crime with which they had to deal. He confessed his suspicion that the feverish haste of the Government in presenting this Bill was only to be accounted for by their fear that if they took the stages of the measure at the ordinary speed, and gave time to the House fully to consider it, it would be found that serious agrarian crime had almost disappeared in Ireland, leaving them no case for dealing with that part of the subject. When he moved for the Return of the first fortnight in January, he was met with opposition on the part of the Government, and it was only after great efforts that the damning fact was disclosed that the proofs of the increase of crime did not exist. Again, very effective and melodramatic use had been made of the term "unwritten law of the Land League," in the course of the debate; and the Chief Secretary, whenever he spoke of that unwritten law, sank his tones to a tragic depth. But this law was as familiar to the landlords as it was to the tenants; and if not written, they were printed and circulated broad-cast amongst the people. The Land League recommended people to try as honest men to do what they could to pay their rent; to offer to the landlord what they could pay, and that had been stigmatized as inciting to breaches of contract. He ventured to say it was nothing of the kind, and that, had it not been for the Land League, there would have been many more breaches of contract. The theory of the Chief Secretary for Ireland was that there was a deliberate and sinister sequence in the outrages committed in Ireland; that they commenced by the slightest of suggestions; were followed by threatening letters, and when these proved unavailing recourse was had to incendiary fires, outrages on the person, and even murder. He maintained that theory to be entirely unsupported by any fact brought forward by the Government; and he asserted that it was not true that there was any such sequence of outrages in Ireland as would entitle the right hon. Gentleman to say that there was any deliberate and organized attempt to cause intimidation. Out of 22 threatening letters received in nine months by persons in Sligo, no other consequence followed except in two cases, in one of which a rick of chaff and in the other a rick of hay was burnt. Therefore, he thought that threatening letters ought to be once for all excluded from the consideration of the House. With regard to the maiming of cattle, he regretted to point out to the House that this was a measure of revenge unfortunately of frequent occurrence in Ireland, and was probably a relic of former times, when the people were in such a state of slavery and subjection that they were driven to that cowardly means of carrying out revenge. But if he compared the year 1831 with the year 1880, he found that the houghings of cattle amounted then to 455, and in the face of that fact Earl Grey was enabled to wait a much longer time than Her Majesty's Government before recommending measures of coercion. With regard to carding, he admitted it was a barbarous offence; but then there was not a single case of carding to be found in the Blue Book presented to the House. In fact, the total number of cases of wounding the person in 1880 amounted to 10 only. Again, if they compared the meetings of the Land League with the number of crimes of cutting and wounding, it would be seen that there was no ground for the belief that the Land League meetings had stimulated crime. In January, 1880, there were 26 meetings of the Land League and one person cut and maimed; in February 15 meetings and no such crime; in March six meetings and no such crime. In the last month of the year there were 190 Land League meetings and only one of these crimes. Even supposing that the 10 cases of cutting and maiming the person committed in Ireland during the year 1880 included one or two cases of carding, he asked what justification there was for the general and sweeping statement that when outrages on property proved insufficient outrages on the person followed? Whatever was the intention of making that statement its effect was to lead the British public to believe that this crime was common in Ireland. While he did not wish to proceed to the length of charging the right hon. Gentleman with attempting to mislead the British public, he said that the effect of his statement was as injurious and unjust as if it had been made with a deliberate intention. Again, the right hon. Gentleman said there had been few cases of murder, and then he went on to make the following extraordinary remark—"O! but they were not necessary." He asked the House fully to consider what was intended to be conveyed by those words. The right hon. Gentleman in that statement said to the House and to the country, as clearly as words could convey it, that if they had been necessary to cause intimidation murders would have been committed. He (Mr. Sexton) submitted that when the total of murders committed in Ireland amounted to eight only according to the Returns, and when that number had been reduced by the scrutiny of Irish Members, the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that murders were not committed because they were not necessary involved a gross, unprovoked, and most wanton attack on the character of a people to whom the crime of murder and all grave crime was as alien and horrifying as it was to any civilized people in the world. When they proceeded to examine the details of the eight murders committed in the course of the year, the result was the same as when they compared the totals and the details of all the Returns laid before Parliament in relation to this question—the number fell to seven. He did not know how the eighth crept into the total; he could find only a total of seven fully accounted for, and in the detailed account he could find only six. The Chief Secretary had stated that an agrarian murder was never committed unless in pursuance of some cold-blooded plan to intimidate; but he would call attention to the six agrarian murders described as having been committed in the nine months of last year. One was the case of Bernard Morris, who, according to the Constabulary Report, had had a dispute with a relative named Patrick Morris about the ownership of a piece of land, and was subsequently shot by him in the right thigh, the wound ultimately proving fatal. It was clear that this was a family dispute, culminating, unfortunately, in the death of one of those who were parties to it. It had no reference to the question of rent, but to the question of the ownership of land, and, as a matter of fact, could in no way affect the question with which the Land League was concerned, and which caused the great tension which at present existed between the different classes of Ireland. There were two reasons why this case should not have been put in the Government Return, one being because it was a family dispute, and not an agrarian offence having any proper or intelligent relation to the claim for the coercion of the people; and the other because the ordinary law was found quite sufficient to meet and deal with the case. Patrick Morris pleaded guilty at the Winter Assizes, and was sentenced to a long term of imprisonment for manslaughter. It was a misleading of the House, and a great increasing of the difficulty in which hon. Members found themselves, to admit such evidence as this on behalf of the coercion of the Irish people. He only mentioned these cases because murder was charged against the Irish people, and because they heard so much about the bloodthirstiness of Ireland, and, therefore, because it appeared to him right to point out how infinitesimal and unworthy was the case of the Government so far as it related to this particular crime. Another case given in the Returns was that of Kryle Power, who was attacked and killed by his step-brother George Power, with whom he had quarrelled concerning a piece of land which had belonged to his father. This was another family dispute, and not a case arising out of the tension between the classes—out of the state of the law or the disordered condition of society, and, like the other case, was only a manslaughter, the offence having been committed under provocation. The ordinary law was found sufficient to deal with it, and George Power was brought up at the Winter Assizes and convicted—notwithstanding that they were told that Irish juries would not convict anyone—and sentenced to 20 years' penal servitude. This left only four murders; and he thought, as to some of these, it might be fairly contended that they were not agrarian, although he did not feel constrained to go into any cases but those in which there was not a shadow of a case for saying that they were agrarian. He had proved that two of the cases were not agrarian, and came to the residue of four; and, with regard to these, he must say that when the Government asked for coercion of the people on a case which—in regard to murder — was sustained by only four instances, that case was founded on a measure of crime which had been more than equalled in many of the most peaceful and tranquil years through which Ireland had ever passed. Periods might be referred to in which, although there had been no necessity to seek measures of coercion, owing to the objectionable nature of the Land Laws the number of agrarian murders had exceeded that upon which the Government now relied. The Chief Secretary had referred to police protection given to individuals; but the Irish landlord saw nothing disgraceful, or even unpleasant and inconvenient, in being attended through the country by two stalwart constables. Some, indeed, looked upon it as adding to their dignity, and many would like nothing better than to receive a threatening letter, so that they might be able to present themselves to the Government as persons entitled to have police protection. According to the Returns, the number of threatening letters sent during the period in question was 1,300, and the number of persons receiving police protection was also 1,300. It appeared to him that, in some parts of the country, nearly every landlord received a threatening letter, and considered himself entitled to have police protection; and he would go further, and add that when the landlords of Ireland found that the fact that they were receiving police protection was regarded by the Government as a reason for coercion, their demands for that protection would considerably increase in number. He wished he could induce the House to reflect upon the ease with which a man in the position of an Irish landlord could persuade himself that police protection was a needful thing for him. In Ireland the landlords were not as they were in England, for they did not mix with the people amongst whom they lived, nor meddle with their affairs, nor constitute themselves a part of the general community; but they stood aloof from the people, and, in many instances, acted the part of tyrants. They knew they were hated by the victims of their despotism, and when a time of agitation came they experienced that fear which sprung from a bad conscience, and the feeling made them very ready to appeal for police protection when there was not the slightest necessity for it. There were cases, moreover, that could be quoted in which landlords had, by absolute breaches of the law, excited the animosity of the people, and, when they had placed themselves in that unpleasant position, had thrown themselves on the Government as claimants for police protection. The way to put an end to the necessity for police protection was to put an end to the state of society in Ireland which provoked passion and resentment. To refer to another part of the question, the Chief Secretary had said a great deal about Land League "Courts;" but really he did not think they deserved the name which had been bestowed upon them in the House. They were only meetings of local committees of the Land League; and it was only just to the Central Committee to say that it did not, and does not, include in its plan of operations any proceeding by "Courts," or the hearing of complaints or the arrogating to itself of any function of the law. It was true many persons whose conduct had been complained of had made requests to be heard before the committees; but it was absurd, on such a ground as that, to accuse the Land League or any of its branches of taking to itself any part of the function of the law. The Central Committee of the League in Dublin had certainly never requested anyone to go before it; but requests had been made to it to grant interviews on the part of persons who wished to have the opportunity of explaining certain conduct alleged against them. In many cases it had granted such interviews, and he did not believe the local branches had ever intended to do more than this. They took on themselves the function of arbitrators, and had proved very useful in that capacity, having, in many instances, allayed passions that might have caused trouble; and it seemed to him that instead of this being alleged as a reason for the condemnation of the Land League, it ought to be recognized as something that should stand to its credit in the account. But whether or not the Land League "Courts," as some hon. Members were pleased to call them, ought to form no case for the coercion of the people, for the Chief Secretary had himself declared that the proceedings taken at Tralee had induced the local branches to discontinue the practice objected to. He (Mr. Sexton) did not know whether this was so or not; but if it was, so far as the Land League Courts were concerned, if the ordinary law was sufficient, it was, of course, unnecessary to resort to any extraordinary measures. Then the right hon. Gentleman had based a good deal of his case upon the proportion of apprehensions to the total number of agrarian crimes, saying that out of 2,590 agrarian crimes the apprehensions were only 295, or, deducting those for threatening letters, 182; but he had here to charge the right hon. Gentleman with having committed a very grave error in his statement. He supposed he was bound to believe that the mistake had occurred through inadvertence; but, at any rate, the Chief Secretary had greatly under-stated the apprehensions. These were not 16 per cent, as made out by the right hon. Gentleman, but 23 per cent, a proportion, he submitted, which, considering the difficulty of detecting agrarian crime, was a very respectable one; and, so long as it could be maintained by the police, the people of Ireland might very well claim that the Government should not resort to any coercive measures. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the police knew the offenders; but how could that be the case when they did not succeed in detecting the offenders? And how could the Government base their application for general and plenary powers to arrest them on such a statement? But, in another part of his speech, the right hon. Gentleman said the police did not know the offenders. If the measure was passed the police in Ireland, in order to show their diligence and prove their activity, would pounce upon a great many innocent people, the result of which would be a great deal of suffering on the part of those who had committed no offence whatever against the law. He made no doubt, however, that the measure they were asked to pass was not so much a measure for the restoration of peace and order in Ireland, as a measure for the repression of the Land League—as a measure of revenge on that body for its action in the past. If the Bill were merely intended for the general purpose of restoring peace and order the Government would not deem it necessary to make it retrospective, but would be content—as all Governments had been hitherto—to apply themselves to the future, and to take powers for the arrest of every man who should, after the passing of the measure, be found guilty of the commission of crime. They might have been content with this, seeing that agrarian crime was decreasing day by day in Ireland, and had now reached a very low level. In view of that fact the Government might very well have taken powers for the future—that was to say, powers for the seizure of future criminals—and not have asked for extended and plenary power of arrest in regard to acts committed in the past. His explanation of the matter was this—that the Government had failed to discover any legal means of impeding or embarrassing the Land League. They had failed to procure a conviction against that body in the recent State Trials. They had failed because they deserved to fail; because they had endeavoured to bring a law in operation with regard to facts against which the law was not applicable; and, to compensate themselves for that failure, and in order to satisfy the Irish landlords, they now brought in this measure, not for the purpose of restoring peace and order, but for the purpose of attacking that body—the Irish National Land League—which they found they could not attack under the operation of the ordinary law. As to the non-efficiency of the police to deal with existing crime in Ireland, which the right hon. Gentleman had referred to, it must be borne in mind that there were several classes of offences in which detection, from the nature of the offences, was next to impossible—such, for instance, as arson, incendiary fires, the maiming of cattle, threatening letters, and injury to property. He would submit to the most searching scrutiny the axiom he laid down—that these offences were almost impossible of detection. But out of 761 agrarian crimes, affording to the police some reasonable chance of detection, there had been 243 arrests—that was to say, that the arrests had been 47 per cent of the crimes, which proportion came up to the ordinary proportion in such cases in every other civilized country. The number of trials had been 176, and the number of convictions 79, so that here, again, the proportion was very respectable, and testified to the efficiency of the police and the ordinary law to deal with agrarian crime. The right hon. Gentleman complained that the lawlessness that prevailed was affecting every interest of the country, and that the shopkeepers were unable to serve processes; but against this he would put the fact that within the last few days Petitions against the Coercion Bill had been presented from almost every one of the Municipal Bodies of Ireland; and these Corporations—like the Corporations of other countries—were the quintessence of the mercantile community. These were people who would be affected, if anybody was, by inability on the part of the shopkeepers to issue processes against their debtors. He was at a loss to imagine how the Government could continue to pretend that the shopkeepers were unable to issue processes or unable to collect their debts when they found the chiefs of the shopkeepers of Ireland, the merchants and traders, opposed to the policy which the Ministry declared was for the protection of the shopkeepers. In the course of the evening he had seen a Petition or letter addressed from Tipperary to the Member for that county, in which was resented, as a slander and calumny, the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the shopkeepers of Tipperary were unable to collect their debts or issue processes. The writers declared that the only difficulty they experienced in collecting their debts from the farmers in the district arose from the poverty and extreme necessity of some of the individual farmers, and they—the shopkeepers—were too high spirited and too rational to allow the inability to pay on the part of some of the farmers to betray them into a policy of insulting and coercing the people, even though the Government endeavoured to recommend it to their favour by telling them that it was for the protection of their interests. To refer to the question of Irish juries, it had been remarked by Mr. Justice Fitzgerald that Irish jurors did not appear in sufficient numbers in answer to summons.

DR. COMMINS believed the observation had been made by Mr. Justice Barry.

MR. SEXTON continued, that the matter was not important; but he contended that statistics showed Irish jurors were not remiss in answering to summons, and, as to their not daring to convict offenders in every class of case where conviction was at all rationally possible, the juries, as he had already shown, were ready and willing to convict; and, in all these classes of cases, there was a proportion of 45 per cent of convictions to be shown. The Chief Secretary, referring to another matter, had said that it not unfrequently happened that the most powerful man in a district in Ireland was a most contemptible, dissolute ruffian and blackguard; and, by a series of skilfully-contrived phrases, he had managed to convey to the House and the country that there was a connection existing between the hon. Member for Cork and the Land League and such "contemptible, dissolute ruffian and blackguard." He (Mr. Sexton) could not too strongly or too indignantly resent the imputation, no matter from what quarter it might come, that there was between the hon. Member for Cork, or any other hon. Member in that House, or between the Land League and those who perpetrated these crimes, any sodality or sympathy whatever. One of their objects in promoting the Land League had been to put an end to crime, because, although they saw that some crime would come from the distress and from the endeavours of the Land League to get the rent, and that the enemies of the people might be, in consequence, enabled to accuse them of some sympathy with such crime, and, in fact, of some responsibility for causing it, yet they did not feel justified in standing aloof from the people in their distress. They knew that the people had no hope from this Parliament, seeing how easily the Government was put down last year; and they saw there was nothing for it but for the people to organize, and, by organized and peaceful action, oppose the landlords who were disposed to tyrannize. They were confident that by substituting such a method for the unfortunate method of terrorizing by private and cowardly crime they would be able to bring down the level of crime in Ireland; and he thought he could safely say that if the Land League had not existed, and had not exerted itself to show the people that there were peaceful and public means of pressing their claims on the landlords, and of showing their determination to keep themselves and their homes, it was not hundreds, but thousands, of outrages the House would now have on the records before it. The consciences of the members of the Land League acquitted them of any complicity in crime. Outrages were especially painful to them, and it was really exasperating when, after having devoted their efforts so thoroughly as they had done to the direction of the spirit of the people into public channels of agitation that were peaceful and legal, they found themselves coupled with such innuendoes as that they had connived at, or contributed to, the commission of these crimes and outrages. It was not without reason that the Chief Secretary had been accused of using unjustifiable language towards the Catholic clergy in Ireland, although the character of these gentlemen stood so high that he did not feel constrained to defend them in that House. The right hon. Gentleman knew that the priests were the most powerful men in many districts, and were, in many cases, the presidents or secretaries of the branches of the Land League. He did not feel constrained either to defend the characters of the leading members of the local branches of the Land League, who could very well afford to treat with disregard any language levelled at them in these debates by the Chief Secretary or any other Member of the House. But he really was entitled to ask who were referred to as the powerful, contemptible, dissolute ruffians and blackguards? It had been endeavoured, in most cautious phraseology, to identify them with some members of the Land League; but, seriously, it was the greatest travesty of the facts to endeavour even to suggest such a thing. The Land League ought to be judged on its public platform and labours; and those who had borne the brunt of its labours, and subjected themselves to much acrimony and misapprehension, might at least claim not to be held responsible for more acts than they owned, and to be protected from innuendoes—innuendoes by which it was sought, not openly and manfully, but in an oblique and covert fashion, to connect them with acts which they condemned, and which they denounced and deplored. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of "Secret Committees," which were another part of the melodramatic machinery by which the Government had endeavoured to establish their case. But surely the House was entitled to something more than declamation on such a subject as this. He (Mr. Sexton) denied that these Secret Committees existed, and declared that the whole operations of the Land League were public and above board, and, he believed, legal, let who might differ from him. He was stating what was indisputable, when he said that ever since the Land League began to take a part in the public affairs of Ireland it had always denounced crime of every kind, making such denunciation an important plank in its platform. He had himself expounded the doctrine from the first, and had never ceased expounding it on every platform on which he had stood. There were, as he had told the people, three reasons against the commission of crime—first, the law of religion condemned it; secondly, the law, not only of England, but of every civilized country, condemned it; and, thirdly, he had told the people that if crime was committed in the country, no matter by whom, an effort would immediately be made by the landlord classes to establish connection between the operation of the Land League and the commission of crime, and that if they wished to save the League from annoyance, false accusations, and insult they must not only abstain from crime themselves, but endeavour to keep all whom they could influence from the commission of it. He recorded here that he and, as far as he knew, all prominent members of the Land League had not only recently, but for many months past, had never ceased to impress upon the people, not only the religious and moral objections to crime, but also the inutility and folly of it, because it could be used by the enemies and opponents of Ireland as an argument for resorting, not to remedial but repressive measures, and for delaying that reform which was the aim of their exertions. With regard to the provisions of the Bill, as the right hon. Gentleman had stated them——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lyon Playfair): The hon. Member must not discuss the details of a Bill which is not before the House. He can refer to anything descriptive of it used by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. SEXTON declared that the provisions of the Bill were a mean and cowardly and covert means of attacking the members of the Land League, which the Government had not been able successfully to attack openly and publicly. What particularly led him to think that the Bill, if passed into law, would be used for the destruction of the Land League was because the execution of the new law would rest exclusively in the hands of the class against whom the Land League operated. The Land League had directed its operations against the landowners; and if the Act was passed the landlords would have their enemies thrown into their hands. They would single out some particular man, pounce upon him, and throw him into gaol. He could easily imagine how the Bill would operate in Sligo or in other counties. He did not wish to impute any degree of influence to any class; but the promotion of the police in Ireland rested wholly with the magistrates. The same remark applied to the resident magistrates, who were under the influence of the landlords. The machinery of suspension which they contemplated would be put into operation by the police, and if there was in any locality a man who was a prominent member of the Land League, what was more reasonable to suppose than that a resident landlord would go to a constable, or head constable, to administer a seasonable spur to that officer's power of "reasonable suspicion." Everyone knew that among those whose duty it was to execute an act suspicion became a disease, and when the Irish police found it was to their interest and the interests of the landlords to suspect a particular man they would not be slow to do so. In fact, the whole machinery of the Act would be in the hands of the landlords, who would be able to apply it against the tenants, and that was what the Government called restoring peace to Ireland. The effect of the Act would, however, be the reverse of that, because in the interval that would pass between the passing of the Coercion Act and the Land Act the landlords would have ample time for gratifying their revenge and carrying out any designs they might have against the lives of the people in their power. The landlords would say if the tenants were to be allowed to punish them, and to be enabled to become possessed of interests which the landlords could not buy with money, their course would be to take possession of the tenant's lands in anticipation of the Act. They would ruthlessly clear out multitudes of tenants. They would not only put in execution evictions of 5,000 people because they had not paid their rents, but they would evict a vast number of small tenants likely to be evicted by the Land Act. This course, he believed, would greatly increase the outrages in Ireland, and upon that House would rest the responsibility of allowing the landlords to act in that way, because if the House had passed a remedial measure first the landlords would not have been enabled to take that course; but by passing the Coercion Act the landlords would be able to throw into prison the only people who would have given fresh life to the country. Those would be the shocking results of the policy of the Government. The Prime Minister had stated that it was upon the total failure of the administration of the law in Ireland that the Government rested their case. He thought he had already shown that there had not been any such total failure of arrests and convictions. The right hon. Gentleman based a very important part of his argument on the circumstance that while evictions had decreased in the last quarter of last year crime had greatly increased. No doubt evictions were one of the elements which determined the increase or decrease of crime in Ireland; but evictions only formed one of the elements, and if they wanted to determine the increase or decrease they must take a wider view than the evictions of that quarter. It was not only the evictions in December that would influence the December crimes; the evictions in June or in March would also have a direct bearing on the crime at the end of the year. That was especially the case at the end of last year, because when the landlords were evicting tenants in March and June there were four organizations in Ireland which distributed £4,000,000 in relieving the people who had been evicted. That continued in all cases until the end of June, and in many cases until September, and he need not point out how effectual that had been; but the people who were evicted in September had no such relief; the unfortunate people who had fallen victims to the landlords' power in the last quarter of the year had no such relief, and agrarian crime might well have been higher than in the previous quarter. It was only in winter that the final test came that had driven those people to crime; therefore the test of evictions was not conclusive. The right hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to show that there was a connection between the meetings of the Land League and the increase of crime. That was very ingenious. He was able to show that there was an increase in the number of meetings and in the crime; and he used the remarkable expression that the movements of agrarian crime appeared to correspond with the movements of the Land League. He (Mr. Sexton) would say with the utmost confidence that the increase of the Land League meetings, and of crime in the last quarter of last year, were two independent facts arising from a common cause, but neither exercising any influence on the other. The Land League meetings were more numerous in that quarter than in previous quarters, because it was in the last quarter that the conflict between the landlords and the tenants reached an acute stage. The harvest having been gathered in—and it was a larger harvest than there had been in previous years—the landlords desired to make use of that fact to gather not only the rents for that year, but for previous years. The result was that tenants, especially in the Western parts of the country, urged the Land League to hold meetings in their districts. The League held meetings where the tenants were most in need of organization; and, therefore, the meetings in the districts suffering from distress were naturally very numerous, there being no other way of helping the people to retain their homes. Last winter the springs of charity had been dried up, the landlords had not only ceased to expend the loans they had received from Government, but, in many cases, they revenged themselves on the Land League by wantonly dismissing the men in their employment; and he apprehended that the dismissal of those men might account, in a considerable degree, for offences against property and person. The argument as to the relation between the increased number of meetings and increased crime would not bear examination; and an analysis of the figures as to the crimes and meetings would entirely demolish the theory of the Prime Minister. The landlords had exercised in eight counties their power in the most despotic manner; that had excited terror and apprehension. He submitted, no matter how elaborate and ingenious the figures brought to bear on this question might be, the fact that two-thirds of the crime arose in eight counties, principally on the West Coast of Ireland, which abounded in a small and poor class of tenants, was a conclusive reply to any such theory. Those eight counties were the special zone of landlord despotism. It was not the Land League meetings that had increased the crime; but the distress and the obstinacy with which the landlords had endeavoured to utilize the harvest of last year. He did not think there was anything more for him to say except to express his deep disappointment at finding that the Government, instead of applying remedial measures to Ireland, had chosen to imperil the ultimate affections of the people by a measure which would arouse their fears and apprehensions. He regretted that the Government had taken the wrong course. It was the boast of English statesmen that they had known how to take action to widen the boundary of public liberty. In Ireland they had known how to do that which would widen the gulf that was between the two countries. That gulf would now be made more deep and wide. The additional powers would be an additional weakness. The real power of the Government would be in the affection and confidence of the people, and it would have gone a long way to win that affection if they had inaugurated that Session by a measure of relief instead of a measure of coercion; but as they had taken that step the course of the Irish Members was plain. They could only offer opposition to any measure seeking to restrict the liberties of the people, and they would offer a determined resistance. They could have no compromise, no matter what remedial measures the Government might have in store; they could not postpone for a moment their opposition to that measure. The question was one of the utmost importance, and they felt it their duty to meet the Government foot to foot, and they would fight the battle inch by inch.

Mr. LEAMY said, the Solicitor General for Ireland had referred to the case of two men who were charged at the late Waterford Assizes with the murder of Mr. Boyd, and stated that he was compelled to apply for a postponement of the trial, because the intimidation was so strong in Waterford that a jury could not be procured. He thought the whole conduct of the Crown in that case was sufficient to justify the apprehensions of the Irish people as to how the Irish Government would use the exceptional power about to be given them. He would not dwell upon the offer of £500 reward for information after the two men had been committed for trial and every detail as to the manner in which the murder had been committed was published in the newspapers, or on the inducement which so large reward held out to any wretched tramp, whose whereabouts on the day of the murder were unknown to anyone save himself, to come forward and swear away the lives of the men whom the Crown pointed out to him as the guilty parties; for the Government, in offering this reward, under such circumstances, was probably within the law. But it certainly was not within the law, but, on the contrary, trampled upon the law, when it took from their parents two girls, under age, witnesses in the case, and hid them in a house in Dublin, following, apparently, the practice of the dark days of '97, which Curran described as that of "burying a witness to dig out an informer;" and it was not until a threat was made of an application to the Queen's Bench for a Habeas Corpus that these children were sent home. When the Irish Government could act in this way while the Habeas Corpus Act was in force, the Irish people had every reason to fear that they would misuse the exceptional powers about to be conferred on it. When the Irish authorities could be guilty of such offences against the law, how could they be trusted with the exceptional powers proposed? It was not necessary for him to allude to the Bill, which had been circulated amongst Members, because the Chief Secretary for Ireland had stated he proposed to take power to enable the Lord Lieutenant by his warrant to arrest

> "Any person whom he may reasonably suspect of having, either before or after the passing of the Act, been guilty as principal or accessory of high treason, treason-felony, or treasonable practices, wherever committed, or of any crime punishable by law committed in a prescribed district, being an act of violence or intimidation, or the inciting to an act of violence and intimidation, or tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order."

He submitted that of all the numberless Coercion Acts that had been passed for Ireland that the new Bill was the worst, inasmuch as it gave such exceptional powers to the authorities. The right hon. Gentleman had said he would exercise those powers upon his honour; but Grattan had said that

> "When the liberty and security of one nation depends upon the honour of the other, the former might have much honour, but the latter could have no liberty."

And if the liberties of the Irish people were to depend on the Lord Lieutenant, the Lord Lieutenant might have much honour, but the people would have no liberty. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said the laws would only be tyrannical in the hands of tyrants; but there was nothing more likely to convert a Minister into a tyrant than to invest him with such powers as those. The right hon. Gentleman said he opposed former coercions because he thought they were not necessary; if he thought that when they were not necessary how much more was it incumbent upon the Irish Members to resist a measure when they believed it to be unnecessary? Then, again, the Act was to be retrospective; but they did not know how far Ministers would go back. They might go back to 1848. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster said they only wanted the Bill for 18 months. The Bill of Earl Grey was only for six months; but it was renewed in September, and in May, and several times afterwards, and they knew very well that the renewal of Acts were the most familiar proceedings of legislation with which they were acquainted. How did they know that the Chief Secretary or his Ministry would last as long as the Bill? If such laws were tyrannous in the hands of tyrants, what guarantee had they that a Minister more tyrannical than the Chief Secretary might not have the power of exercising those laws? They objected to the Motion of the Chief Secretary; first, because they thought it wholly unnecessary; and, secondly, because they believed it was not a true remedy for Irish discontent and Irish grievances; and also because they thought that the present laws, if vigorously and intelligently exercised, would be sufficient. If in a particular year distress and excitement and agitation had increased, that was no reason why the Ministry should say that the ordinary law was not sufficient. How long had the present Ministry tried the ordinary law? For seven months; and because crime had increased they rushed to Parliament and said—"Crime is on the increase; suspend the Constitution. We cannot govern Ireland with the ordinary law." Lord Brougham had said there was no better argument against such extraordinary power that the tendency of such powers being repeated; and one would think they had had quite enough of enactments of that kind in Ireland. What was the object of imposing coercion? Was it to break the spirit of Irish people? They had failed to do so up to the present time; they should fail to do it now. His hon. Friend was right when he said that the vague thing "treasonable practices" and the retrospective effect of the Bill might put down the Land League; but they could not kill the spirit of independence and self-reliance which that agitation had given to the people, nor restore to the landlords the power that agitation had wrested from them. It was not the Lord Lieutenant, but the landlords and magistrates, who would really exercise these powers, and it was only human nature that they should endeavour to punish the men who had weakened, if not broken, their power. The Bill was called a Life and Property Protection Bill. The right hon. Gentleman objected to its being called a Coercion Bill; but he had heard Members speaking of former measures as Coercion Bills, and so long as Ireland was connected with this country and governed by the English Parliament so long would there be Ministers pressing Coercion Bills upon Ireland. They had been told that the Land League and the unwritten law had been reigning for some time; but what was the Irish Government doing during the Recess? The Government knew of the League being proclaimed in a dozen places every Sunday. It was proclaimed from every platform of every meeting to which the Government reporters were sent. Why did not they hear anything from the Government then? If the Land League was illegal now it was illegal then? They had heard of the illegality of the Land League Courts. Was there a Gentleman on the Treasury Bench who had not heard of the Courts of the landlords? Landlords had frequently summoned and fined their servants for offences; but it was only when the Land League announced such Courts that the Government condemned such Courts as illegal.

Mr. BIGGAR charged the bad landlords of Ireland with having entered into a conspiracy to deceive the Chief Secretary, and to spread false and exaggerated reports of crime and outrage, so as to prejudice the people of England against the Irish. These men still desired to retain their power to evict tenants without mercy, and to extort exorbitant rents, and the statements emanating from such a source were utterly untrustworthy. He thought that apprehensions concerning Ribbonism and Fenianism were the main causes that had influenced the Chief Secretary in bringing forward this Bill, and he regarded those apprehensions as altogether without foundation. He knew nothing whatever about the Fenian leaders. The ultimate aims of that society, as far as he understood them, were right and laudable; but with regard to their present policy he knew literally nothing, and he thought the Chief Secretary must have been imposed upon by paid spies. ["Question!"] He knew that he was speaking to an adverse audience; but that would not deter him from doing his duty. The Land League, it had been said, issued commands to the people. As far as he knew, the Land League issued no commands to the people. The Land League, it had been said, forced people to agree with them. On the contrary, the Land League aimed only at moral influence. It went no further. At the meetings which he attended he always advised the people not to violate the Criminal Law.

[9 A.M. WEDNESDAY, FEB. 2.]

At this time, Mr. SPEAKER returned to the House and resumed the Chair; and the hon. Member for Cavan at once resumed his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER thereupon addressed the House as follows:—

The Motion for leave to bring in the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill has now been under discussion for above five days. The present sitting, having commenced on Monday last, at Four o'clock, has continued until this Wednesday morning, a period of forty-one hours, the House having been frequently occupied with discussions upon repeated dilatory Motions for Adjournment. However prolonged and tedious these discussions, the Motions have been supported by small minorities, in opposition to the general sense of the House.

A crisis has thus arisen which demands the prompt interposition of the Chair, and of the House. The usual rules have proved powerless to ensure orderly and effective Debate. An important measure, recommended in Her Majesty's Speech nearly a month since, and declared to be urgent, in the interests of the State, by a decisive majority, is being arrested by the action of an inconsiderable minority, the Members of which have resorted to those modes of "Obstruction," which have been recognised by the House as a Parliamentary offence.

The dignity, the credit, and the authority of this House are seriously threatened, and it is necessary that they should be vindicated. Under the operation of the accustomed rules and methods of procedure, the Legislative powers of the House are paralysed. A new and exceptional course is imperatively demanded; and I am satisfied that I shall best carry out the will of the House, and may rely upon its support, if I decline to call upon any more Members to speak, and at once proceed to put the Question from the Chair. I feel assured that the House will be prepared to exercise all its powers in giving effect to these proceedings.

Future measures for ensuring orderly Debate I must leave to the judgment of the House. But I may add that it will be necessary either for the House itself to assume more effectual control over its Debates, or to entrust greater authority to the Chair.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 164; Noes 19: Majority 145.

AYES.

Agar-Robartes, hon. T. C.
Armitstead, G.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Aylmer, Capt. J. E. F.
Balfour, Sir G.
Balfour, J. B.
Barran, J.
Bass, H.
Beach, rt. hn. Sir M. H.
Biddulph, M.
Brassey, H. A.
Briggs, W. E.
Brinton, J.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, rt. hon. Lord C.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Bryce, J.
Butt, C. P.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, J. A.
Campbell, R. F. F.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Carington, hon. R.
Carington, hon. Col. W. H. P.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Cheetham, J. F.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Churchill, Lord R.
Cohen, A.
Colman, J. J.
Corbett, J.
Corry, J. P.
Cotes, C. C.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowan, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Craig, W. Y.
Cropper, J.
Cross, rt. hon. Sir R. A.
Cunliffe, Sir R. A.
Currie, D.
Davey, H.
Davies, D.
Dawnay, Col. hn. L. P.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Duckham, T.
Duff, rt. hon. M. E. G.
Earp, T.
Egerton, Adm. hon. F.
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Evans, T. W.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fort, R.
Fowler, H. H.
Fowler, W.
Fry, T.
Galway, Viscount
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gorst, J. E.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grant, Sir G. M.
Grantham, W.
Grenfell, W. H.
Grey, A. H. G.
Guest, M. J.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, J. G. C.
Harcourt, rt. hon. Sir W. G. V. V.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hastings, G. W.
Havelock-Allan, Sir H.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Heneage, E.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hill, Lord A. W.
Hill, T. R.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Hollond, J. R.
Holms, J.
Howard, J.
Inderwick, F. A.
James, C.
James, Sir H.
James, W. H.
Jardine, R.
Laing, S.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawrence, W.
Lee, H.
Lefevre, right hon. G. J. S.
Leigh, hon. G. H. C.
Lubbock, Sir J.
M'Lagan, P.
M'Laren, J.
Maitland, W. F.
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Marjoribanks, E.
Marriott, W. T.
Mason, H.
Maxwell-Heron, J.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Morgan, rt. hon. G. O.
Moss, R.
Mundella, rt. hon. A. J.
Nicholson, W.
Northcote, rt. hn. Sir S. H.
Otway, A.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Pease, A.
Pease, J. W.
Pender, J.
Playfair, rt. hon. L.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Portman, hn. W. H. B.
Powell, W. R. H.
Pugh, L. P.
Pulley, J.
Ralli, P.
Rathbone, W.
Reed, Sir C.
Reed, Sir E. J.

Rendel, S.
Richardson, T.
Roberts, J.
Rogers, J. E. T.
Round, J.
Roundell, C. S.
Russell, Lord A.
Samuelson, H.
Sandon, Viscount
Scott, M. D.
Severne, J. E.
Shield, H.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Spencer, hon. C. R.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Stanley, hon. E. L.
Stevenson, J. C.
Thomasson, J. P.
Tillett, J. H.
Tottenham, A. L.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, G. O.
Vivian, A. P.
Walrond, Col. W. H.
Waugh, E.
Wiggin, H.
Wilson, Sir M.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Woodall, W.

TELLERS.

Grosvenor, Lord R.
Kensington, Lord

NOES.

Barry, J.
Biggar, J. G.
Brooks, M.
Callan, P.
Commins, A.
Fay, C. J.
Gabbett, D. F.
Gray, E. D.
Kinnear, J.
Leamy, E.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Coan, J. C.
Molloy, B. C.
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Kelly, J.
Power, J. O'C.
Sexton, T.
Sullivan, T. D.
Synan, E. J.

TELLERS.

Givan, J.
Lyons, R. D.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded to put the Main Question, which was agreed to without a division.

[These proceedings caused great excitement among the Members present; and those who had voted in the minority withdrew from the House, crying "Privilege! Privilege!"]

Ordered, that leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland, and that Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, Mr. GLADSTONE, and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT do prepare and bring it in.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 79.]

MR. SPEAKER having asked at what time the second reading would be taken?

MR. GLADSTONE said: This day, at 12 o'clock. The right hon. Gentleman added: Before moving the adjournment of the House, I wish to give a Notice which has reference, I need not say, to the appeal made by yourself from the Chair, with reference to the better conduct of the Business of the House on future occasions. I propose to move tomorrow the following Resolutions:—

"1. If upon Notice given a Motion be made that the state of Public Business is urgent, and if on the call of the Speaker 40 Members shall support it by rising in their places, the Speaker shall forthwith put the Question, no Debate, Amendment, or Adjournment being allowed; and if, on the voices being given he shall without doubt perceive that the Noes have it, his decision shall not be challenged, but, if otherwise, a Division may be forthwith taken, and if the Question be resolved in the affirmative by a majority of not less than three to one, the powers of the House for the Regulation of its Business upon the several stages of Bills, and upon Motions and all other matters, shall be and remain with the Speaker, until the Speaker shall declare that the state of Public Business is no longer urgent."

That is the first Resolution, and I propose to follow it by a second—namely—"2. That the state of Public Business is urgent."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked if the Notice just given would come on at half-past 4 o'clock tomorrow?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked if it was intended to rescind the Resolution giving precedence to the Coercion Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE: This Motion will take precedence.

MR. CALLAN: As a Member who has neither moved nor seconded any of the obstructive Motions introduced during the Sitting of the House, but as one who has sat here calmly watching, with anxiety, and with feelings of the deepest interest, the course of events, I take this opportunity of stating one reason why I did so.

MR. ALDERMAN W. LAWRENCE: I rise to Order. There is no Motion before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: There is the Motion for adjournment.

MR. CALLAN: I do not intend to refer to the unseemliness of the interruptions which have taken place; but I have waited here in patient expectation since the House met on Monday, hoping that good taste or kindly and generous feeling, if not a sense of justice, would exact from the Treasury Bench, on the part of the Prime Minister, an apology or explanation as to the gross charge which he has made against the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) and the Party to which I belong. But no apology has been made, no explanation rendered. I see in the newspapers a letter written by a third party; but even there no apology is made for the blunder into which the Prime Minister was led by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. A charge was made against the hon. Member for Cork City; and, notwithstanding his repeated denials in this House in the course of the debate, the Prime Minister insisted that the words were not qualified by "unjust," or any term approaching to it, and he read an extract from a speech in which he stated that they should resist evictions, no matter from what cause they came. If those words were not withdrawn, an apology should be given by the right hon. Gentleman who hurled that unfair charge.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: It is quite true that the facts are as stated in the letter which has been referred to by the hon. Member, and I dare say hon. Members may also have seen that letter. The House will recollect what took place when my right hon. Friend was speaking upon the Main Question. He quoted a speech of the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. Parnell) at Ennis, and stated what he said was to happen in the event of a tenant taking a farm from which another tenant had been evicted; and he also stated that there was no qualification in such speech as to whether the eviction was a just or unjust one. The hon. Member for Cork City objected to this quotation, upon which I put into the hands of my right hon. Friend another speech which I supposed to have been made by the hon. Member. I afterwards discovered that an uncorrected proof had been put into my hands, attributing to the hon. Member a speech really made by another person. Finding the mistake that had been made, I at once wrote to the hon. Member, and told him that when I next spoke upon the matter I would publicly explain it. I simply stated the facts as I found them, and did not in the letter apologize, because I felt that the hon. Member for Cork City had not taken care to give an impression that it mattered whether the eviction was just or unjust. At the meeting at Ennis the speech quoted was made, and not only was the word unjust omitted, but a resolution was passed with such omission in the presence of the hon. Member, and without any remark from himself.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Then, after an unbroken Sitting of 41½ hours,

House adjourned at half after Nine o'clock in the morning.

[INDEX.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

VOLUME CCLVII.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1881.

Explanation of the Abbreviations.

In Bills, Read 1^{o}, 2^{o}, 3^{o}, or 1^{a}, 2^{a}, 3^{a}, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY—NAVY—INDIA—IRELAND—SCOTLAND—PARLIAMENT—POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS—CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EDUCATION—CRIMINAL LAW—LAW AND JUSTICE—TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABERCORN, Duke of
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 54

Adulteration of Food Act — Compounds Resembling Butter
  Questions, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 25, 1301

Afghanistan
  LORDS
  MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
  Retention of Candahar, Observations, The Earl of Lytton; debate thereon *Jan* 10, 284
  Memorandum of Lord Napier of Magdala, Question, Observations, Lord Inchiquin, Lord Waveney; Reply, Viscount Enfield *Jan* 25, 1296; Observations, Lord Waveney *Jan* 31, 1703

Afghanistan—Candahar
  Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that Candahar with the dependent territory be constituted into an emporium of trade and commerce under British administration and government" (*The Lord Waveney*) *Jan* 28, 1594; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Afghanistan
  COMMONS
  MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
  Military Operations
  "*Abandonment*" *of Candahar*, Question, Captain Aylmer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 13, 648
  Rewards for Services, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 7, 158

[*cont.*

Afghanistan—cont.

The "Disaster" at Maiwand, Question, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 13, 646

Political Affairs

Native Agents at Cabul, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 31, 1730

Retention of Candahar—Memorandum of Lord Napier of Magdala, Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Onslow; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 25, 1305; Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 27, 1503

Reported Famine in Southern Afghanistan, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 28, 1626

The Papers, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 7, 190; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 13, 630; Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 20, 1037

Africa, South

LORDS

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

The Cape Colony—The Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, Question, Observations, Earl Cadogan; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley *Jan* 10, 282

The Transvaal (Military Operations)

Insurrection of the Boers, Questions, Observations, Lord Brabourne, Viscount Bury; Reply, The Earl of Kimberley *Jan* 11, 435

Repulse of a British Force at Laing's Nek, Question, Earl Cadogan; Answer, The Earl of Kimberley *Jan* 28, 1594

Question, Earl Cadogan; Answer, The Earl of Kimberley *Jan* 31, 1704

Africa, South (Missionaries in Basutoland)

Moved for, "An Address to the Crown praying that a Copy of the Memorial addressed to Her Majesty's Ministers by the Committee of the Paris Evangelical Alliance on the present position of the native churches in Basutoland and the missionaries sent out by the Paris Evangelical Missionary Society be laid on the Table" (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Jan* 7, 154; Motion agreed to

Africa, South

COMMONS

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

The Cape Colony—Despatch of Arms, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 13, 640

The Transvaal

Insurrection of the Boers, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 10, 335;—*Mediation*, Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 17, 832

[*cont.*

Africa, South—cont.

Military Operations

The Disaster in the Transvaal—Surprise of the 94th Regiment, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 10, 338; Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 24, 1199

Repulse of a British Force at Laing's Nek, Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Ritchie, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Gill, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Childers, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 28, 1635

The Re-inforcements, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 31, 1736

Political Affairs

The Transvaal Republic, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Courtney *Jan* 10, 327

The Orange Free State, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 11, 447

Rumoured Negotiations, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 21, 1103

The War in Basutoland—The Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 7, 190

Military Operations in Basutoland, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 20, 1034

Cetewayo, late King of the Zulus, Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 18, 937

The Zulu War—The Loyal Boers, Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 17, 843

Zululand—Rumoured Famines, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 25, 1310

Delagoa Bay, Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 14, 719

Africa, South—Basutoland

Amendt. on Address *Jan* 20, At end of Address to add "And we humbly pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps, either by communication with the Government of Cape Colony, or by proposing mediation between the contending parties, to prevent further destruction of life and property in Basutoland" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*), 1065; Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Jan* 21, To leave out from "That," and add "this House is of opinion that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjustifiable, and would view with regret any measures taken by Her Majesty's Government with the object of enforcing British supremacy over the people of the Transvaal, who rightfully claim their national independence"

[*cont.*

Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal— cont.
(*Mr. Rylands*) v., 1109; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 129, N. 33; M. 96 (D. L. 8)

Agricultural Distress—Report of the Commission
Question, Mr. Spencer Walpole; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 24, 1207

Agricultural Holdings (Warnings to Remove) (Scotland) Bill (*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Barclay*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 10 [Bill 51]

Agricultural Lectures at South Kensington
Question, Mr. O'Shea; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 10, 329

Agricultural Tenants' Compensation Bill (*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. James Cowan, Mr. J. C. Lawrance, Mr. Birkbeck*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 10]

Agricultural Tenants Compensation (No. 2) Bill (*Sir Thomas Acland, Mr. Evans, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Lord Moreton, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Rodwell, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Story-Maskelyne*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 31]

ALEXANDER, Colonel C., *Ayrshire, S.*
Army—Report of Lord Airey's Committee, 1030
Metropolis—Vestries and Local Boards—Removal of Snow, 1734
Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, 617

Alkali Acts, The—Legislation
Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 20, 1033

ANDERSON, Mr. G., *Glasgow*
Brazil—Claims of British Subjects, 840
Law and Justice—The Magistracy (Scotland)—Mr. Stopford Blair, 629, 630
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 551, 553, 579, 706, 708, 709; Amendt. 712, 713
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1483
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 668

ARGYLL, Duke of (Lord Privy Seal)
India—Afghanistan (Occupation of Candahar), 301, 306, 309, 313; Motion for an Address, 1617

ARMITAGE, Mr. B., *Salford*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 759

ARMY
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Alleged Sale of Arms by the late Government, Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 10, 330
Army Organization—Report of Lord Airey's Committee, Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 20, 1030
Army Pay Department, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 31, 1733
Army Retirement—Lord Morley's Committee, Question, Earl Beauchamp; Answer, The Earl of Morley *Jan* 14, 716
Insertion of Army Advertisements in the Press, Question, The Earl of Bradford; Answer, The Earl of Morley *Jan* 10, 282
Issue of Buckshot, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 28, 1623
Medal for the Zulu War, Question, Mr. O'Shea; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 25, 1304
Military Precautions, Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 31, 1746
Officers of this House on Full Pay—Major Nolan, R.A., M.P., Questions, Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Childers *Jan* 10, 324; Question, The Duke of Montrose; Answer, The Earl of Morley *Jan* 27, 1487
Officers off Duty—Uniforms, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 18, 942
Royal Patriotic Fund—Report of 1879*—Appointment of a Select Committee*, Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 7, 156
Separation of Military Prisoners in Civil Prisons, Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 28, 1624

Auxiliary Forces
The Volunteers—Military Precautions—Custody of Arms, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 7, 161
Officers of Volunteers, Question, Mr. Macliver; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 18, 941
Speech of Lord Lytton—Political Speeches, Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Childers *Jan* 7, 159

ARNOLD, Mr. A., *Salford*
Floods, Prevention of, 642
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 553
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 213, 216
Sir Henry Layard, late H.M. Ambassador at Constantinople, 325
Tunis—The Enfida Case, 1727

ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E., *Eye*
Asia, Central—Russian Advances, 1629, 1630
Parliament—Business of the House, 1034
Treaty of Berlin—Abandonment of Candahar, 1173
Mobilization of the Greek Army, 934

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir H. JAMES), *Taunton*
Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment, 2R. 1063, 1064, 1580
Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Municipal Elections, 851
Employers' Liability Act—Contracts, 158
Judicature Acts, 849
Judicial Committee, 2R. 1062
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 706
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Leave, 265, 272
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 632, 633

Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a}* *Jan* 10 (No. 9)
Read 2^{a} *Jan* 13, 619
Committee*; Report *Jan* 14
Read 3^{a}* *Jan* 17
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Jan* 18
Read 2°, after debate *Jan* 20, 1063 [Bill 68]
Committee postponed *Jan* 27, 1580

AYLMER, Captain J. E. F., *Maidstone*
India—Afghanistan—Abandonment of Candahar, 648
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 574
Traction Engines, 335

BALFOUR, General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1032

BALFOUR, Mr. A. J., *Hertford*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1589, 1590
Ireland, State of—Government Officials—Land League, 340, 341

BALFOUR, Mr. J. B. (Solicitor General for Scotland), *Clackmannan, &c.*
Law of Bail and Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 851

Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill
(*Sir Charles W. Dilke, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *Jan* 7, 272; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 2]

Banking Laws Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Charles M'Laren*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 46]

BARCLAY, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—Gordon Hospital Provisional Order, 1187
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Leave, 808

Barristers' Admission (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Callan, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 10 [Bill 54]
Read 2°, after short debate *Jan* 27, 1586

BARRY, Mr. J., *Wexford Co.*
Ireland—Appointment of Magistrates, 635, 636
Ireland, State of—Agrarian Crime, 837
Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 185
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 562
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1343, 1433, 1435, 1436
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 670, 991
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1895, 1998

BARTTELOT, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1506
Crime—Explosion at Salford Barracks, 854
Ireland, State of—County Clare, 1101
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1659
River Floods Prevention, 2R. 1580, 1586

BAXTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Parliament—Business of the House—"Obstruction," 1725

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS-*Gloucestershire, E.*
Africa, South—War in Basutoland—Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, 191
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 691

BEACONSFIELD, Earl of
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 15, 30

BEAUCHAMP, Earl
Army—Army Retirement—Lord Morley's Committee, 716

BELLINGHAM, Mr. A. H., *Louth*
Ireland, State of—Orange Association, 440
Protection of Captain Boycott, 550
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 558
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 594

BELMORE, Earl of
Africa, South (Missionaries in Basutoland), Motion for an Address, 154
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 66

BIDDELL, Mr. W., *Suffolk, W.*
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1911

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
 Army—Issue of Buckshot, 1623
 Inland Revenue—Income Tax in Ireland, 331
 Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Board of Works—Advances for Drainage Works, 1489
  Education — Vaughan's Endowed School, 1726
  Evictions—Case of Denis Murphy, 1498
  Relief of Distress (Ireland) Act, 1024
  State Trials in Dublin, 448, 449
 Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
  Anti-Land League — Placard at Glasgow, 1622
  Cavan, Outrages at, 855
  Proclamation of "Disturbed" Counties, 188
  Prohibited Meeting at Magherafelt, 339
  Representations of Foreign Powers, 724, 853
  Riot at Dungannon, 1488, 1489
 Ireland, State of, Motion for a Select Committee, 548
 Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 555, 712
 Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1344, 1345, 1347, 1348
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 104, 528, 659, 678, 786, 787, 982, 983, 1021, 1022
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1578, 1858, 1860, 1861, 1867, 1894, 1895, 1964, 1971, 1972, 1973, 2032

Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Monk, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Fry, Mr. Barran*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 16]

Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Monk, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Barran*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 44]

BIRKBECK, Mr. E., *Norfolk, N.*
 Fisheries, Inspectors of, 724
 Fishing Vessels (Regulations as to Lights), 1185

BLENNERHASSETT, Mr. R. P., *Kerry*
 Borough Franchise (Ireland), 335
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 589, 948, 951

Board of Trade, Constitution and Duties of
 Question, Mr. Gourley ; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 7, 161

Boiler Explosions Bill
(*Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. Burt, Mr. Henry Lee, Mr. Broadhurst*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 39]

Boiler Explosions—Explosion at Batley
 Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 31, 1740

BORLASE, Mr. W. C., *Cornwall, E.*
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1965

BOURKE, Right Hon. R., *Lynn Regis*
 Slave Trade Treaties with Turkey and Egypt, 1199
 Treaty of Berlin—Miscellaneous Questions
  Article 24—Greece and Turkey—Circular of the French Government, 837
  Montenegrin Frontier, 628, 629, 1302
  Naval Demonstration, 627
  Turkey and Greece, 1037
 Treaty of Washington—Halifax Fishery Commission, 445
 Turkey and Greece—Representation of the Powers at the Porte, 1735 ;—Action of H.M. Government, 1744

BRABOURNE, Lord
 Africa, South—Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers, 435

BRADFORD, Earl of
 Army—Insertion of Army Advertisements in the Press, 282

BRADLAUGH, Mr. C., *Northampton*
 New Zealand — Imprisonment of Natives, 1191
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 386
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1260, 1645, 1660, 1908

BRAND, Right Hon. H. B. W., (*see* SPEAKER, The)

BRAYE, Lord
 Ireland—Letter of H.H. the Pope to the Irish Episcopate, 717

Brazil—Claims of British Subjects
 Question, Mr. Anderson ; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 17, 840

BRIGHT, Right Hon. J. (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), *Birmingham*
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 209, 216
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1555, 1966

BRIGHT, Mr. J., *Manchester*
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 509

BROADHURST, Mr. H., *Stoke-on-Trent*
- Employers' Liability Act, 1880—London and North Western Railway Company, 1627
- House of Commons—Members' Smoking Room, 1633
- Ireland—Port of Dublin—Dues on Rough Timber, 439
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 802
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Leave, 272
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1782

BROOKS, Mr. M., *Dublin*
- Post Office (Ireland)—Telegraph Department, 1500

BROWN, Mr. A. H., *Wenlock*
- Parliament — Business of the House, Res. 1446
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1945

BRYCE, Mr. J., *Tower Hamlets*
- Post Office—Competitive Examinations, &c. 1625
- Turkey—Macedonia—The Albanian League, 847
- Turkey and Greece—The Frontier Question, 1494

Burial Acts—Close of Churchyards
- Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 28, 1631

Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) Bill

(*The Lord Chancellor*)

l. Presented; read 1ª *Jan* 7, 153 (No. 2)
Read 2ª* *Jan* 10
Committee*; Report *Jan* 13
Read 3ª* *Jan* 14
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Osborne Morgan*) *Jan* 18
Read 2° *Jan* 20, 1062 [Bill 66]
Committee*; Report *Jan* 27

Burial Fees Bill

(*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Brinton*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 21]

BURT, Mr. T., *Morpeth*
- Mines, Explosions in—Appropriation of Relief Funds, 718

BURY, Viscount
- Africa, South—The Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers, 437

BUXTON, Mr. F. W., *Andover*
- Election Charges, Return of, 1190
- India—Committee on Military Accounts and Estimates, 1037

BYRNE, Mr. G. M., *Wexford Co.*
- Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 179
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 571, 572, 585
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. Motion for Adjournment, 1371, 1460
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 956, 1018, 1054, 1055
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1545, 1547, 1866, 1930

CADOGAN, Earl
- Africa, South—Cape Colony—Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, 282
  - The Transvaal (Military Operations), 1704; —Repulse of a British Force, 1594

CAINE, Mr. W. S., *Scarborough*
- Prisons (England) Act, 1877—Scarborough Prison, 1203

CAIRNS, Earl
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 46, 47

CALLAN, Mr. P., *Louth*
- Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1586, 1592
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Agrarian Crime—The Returns, 1509, 1510
  - Agricultural Leases—Form of Leases, 1312
  - Griffith's Valuation, 1187
  - Irish Land Commission—The Report, 1313
  - Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act—Report of Commissioners, 1206, 1207
  - Magistracy, 1203
  - Mr. Davitt, 651
- Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Land League — Prohibited Meetings at Drogheda, 189
  - Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 175, 176
  - Protestant Meeting at Drogheda, 1191, 1193
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 562, 563, 564, 579, 709, 712; Motion for Adjournment, 713, 714
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1333, 1362, 1363, 1381, 1382, 1429, 1438, 1447, 1448
- Parliament—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, 275, 424
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 705, 1060, 1061
- Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for a Return, 618
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Leave, 272
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1909, 1943, 2036
- Public Houses (Closing on Sunday), Motion for Leave, 274
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Motion for Leave, 273, 274
- Supply—Exchequer Bonds, 1702

CAMERON, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Motion for Leave, 274

CAMPBELL, Lord Colin, *Argyll*
Post Office—Mails in Argyllshire, 720

CAMPBELL, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Ireland, State of—Return of Evictions, 640
Irish Land Commission—The Report, 1639
Parliament—Order—Blue Books, 1207
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1925
Turkey—Deportation of Bulgarians from Macedonia, 637

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1717

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Pease, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Dr. Cameron*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 27]

CARBUTT, Mr. E. H., *Monmouth, &c.*
Post Office—Re-directed Letters, 1033, 1312
Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879—Recovery of Small Debts, 1107

CARRINGTON, Lord
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 8

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1117
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1446

CAVENDISH, Lord F. C. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Yorkshire, W.R., N. Div.*
Inland Revenue—Collectors of Taxes, 1310
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Board of Works—Advances for Drainage Works, 1489, 1496
  Crown Rents, Tithe Rent Charges, and Income Tax, &c. 157, 945
  Illicit Distillation, 1623
  Irish Land Commission—The Report, 1313
  Registry of Deeds—Report of the Royal Commission, 1038
  State Trials, 641
Law and Police—Fire at the Custom House, 1025
Official Statistics Committee—The Report, 1195
Supply—Exchequer Bonds, 1702

CECIL, Lord E. H. B. G., *Essex, W.*
Africa, South—Insurrection of the Boers—94th Regiment, 1199
Army—Officers' Uniform off Duty, 942
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 560

Central Asia—Russian Advances—Candahar
Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 28, 1629

CHAMBERLAIN, Right Hon. J. (President of the Board of Trade), *Birmingham*
Adulteration of Food Act—Compound Resembling Butter, 1301, 1302
Board of Trade, Constitution of the, 161
Companies Act, 1867—Trinity College, London, 1634
Corn Returns Amendment, 338
Fishing Vessels (Regulations as to Lights), 1185
Life Boats—The "Abraham Thomas," 1104
Mercantile Marine—Life-Boat Services—The Steamship "Rochester," 1502
Merchant Shipping—Statutes, 848
Private Bills—River Thames Bill, 1638
Snow Storm, The — Railway Passengers — London and North Western Railway Company, 1490
Traction Engines, 335

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (LORD SELBORNE)
Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment, 2R. 619
Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal), 1R. 153
Judicial Committee, 1R. 153
Parliament—Queen's Speech, 3
  Roll of the Lords, 282
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—The Government Bills, 826, 827
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Order in Council—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c., 1622

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—See GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E.

CHAPLIN, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1137
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 159
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 514

CHILDERS, Right Hon. H. C. E. (Secretary of State for War), *Pontefract*
Africa, South—Cape Colony — Despatch of Arms, 640
  The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of a British Force, 1635, 1636; —Re-inforcements, 1736
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Alleged Sale of Arms by the Late Government, 330
  Army Pay Department, 1734
  Issue of Buckshot, 1623
  Lord Airey's Committee, Report of, 1030
  Major Nolan, 324
  Medal for the Zulu War, 1304
  Military Precautions, 1747
  Officers' Uniform off Duty, 942

[*cont.*

CHILDERS, Right Hon. H. C. E.—*cont.*
Royal Patriotic Fund—Report of 1879—Appointment of Select Committee, 156
Volunteers—Custody of Arms, 161;—Officers of, 941;—Speech of Lord Lytton, 159
Crime—Explosion at Salford Barracks, 854
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 789, 792, 793, 795
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1952

China — The Chefoo Convention — The Opium Tax
Question, Mr. J. W. Pease; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 18, 934

Church Boards Bill (*Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Edward Howard, Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Marriott, Mr. Pulley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 14]

CHURCHILL, Lord R., *Woodstock*
Africa, South—The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of a British Force, 1635
Ireland—Mr. Davitt, 649
Ireland, State of—Alleged Anarchy, 653
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 561
Palace of Westminster—Smoking Room of the House of Commons, 1198, 1632
Parliament—Business of the House, 1109
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1453, 1456, 1482
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 353, 360, 475, 526, 791, 922
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—Premature Circulation of the Bill, 1743, 1744
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 2036
River Floods Prevention, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1583, 1585

Church Patronage Bill
(*Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Stanley Leighton, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 30]

Churchwardens Admission Bill
(*Mr. Monk, Sir Gabriel Goldney*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 47]

CLARKE, Mr. E. G., *Plymouth*
Companies Act, 1867—Trinity College, London, 1634

Clerical Disabilities Act Repeal Bill
(*Sir Gabriel Goldney, Mr. Thorold Rogers*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 11]

CLONCURRY, Lord
Ireland (Grass Lands, &c.), Motion for a Return, 1183

Coal Mines—Riots in Lancashire
Questions, Mr. Daly; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 28, 1630; *Jan* 31, 1740

COHEN, Mr. A., *Southwark*
Snow Storm, The — Railway Passengers—London and North Western Railway Company, 1490

COLLINS, Mr. E., *Kinsale*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Loyal Boers, 843

COLTHURST, Colonel D. La Zouche, *Cork*
Army—Separation of Military Prisoners in Civil Prisons, 1624
Ireland—Presentment Sessions, 439
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 144
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1543

COMMINS, Dr. A., *Roscommon*
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 172
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 559, 560, 584, 585, 711
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Address in Answer to, 136, 613, 653, 656, 659
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1822, 1930, 1939, 1974, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1987, 1993, 1995, 1996, 2021

Commons
Select Committee appointed *Jan* 27; List of the Committee, 1593

Companies Act, 1867—Trinity College, London
Question, Mr. Edward Clarke; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 28, 1634

Contagious Diseases Acts
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the Contagious Diseases Acts, 1866—1869, their Administration, Operation, and Effect" *Jan* 14; List of the Committee, 814

Contagious Diseases Acts Repeal Bill
(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. William Fowler, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Joseph Cowen*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 7]

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts
Foot-and-Mouth Disease, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 7, 159; Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 14, 722; Questions, Mr. Duckham, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 27, 1506
Foot-and-Mouth Disease (Scotland), Questions, Mr. Cochrane-Patrick, Mr. Pell; Answers, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 18, 944
Order in Council, Jan 4, 1881—*Importation of Cattle from Ireland*, Question, Mr. W. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 31, 1728

Conveyancing and Law of Property Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl Cairns*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Jan* 10 (No. 7)

Corbet, Mr. W. J., *Wicklow Co.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Order in Council Jan. 4, 1881—Importation of Irish Cattle, 1728
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Evictions—Case of Arthur Kavanagh, 326
State Trials, 641
Ireland, State of—Destitution in the County of Wicklow, 1195
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 664
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1910

Corn Returns Bill
(*Colonel Barne, General Burnaby*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 17]

Corn Returns Amendment Bill
Legislation, Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 10, 338

Corn Returns (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Ashley, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 24 [Bill 76]

Coroners (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Healy, Mr. Gray, Mr. Barry*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 20 [Bill 73]

Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Municipal Elections
Question, Mr. A. Morley; Answer, The Attorney General *Jan* 17, 851

County Courts Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Benjamin T. Williams, Sir Eardley Wilmot*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 34]

County Lunatic Asylums—Joint Counties Asylum at Abergavenny
Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 20, 1026

Courtney, Mr. L. H., *Liskeard*
Africa, South—Transvaal Republic, 328
Ireland, State of, Motion for a Select Committee, 548
Law and Police—Case of Thomas Titley, 854
Rebecca Riots, 857

Cowen, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 552, 553
Parliament—Public Business, 341
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1469, 1475, 1478, 1479, 1480, 1481
Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Telegraph Clerks, 1038

Craig, Mr. W. Y., *Staffordshire, N.*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1846

Cranbrook, Viscount
India—Afghanistan—Occupation of Candahar, 309, 313, 316
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 67, 70
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), 1095

Criminal Law
Miscellaneous Questions
Assaults upon Women and Children—Legislation, Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 20, 1025
Convict Labour, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 27, 1489
Explosion at Salford Barracks, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Childers *Jan* 17, 854
Fire at the Custom House, Questions, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 21, 1106
Punishment of Whipping, Question, Mr. Pennington; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 21, 1096

Cross, Right Hon. Sir R. A., *Lancashire, S.W.*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 706
Parliament—Business of the House, 1034
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1445
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Leave, 271
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1294, 1573, 1818, 1820, 1895, 1896, 1911, 1942, 1943, 1967
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 444

Crown Property—Sporting Rights under Crown Leases
Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 31, 1733

Cubitt, Right Hon. G., *Surrey, W.*
Parochial Charities of the City of London, 719

Currie, Mr. D., *Perthshire*
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1169
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1078

Cyprus—Floods at Limassol
Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 20, 1031

Dalhousie, Earl of
Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—Burnett's Literary Fund—Provisional Order, 1174

DALY, Mr. J., *Cork*
  Coal Mines—Riots in Lancashire, 1630, 1740
  Ireland—Coldstream Guards, 1304
  Ireland, State of—Refusal to Pay Poor Rates and Public Cess, 1631
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 555, 707
  Navy—Admission of Boys from Reformatories, 940;—From Workhouses, 1028
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1340, 1342, 1375, 1431
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 402, 884, 1022
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1695, 1836, 1886, 1887, 1915, 1916; Motion for Adjournment, 1919

DAVEY, Mr. H., *Christchurch*
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1273

DAWNAY, Col. Hon. L. P., *Thirsk*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 502

DAWSON, Mr. C., *Carlow*
  Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1152
  Ireland—Law and Justice—Powers of Irish Resident Magistrates, 838
  Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 171
    Public Meetings, 1204;—Limerick Central Land League, 1098, 1502
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 558
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1363, 1364, 1365, 1407, 1459
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Amendt. 995, 1003, 1004, 1007, 1039
  Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for a Return, 617, 618
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1653, 1798, 1870, 1872, 1873, 1931, 1932

DE WORMS, Baron H., *Greenwich*
  Army—Royal Patriotic Fund—Report of 1879—Appointment of a Select Committee, 156
  Criminal Law—Assaults upon Women and Children, 1025

DILKE, Sir C. W. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Chelsea, &c.*
  Africa, South—Delagoa Bay, 720
  Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, Leave, 272, 273
  Brazil—Claims of British Subjects, 840
  China—Chefoo Convention—Opium Tax, 935
  Egypt—Finance, 851
  Ireland—Representation by Foreign Powers, 853
  Madagascar—Conflicting Interests of France and England, 1626
  Mexico—Diplomatic Relations, 1101
  Morocco—Outrage at Tangiers, 833

[*cont.*

DILKE, Sir C. W.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for a Return, 617, 618, 715; Motion for an Address, 813, 814
  Sir Henry Layard, late H.M. Ambassador at Constantinople, 326
  Slave Trade Treaties with Turkey and Egypt, 1199
  Spain—Commercial Relations—The Differential Duties, 1739
  Treaty of Berlin—Miscellaneous Questions
    Article 23—European Provinces of Turkey, 1493
    Article 24—Greece and Turkey—Circular of the French Government, 837, 838, 1202
    Bulgaria—The Varna Railway Company, 1493
    Mobilization of the Greek Army, 934, 994
    Montenegrin Frontier, 628, 629, 1362
    Naval Demonstration, 627
    Turkey and Greece, 1037;—Frontier Question, 1494
  Treaty of Washington, 1854—Halifax Fishery Commission, 445
    The Fortune Bay Fishery Dispute, 1307
  Tunis—The Enfida Case, 1727
  Turkey—Importation of Bulgarians from Macedonia, 637, 848
  Turkey and Greece—Representation of the Powers at the Porte, 1735;—Action of H.M. Government, 1744, 1745

DILKE, Mr. A. W., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1418

DILLON, Mr. J., *Tipperary*
  Ireland—Agrarian Crime—The Returns, 1508, 1734
    Magistracy, 1189
  Ireland, State of—Law of Public Meetings, 1311
    Precautionary Measures, 1102
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1374; Motion for Adjournment, 1419, 1422, 1455, 1456
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 868, 875, 878, 880, 881, 882, 1014, 1015, 1016
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1248, 1249, 1578, 1810, 1811, 1890, 1891, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1951, 1959

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1483
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 730, 731, 732

Distress for Rent Bill
(*Mr. Rendel, Mr. Gurdon*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 21 [Bill 74]

DODDS, Mr. J., *Stockton*
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1435

DODSON, Right Hon. J. G. (President of the Local Government Board) *Scarborough*
Alkali Acts, 1033
Employers' Liability Act, 1880—Lock-Out of Miners, 940
London and North Western Railway Company, 1628
Floods, Prevention of, 642
Highways Acts—Accounts of Surveyors of Highways, 440
Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878, 848
Law of Settlement, 336
Local Taxation and County Government, 636
Noxious Gases, 337
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1958
River Floods Prevention, 2R. 1582, 1585

DONOUGHMORE, Earl of
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 55

DUCKHAM, Mr. T., *Herefordshire*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 1506
Corn Returns Amendment, 338
Crown Property — Sporting Rights under Crown Leases, 1733

DUFF, Right Hon. M. E. G. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Elgin, &c.*
Africa, South—Miscellaneous Questions
Cetewayo, late King of the Zulus, 937
Military Operations in Basutoland, 1034
Transvaal, 1104;—Disaster—94th Regiment, 359;—Insurrection of the Boers, 336, 1199;—Orange Free State, 448;—Repulse of a British Force, 1635, 1637
Zululand, 1311
Zulu War—Loyal Boers, 843
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1159
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1083, 1086
Cyprus—Floods at Limassol, 1031
New Zealand—Imprisonment of Natives, 1191
Prince Edward's Island—Land Question, 843

DUFF, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Navy—Seamen in Her Majesty's Fleet, 637

DUNRAVEN, Earl of
India—Afghanistan—Candahar, Motion for an Address, 1610
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 64
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—The Government Bills, 830

DUNSANY, Lord
Land League Meetings and Agrarian Crime (Ireland), Motion for Returns, 427, 433

Educational Endowments (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 18 [Bill 65]

Education Department
Agriculture in Village Schools, Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 13, 638
Gipsy Children, Question, Mr. T. C. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 20, 1032
School Board Fees, Question, Mr. Pugh; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 27, 1491

Elementary Education Act, 1880—*Labour Certificates*, Question, Mr. Rankin; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 18, 943
Endowed Schools—Dulwich College, Question, Mr. Charles Roundell; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 11, 441
Endowed Schools Commissioners, Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 27, 1494

EDWARDS, Mr. H., *Weymouth*
Police Act (Metropolis)—Removal of Snow, 1106

EGERTON, Hon. Wilbraham, *Cheshire, Mid*
Alkali Acts, 1033
Noxious Gases, 337

Egypt (*Finance*)
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 17, 851

ELCHO, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Science and Art—The Robinson Collection at South Kensington, 1735

Elections (Closing of Public Houses) Bill (*Mr. Carbutt, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. Caine*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 12 [Bill 58]

Employers' Liability Act, 1880
Contracts to Avoid, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Attorney General *Jan* 7, 157
Lock Out of Miners, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 18, 939
London and North Western Railway Company, Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 28, 1627

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Peddie, Mr. O'Connor Power*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 19 [Bill 71]

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Macliver, Mr. Morley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 20 [Bill 72]

Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Mundella*) *Jan* 14, 807; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 61]
Bill withdrawn * *Jan* 18

ENFIELD, Viscount (Under Secretary of State for India)
India—Afghanistan (Occupation of Candahar), 319, 1298; Motion for an Address, 1600

ERRINGTON, Mr. G., *Longford Co.*
India—Land Laws of Bengal—Report of the Commission, 631
Medical Reform, 1030
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 979

FAWCETT, Right Hon. H. (Postmaster General), *Hackney*
Ireland, State of—Postal Service, 1299
Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
City and County of Kilkenny, 1197
Competitive Examinations, &c. 1625
Fee for "Late Post," 1100
Ireland—Telegraph Department, 447, 1500
Mails in Argyllshire, 720
New Money Orders, 1027
Postal Orders, 1507, 1508
Re-Directed Letters, 1033, 1312
Savings Banks, 624, 626
Snow Storms—Conveyance of Mails, 1310
Telegraph Department—Telegraph Clerks, 1028;—Telegraph Clerks at Liverpool, 1033;—Telegraphic Communication—Underground Wires, 1507
Travelling Post Offices, 1198

FAY, Mr. C. J., *Cavan Co.*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1933

FINDLATER, Mr. W., *Monaghan*
Army—Military Precautions, 1746
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1418

FINIGAN, Mr. J. L., *Ennis*
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 182
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1328, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1383, 1449
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 149, 985, 1012
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1925, 1926, 1933, 1934; Motion for Adjournment, 1936

FIRTH, Mr. J. F. B., *Chelsea*
Education Department—Agriculture in Village Schools, 638

Fisheries
Inspectors of Fisheries—The Vacant Inspectorship, Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 14, 724
Fishing Vessels (*Regulations as to Lights*), Question, Mr. Birkbeck; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 24, 1185

FITZMAURICE, Lord E., *Calne*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1431, 1440, 1444, 1445

FITZPATRICK, Hon. B. E., *Portarlington*
Ireland, State of—Land League Placards, 336
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 389

Floods, Prevention of—Legislation
Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 13, 642

FORSTER, Right Hon. W. E. (Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), *Bradford*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1589
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Agricultural Leases—Form of Leases, 1312
Board of Works—Killala Harbour, 1099
Borough Franchise, 335
Captain Boycott, Protection of, 550
Coldstream Guards, 1304
Constabulary — Arrest of Children at Castlecomer, Co. Kilkenny, 1024, 1194
Distress, 1105
Dublin Metropolitan Police—The Accounts, 635
Education—Athy Model School, 1188;—Vaughan's Endowed School, 1726
Evictions—Case of Arthur Kavanagh, 327
Fever, Outbreak of, 646
Flogging for Political Offences, 633
Griffith's Valuation, 1187
Industrial School in Connemara, 1739
Irish Land Commission—The Report, 1313, 1639
Kanturk Union, Distress in, 1309
Landlord and Tenant, 853;—Report of Commissioners, 1206, 1207
Law and Justice—Powers of Irish Resident Magistrates, 833
Magistracy, 721, 939, 1189, 1203;—Appointment of Magistrates, 635;—Clerical Magistrates, 1492;—Language of an Irish Magistrate, 334;—Mr. R. H. Notter, 1726
Mr. Davitt, 651, 652
Municipal Boundary Commission — The Report, 634
Municipal Corporation Officers Superannuation, 834
National Education—Parsonstown Model School, 445
National Schools—Agriculture, 850
Offences other than Agrarian, 813
Port of Dublin—Dues on Rough Timber, 439
Presentment Sessions, 439
Relief of Distress Act, 1024;—Out-door Relief, 1627
Seeds Act, 1880—Re-payment of Special Rates, 938

[*cont.*

FORSTER, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
Agrarian Crime, 832, 835, 836, 837;—The Returns, 842, 843, 1307, 1509, 1510, 1638, 1734
Castlebar, Distress at, 1729, 1730
Cavan, Outrages in, 855
Clare County, 1101
Constabulary, 936, 937
Cork Co,. Outrages in, 1506, 1740
Donegal Co. 849
Dungannon, Riot at, 1488, 1489
Forcible Re-entry—Kilfinane, Co. Limerick, 1197
Government Officials—Land League, 340
Granard, Co. Longford, 1301
Land League — Arrest of Members at Tralee, 192, 648, 845;—Prosecution of, 334;—Imprisonment of, 446, 447;—Compulsory Subscription, 1624;—Domiciliary Visits of the Police, 1733;—Placards, 337;—The Magistrates, 642, 643
Law and Justice—Trial by Judge, 1195
Loughrea, Distress in, 1303, 1312
Meetings in County Down, 338;—Queen's Co. 326
Orange Association, 440
Policy of the Government, 1748
Proclamation of "Disturbed" Counties, 187, 188, 1107, 1205
Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 162, 169
Proclamations for the Suppression of Meetings, 324
Prohibited Meeting at Clondalkin, 327;—Cullohill, 331; — Drogheda, &c. 189, 332;—Galway, 841;—Kanturk, 325;—Magherafelt, 339, 340;—Westmeath, 841
Prohibited Meetings, 838, 839
Protestant Meeting at Drogheda, 1192, 1193
Public Meetings—Limerick Central Land League, 1097, 1098
Refusal to Pay Poor Rates and Public Cess, 1632
Reported Collision at Claremorris, 323
Return of Evictions, 639, 640
Threatening Letters, 847
Threatening Notices—King's Co., 1185
Wicklow Co., Destitution in, 1196
Ireland—Outrages, Motion for a Return, 809
Ireland, State of, Motion for a Committee, 547, 548, 549
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 551, 558, 581
Parliament—Business of the House, 1109
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1349, 1373, 1414, 1428, 1479, 1480, 1481, 1487
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 210, 227, 229, 231, 232, 237, 260, 359, 656, 679, 705, 981, 1004, 1059, 1061; Report, 1065
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) —Premature Circulation of the Bill, 1743
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1209, 1214, 1215, 1223, 1520, 2037

FORSTER, Sir C., *Walsall*
Public Petitions, Motion for a Select Committee, 616

FORTESCUE, Earl
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), 716;—The Government Bills, 815, 823, 1091
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1723

FOWLER, Mr. H. H., *Wolverhampton*
Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—The Election Commission, 1729
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 1308

FOWLER, Mr. R. N., *London*
Africa, South—Delagoa Bay, 719
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1132
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1088
India, Affairs of—Royal Commission, 1496
Parliament—Arrangement of Business, 946
Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 148, 525
Post Office — Snow Storm — Conveyance of Mails, 1310
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1819, 1867, 1945

FOWLER, Mr. W., *Cambridge*
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1069
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 710
Protection of Life and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, Motion for Adjournment, 1573, 1578

Free Education (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Mr. Ernest Noel, Mr. Peddie, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Mackintosh*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 6]

Free Libraries Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Lord George Hamilton, Sir Charles Reed*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 43]

French Marriage Law
Question, Mr. Lewis Fry; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 11, 440

FRY, Mr. L., *Bristol*
French Marriage Law, 440

GABBETT, Mr. D. F., *Limerick*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, Motion for Adjournment, 1809

GALLOWAY, Earl of
Protection of Life and Property (Ireland) The Government Bills, 823

GIBSON, Right Hon. E., *Dublin University*
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of "Disturbed" Counties, 187, 188
Return of Evictions, 640

[*cont.*

Gibson, Right Hon. E.—*cont.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 248, 262
- Police Act (Metropolis)—Removal of Snow, 1107

Giffard, Sir H. S., *Launceston*
- Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 632

Gill, Mr. H. J., *Westmeath*
- Africa, South—The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of a British Force, 1637, 1638
- Ireland — Dublin Metropolitan Police — The Accounts, 634
- Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 181
  - Prohibited Meeting at Clondalkin, 327
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 576; Motion for Adjournment, 577
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 506, 987, 988
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1779, 1901, 1927, 1936, 1937

Givan, Mr. J., *Monaghan*
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1407
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1245, 1246

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E. (First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer), *Edinburghshire*
- Africa, South—The Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers, 833;—Military Operations—Repulse of a British Force, 1637
  - War in Basutoland—Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, 190, 191
- Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1138, 1139
- Ireland — Agrarian Offences — The Returns, 1734
  - Land Bill, 1201
  - State Trials in Dublin, 448
- Ireland, State of—Government Officials—Land League, 341
  - Precautionary Measures, 1102
- Joint Stock Banks, 1307
- Licensing System, 330
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House—"Obstruction," 1725;—An "All Night Sitting," 1745
  - Parliamentary Procedure—Questions, &c. 844
  - Public Business, 342, 449, 855, 1035, 1109, 1741
  - Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 104, 119, 148, 421, 868, 874, 1041, 1048; Report, 1064
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1313, 1314, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1371, 1460; Motion for Adjournment, 1487
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1566, 1573, 1680, 1684, 1690, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1809, 1815; Motion for Adjournment, 2035, 2036

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
- Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 444, 1308; Statement, 1639
- Turkey and Greece—Greek Frontier, 341
- Ways and Means—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Inland Revenue—Income Tax in Ireland, 331
  - Inland Revenue Act, 1880—Drawback on Malt, 839, 1299
  - Restrictions on Distilling, 1189

Gordon, Hon. General Sir A. H., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
- India — Afghanistan (Southern) — Reported Famine, 1626

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*
- Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1081
- Army—Volunteers—Speech of Lord Lytton, 159
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 565
- Parliament—Business of the House, 1034
  - Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 359, 1040
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1454, 1468
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1958, 1959
- River Floods Prevention, 2R. 1584, 1585

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
- Africa, South—The Transvaal, Disaster in—94th Regiment, 338
- Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1154
- Army—Volunteers—Custody of Arms, 161
- Board of Trade, Constitution of the, 161
- Life Boats—The "Abraham Thomas," 1104
- Navy—H.M.S. "Hotspur," 1186

Grant, Mr. D., *Marylebone*
- British Museum—Admission of the Public, 852
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 584
- Palace of Westminster—House of Commons—Electric Light, 626
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 884

Grantham, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*
- Army (India) Bengal Staff Corps—Captain J. B. Chatterton, 328

Granville, Earl (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—Burnett's Literary Fund—Provisional Order, 1174
- Ireland—Letter of H.H. the Pope to the Irish Episcopate, 718
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 25, 30, 35, 46, 70
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—The Government Bills, 821, 1094, 1095

Gray, Mr. E. D., *Carlow Co.*
Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, Leave, 273
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Board of Works—Advances for Drainage Works, 1496
  Municipal Boundary Commission—The Report, 634
  Municipal Corporation Officers Superannuation, 834
  Outbreak of Fever, 646
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 168
  Threatening Letters, 847
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 553, 706, 710
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1313, 1314; Motion for Adjournment, 1359, 1362, 1410, 1448, 1457, 1480
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 773, 802, 951, 954, 1008, 1009, 1010
Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for a Return, 618
Post Office—New Money Orders, 1026, 1507
Prince Edward's Island—The Land Question, 843

Greer, Mr. T., *Carrickfergus*
Ireland—State Trials, 1508

Gregory, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1897

Grey, Mr. A. H. G., *Northumberland, S.*
Science and Art—South Kensington Museum, 1504

Guest, Mr. M. J., *Wareham*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1444
Tunis—The Enfida Case, 1727

Hamilton, Lord C. J., *Liverpool*
Army—Major Nolan, 324
Ireland — Seeds Act, 1880 — Re-payment of Special Rates, 938

Hamilton, Right Hon. Lord G. F., *Middlesex*
Inland Revenue Act, 1880—Drawback on Malt, 839
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1528

Harcourt, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Derby*
Agricultural Commission, 1207
Army—Separation of Military Prisoners in Civil Prisons, 1624
Boiler Explosions—Explosion at Batley, 1740
Burials Act—Close of Churchyards, 1631
Convict Labour, 1489, 1490
County Lunatic Asylums—Joint County Asylums at Abergavenny, 1026

[cont.

Harcourt, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  Assaults upon Women and Children, 1025
  Fire at the Custom House, 1106
  Punishment of Whipping, 1096
Fisheries, Inspectors of, 724
French Marriage Law, 441
Ireland, State of—Anti-Land League—Placard at Glasgow, 1623
Law and Police—Case of Thomas Titley, 442
  Detection of Crime, 942
Metropolis—Vestries and Local Boards—Removal of Snow, 1735
  Water Supply, 935
Mines Acts—Reports of Inspectors of Mines, 157
Mines (Coal) Regulation Act, 1872—The Pen-y-Craig Explosion, 1310, 1494;—Riots in Lancashire, 1631, 1741
  Explosions in Mines—Appropriation of Relief Funds, 719
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1374, 1426
Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—The Election Commissions, 1729
Parochial Charities of the City of London, 719
Prisons (England) Act, 1877—Scarborough Prison, 1204
Return of Election Charges, 1190
River Floods Prevention, 2R. 1584
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Census—Gaelic Population, 329
  Endowed Institutions Act, 1878—Gordon Hospital Provisional Order, 1187
  Law and Justice—The Magistracy — Mr. Stopford Blair, 629
Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879—Recovery of Small Debts, 1108
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 944

Harcourt, Mr. E. W., *Oxfordshire*
Post Office Savings Banks, 624, 626

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of (Secretary of State for India), *Lancashire, N.E.*
Army (India)—Bengal Staff Corps—Captain J. B. Chatterton, 328
Asia, Central—Russian Advances, 1629, 1630
India—Miscellaneous Questions
  Affairs of India—A Royal Commission, 1497
  Committee on Military Accounts and Estimates, 1036
  Conspiracy at Kolapore, 646, 1103
  Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services of India, 1498
  Indian Army Commission—The Report, 632
  Land Laws of Bengal—Report of the Commission, 631
  Railway to Quetta and Candahar, 1624
  Stanley Covenanted Engineers, 1188
India—Afghanistan—Miscellaneous Questions
  Afghanistan and Turkey—Papers, 190
  Blue Book, 1037
  Military Operations—Candahar, Abandonment of, 649;—Retention of, 1305, 1306, 1503;—Disaster at Maiwand, 647;—Rewards for Services, 158

[cont.

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
  Papers, 630
  Political Affairs—Native Agents at Cabul, 1731
  Southern Afghanistan—Reported Famine, 1626
 Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 568
 Parliament—Arrangement of Business, 946
  Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 522, 526, 527, 528, 536, 705, 749, 924, 931, 932
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1826

HAVELOCK-ALLAN, Major-General Sir H. M., *Sunderland*
 Africa, South—The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of a British Force, 1636
 India—Afghanistan (Military Operations)—"Disaster" at Maiwand, 646, 647
 Indian Army Commission—The Report, 631
 Mercantile Marine—Life-Boat Services—The Steamship "Rochester," 1502
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1868

HAY, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Wigtown, &c.*
 Law of Settlement, 336
 Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 564
 Navy—H.M.S. "Atalanta," Loss of—Report of Committee, 336
  Murder of Lieutenant Bower and his Boat's Crew, 722
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 503

HEALY, Mr. T. M., *Wexford*
 Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Leave, 807
 Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Flogging for Political Offences, 633
  Magistracy 939;—Language of an Irish Magistrate, 634;—Clerical Magistrates, 1491;—Mr. R. H. Notter, 1726
 Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
  Agrarian Crime, 834, 835, 837
  Clareen, Holymount, Affray at, 1499, 1500
  Constabulary, 935, 937
  Cork Co. Outrages in, 1505, 1506
 Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 571; Motion for Adjournment, 707, 712, 713
 Parliament—Business of the House, Res. Motion for Adjournment, 1350, 1351, 1352, 1358, 1385, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1443, 1444, 1445, 1446
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 540, 883, 890, 891, 1017, 1018, 1049
 Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for a Return, 618
 Post Office—Fee for "Late Post," 1100
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1214, 1223, 1692, 1695, 1696, 1699, 1875, 1876, 1882, 1884, 1885; Motion for Adjournment, 1886, 1898, 1940, 1941
 Right of Public Meeting in England and Ireland, 1201

HENDERSON, Mr. F., *Dundee*
 Law of Bail and Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 850

HENEAGE, Mr. E., *Great Grimsby*
 Local Taxation and County Government, 636
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1860

HENRY, Mr. Mitchell, *Galway Co.*
 House of Commons—Members' Smoking Room, 1633
 Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1363, 1379, 1381
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 421, 451, 462, 957
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1834

HERMON, Mr. E., *Preston*
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 675, 1039

HERSCHELL, Sir F. (*see* SOLICITOR GENERAL, The)

Highways Acts—Accounts of Surveyors of Highways
 Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 11, 440

Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878
 Question, Colonel Walrond; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 17, 848

Highways Bill
 (*Mr. Estcourt, Mr. Yorke, Mr. Master*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 38]

HILL, Mr. T. R., *Worcester*
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1936

HOLLAND, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
 Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1154
 Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1072
 Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice, &c. 943
 Treaty of Washington, 1854—Fortune Bay Fishery Dispute, 1306

HOPE, Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
 Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment, 2R. 1063
 House of Commons—Members' Smoking Room, 1633
 Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 579
 Science and Art—The National Portrait Gallery, 1742

HOPWOOD, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 706
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1774

HUNTLY, Marquess of
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1720

ILLINGWORTH, Mr. A., *Bradford*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1484

INCHIQUIN, Lord
India—Afghanistan—Retention of Candahar—Lord Napier of Magdala, 1296
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—The Government Bills, 828

INDIA
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Affairs of India—A Royal Commission, Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 27, 1496
Army—The Bengal Staff Corps—Captain J. B. Chatterton, Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 10, 328
Conspiracy at Kolapore, Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 13, 645;—*Disturbances at*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 21, 1103
Land Laws of Bengal—Report of the Commission, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 13, 631
Railway to Quetta and Candahar, Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 28, 1624
The Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services of India, Question, Sir David Wedderburn; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 27, 1498
The Indian Army Commission—The Report, Question, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 13, 631;—*Committee on Military Accounts and Estimates*, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 20, 1036
The Stanley Covenanted Engineers, Question, Mr. Litton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *Jan* 24, 1188

Industrial Schools and Reformatories (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Callan, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Martin*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 4]

Infectious Diseases Notification (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Edmond Gray, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Dawson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 40]

IRELAND
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Agricultural Leases—Forms of Leases, Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 25, 1312
Board of Works—Advances for Drainage Works, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 27, 1489; Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish, 1496;—*Killala Harbour*, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 21, 1099
Borough Franchise—Legislation, Question, Mr. Blennerhassett; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 335
Crown Rents, Tithe Rent Charges, and Income Tax, &c., Questions, Mr. Tottenham; Answers, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 7, 157; *Jan* 18, 945
Dublin Metropolitan Police—The Accounts, Question, Mr. Gill; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 634

Education
Athy Model School, Question, Mr. Leahy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1187
Industrial Schools in Connemara, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 31, 1739
National Schools—Agriculture, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 850
Parsonstown Model School, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 11, 444
Vaughan's Endowed School, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 31, 1726

Flogging for Political Offences, Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 633
Griffith's Valuation, Questions, Mr. Metge, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1186
Inland Revenue—Illicit Distillation, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 28, 1623
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870—*Report of the Commissioners*, Questions, Mr. Callan, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1206; Question, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 25, 1313; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 28, 1639

Law and Justice
Powers of Irish Resident Magistrates, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 838

Letter of H.H. the Pope to the Irish Episcopate, Observations, Question, Lord Braye; Reply, Earl Granville *Jan* 14, 717
Municipal Boundary Commission—The Report, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 634
Municipal Corporation Officers' Superannuation, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 834
Outbreak of Fever, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 646

cont.

IRELAND—*cont.*

Post Office—The Telegraph Department, Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 11, 447; Question, Mr. Maurice Brooks; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 27, 1500

Presentment Sessions, Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 11, 439

Registry of Deeds—Report of the Royal Commission, Question, Dr. Lyons; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 20, 1038

Relief of Distress Amendment Act, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 20, 1024;—*Out-Door Relief*, Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 28, 1627

The Coldstream Guards, Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 25, 1304

The Land Bill, Question, Mr. P. J. Smyth; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 24, 1201

The Magistracy

Appointment of Magistrates, Question, Mr. Barry; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 635

Clerical Magistrates, Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 18, 939; *Jan* 27, 1491; Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1189; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster, 1203

Language of an Irish Magistrate, Mr. R. H. Notter, Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 634; *Jan* 31, 1726

Religious Communions, Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 14, 721

The Port of Dublin—Dues on Rough Timber, Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 11, 439

The Seeds Act, 1880—*Repayment of Special Rates*, Questions, Lord Claud Hamilton, Major Nolan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 18, 938

The State Trials in Dublin, Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Pease; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker *Jan* 11, 448; Question, Mr. W. Corbet; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 13, 641; Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 17, 856; Questions, Mr. Greer, Mr. A. M. Sullivan; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 27, 1508; Question, Mr. A. M. Sullivan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 31, 1731

State of Ireland

Distress in Certain Districts, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 21, 1105

The Distress in the Kanturk Union, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 25, 1309

Distress at Castlebar, Questions, Mr. Nelson, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 31, 1729

Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough—Order—Questions—Moving the Adjournment of the House, Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 7, 162

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*State of*—cont.

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. O'Kelly*); after debate, Question put, A. 38, N. 301; M. 263 (D. L. 1)

Proclamation of "Disturbed" Counties, Questions, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 7, 187

Reported Collision at Claremorris, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 323

Proclamations for the Suppression of Meetings, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 324

Evictions

Case of Arthur Kavanagh, Question, Mr. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 326

Case of Denis Murphy, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 27, 1497

Returns of Evictions and Outrages, Questions, Mr. Parnell, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 639

Land Meetings in County Down, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 337

Government Officials — The Land League, Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 10, 340

The Orange Association, Question, Mr. Bellingham; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 11, 440

Protection of Captain Boycott, Question, Mr. Bellingham; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 12, 550

Michael Davitt, a Convict on Ticket-of-Leave, Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Callan, Colonel Makins; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 649

Alleged Anarchy, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Lord Randolph Churchill *Jan* 13, 652

Protection of Person and Property—Legislation, Notice of Question, Earl Fortescue *Jan* 14, 716; Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *Jan* 17, 815; Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, Earl Granville *Jan* 21, 1091

Police Constable Quinn, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 14, 721

Representations of Foreign Powers, Question, Mr. Biggar; Observations, Mr. Speaker *Jan* 14, 724; Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Question, Mr. O'Connor Power [No reply] *Jan* 17, 853

Agrarian Crime, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 832; Questions, Mr. Healy, Mr. Barry; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, 834; Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 28, 1638;—*The Returns*, Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 842; Questions, Mr. Dillon, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 27, 1508; Questions, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 31, 1734

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Threatening Letters and Notices, Questions, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Gray; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 846

County of Donegal, Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 849

Landlord and Tenant—Case of — M'Donald, Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 852

Outrages in Cavan, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 855

The Irish Constabulary, Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 18, 935

The Constabulary—Arrest of Children at Castlecomer, Co. Kilkenny, Questions, Mr. Marum; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 20, 1024; *Jan* 24, 1194

County Clare, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 21, 1101

Precautionary Measures, Questions, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Dillon; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 21, 1102

Proclamation of County Sligo, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 21, 1107

The King's County, Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1184

Protestant Meeting at Drogheda, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1191

Law and Justice—Trial by Judge, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1194

Destitution in the County of Wicklow, Question, Mr. W. Corbet; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1195

Forcible Re-entry — Kilfinane, Co. Limerick, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1196

Right of Public Meeting in England and Ireland, Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 24, 1200

Private Meetings of Public Bodies—The Police, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 24, 1204

County of Sligo—Proclaimed Districts, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 24, 1205

Law of Public Meetings, Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 25, 1311

The Postal Service, Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 25, 1298

Granard, Co. Longford, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 25, 1301

Distress in Loughrea, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 25, 1303; Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster, 1312

Agrarian Offences, County of Leitrim, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 25, 1307

Riot at Dungannon, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 27, 1488

Affray at Clareen, Holymount, Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 27, 1499

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Outrages in County Cork, Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 27, 1505

Anti-Land League — Placard at Glasgow, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 28, 1622

Refusal to pay Poor Rates and Public Cess, Question, Mr. Daly; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 28, 1631

Alleged "Boycotting" in Cork, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 31, 1739

The Land League

Arrest of Members at Tralee, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 7, 191; Questions, The O'Donoghue, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 13, 643; Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster, 647; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 14, 722; Question, Observations, Mr. Parnell; Reply, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 844; Postponement of Resolution, Mr. Parnell *Jan* 21, 1172;—*Prosecution of Land Leaguers at Tralee*, Questions, Mr. Parnell, The O'Donoghue; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 10, 332;—*Imprisonment of Land Leaguers in Tralee Gaol*, Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 11, 445

Meetings in Queen's County, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 326

Land League Placards, Questions, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 336

Private Meetings of the Land League—Domiciliary Visits of the Police, Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 13, 640; *Jan* 17, 846; Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 31, 1732

The Magistrates, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 13, 642

Public Meetings — Limerick Central Land League, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 21, 1097; Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland, 1108

Maryborough, Queen's County, Question, Mr. Lalor; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 24, 1189

Land League Courts at Limerick, Question, Mr. Dawson; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Jan* 27, 1502

Compulsory Subscription, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 28, 1624

Prohibited Meeting at Drogheda, &c., Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 7, 189; Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 331

Prohibited Meeting at Kanturk, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 325

Prohibited Meeting at Clondalkin, Question, Mr. Gill; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 327

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Prohibited Meeting at Cullohill, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 331
Prohibited Meeting at Magherafelt, Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 10, 339
Prohibited Meetings of the Land League, Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Lalor; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 838
Prohibited Meeting in Galway, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 841
Prohibited Meeting in Westmeath, Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 17, 841

Ireland—Agrarian Offences
Motion for a Return (*Mr. Sexton*) *Jan* 14, 807

Ireland—Outrages other than Agrarian
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return in continuation of Return [C. 2756], classifying the Outrages other than Agrarian Outrages enumerated in said Return, in the same way as Agrarian Outrages are classified in said Return" (*Mr. Parnell*) *Jan* 14, 809; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Ireland (*Grass Lands, &c.*)
Moved for, "A Return showing the total areas of 'Grass Lands,' including Meadows and Pastures, and the total area of Tillage Lands, including all kinds of Crops and Fallows, in Ireland, for the years 1850, 1855, 1860, 1865, 1870, 1875, and 1880" (*The Lord Cloncurry*) *Jan* 24, 1183; Motion agreed to

Ireland—Land League Meetings and Agrarian Crime
Motion for Returns (*Lord Dunsany*) *Jan* 11, 427; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the negative

Ireland, State of
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into alleged outrages in Ireland, and the effect of distress, and the system of land tenure thereon, the present state of the law for the prevention of such outrages, and the manner in which the said law has been administered" (*Mr. Parnell*) *Jan* 11, 547; after short debate, Motion postponed

Irish Railways Purchase Bill
(*Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, Colonel Colthurst*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 28]

James, Sir H. (*see* Attorney General, The)

James, Mr. W. H., *Gateshead*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 577
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 861, 1013

Jenkins, Mr. D. J., *Penryn, &c.*
Navy—Naval Training Brigs, 1202

Johnson, Mr. W. M. (Solicitor General for Ireland), *Mallow*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1590
Ireland—Evictions—Case of Denis Murphy, 1498
  State Trials, 856, 1508, 1731, 1732
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
  Clareen, Holymount, Affray at, 1499, 1500
  Domiciliary Visits, 641, 846
  Land Leaguers—Arrest of, 645, 722;—Prosecution of, at Tralee, 332, 333, 334
  Maryborough, Queen's Co., Land League, 1190
  Police Constable Quinn, 721
  Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 177, 182
  Public Meetings, 1204;—Law of, 1311;—Limerick Central Land League, 1108, 1502
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 133, 135, 262, 462, 469, 475, 477, 480, 482, 483, 486, 659, 916
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1266, 1538, 1648, 1651, 1653
Right of Public Meetings in England and Ireland, 1200, 1201

Joint Stock Banks
Question, Mr. Macliver; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 25, 1307

Judgments (Inferior Courts) Bill
(*Mr. Norwood, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Litton, Mr. Monk, Mr. Reid, Mr. Serjeant Simon*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 48]

Judicature Acts Commission
Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, The Attorney General *Jan* 17, 849

Judicial Committee Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Jan* 7, 153 (No. 3)
Read 2ª* *Jan* 10
Committee*; Report *Jan* 13
Read 3ª* *Jan* 14
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Jan* 18
Read 2° *Jan* 20, 1062 [Bill 67]
Committee*; Report *Jan* 27
Read 3°* *Jan* 28

Kenmare, Earl of (Lord Chamberlain of the Household)
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, 426

Kennaway, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
Inland Revenue—Collectors of Taxes, 1310

KENSINGTON, Right Hon. Lord (Comptroller of the Household), *Haverfordwest*
- Parliament—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, 275, 423

KIMBERLEY, Earl of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
- Africa, South—Cape Colony—Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, 283
  - The Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers, 437;—Military Operations, 1704;—Repulse of a British Force, 1594
- Africa, South (Missionaries in Basutoland), Motion for an Address, 155
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 67

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Northampton*
- Africa, South—The Transvaal, 1103;—Insurrection of the Boers, 335
- City of London—Temple Bar Memorial, 1500
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act—Report of the Commissioners, 1207
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 149, 954
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1418
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, Motion for Adjournment, 1295, 1510, 1520, 1526, 1753, 1839

LALOR, Mr. R., *Queen's Co.*
- Ireland, State of—Maryborough, Queen's Co., Land League, 1189;—Prohibited Meetings of the Land League, 839
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 577
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 924
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1362
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1902, 1919
- Rebecca Riots, 856

Landed Proprietors (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Patrick Martin, Mr. Fay, Mr. Litton*)
- c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. P. J. Smyth*) *Jan* 11, 550; after short debate, Motion postponed
- Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 14 [Bill 63]

LANSDOWNE, Marquess of
- India—Afghanistan—Candahar, Motion for an Address, 1606

Law and Police
- *Case of Thomas Titley*, Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 11, 441; Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Courtney *Jan* 17, 854
- *Detection of Crime*, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 18, 941
- *Fire at the Custom House*, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 20, 1025

Law of Settlement—Legislation
- Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 10, 336

LAWRENCE, Mr. Alderman W., *London*
- Parliamentary Procedure—Questions, &c. 843
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 2036

LAWSON, Sir W., *Carlisle*
- Africa, South—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Cape Colony— Despatch of Arms, 640
  - The Transvaal—Repulse of the British Force, 1637, 1638
  - War in Basutoland—Instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson, 190, 191
  - Zululand, 1310
- Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1166
- Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1065, 1090
- Army—Major Nolan, 324
- Licensing System, 330
- Parliament—Business of the House, 1035, 1036
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 145

Layard, Sir Henry, late H.M. Ambassador at Constantinople
- Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Rylands; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 10, 325

LEAHY, Mr. J., *Kildare*
- Education (Ireland)—Athy Model School, 1187
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1907, 1908

LEAMY, Mr. E., *Waterford*
- Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 174
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 576
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 976, 1019
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1368, 1446, 1457
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1864, 1865, 1923, 1964, 1965, 2028

LEATHAM, Mr. W. H., *York, W. Rid., S.*
- Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1672

LEE, Mr. H., *Southampton*
- Madagascar—Conflicting Interests of France and England, 1626

LEFEVRE, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw (Chief Commissioner of Works), *Reading*
- City of London—Temple Bar Memorial, 1501
- Crown Property — Sporting Rights under Crown Leases, 1733
- Palace of Westminster—Decoration of the Central Hall, 1742
  - House of Commons—Smoking Room, 1193, 1632, 1634;—The Electric Light, 626

[*cont.*

LEFEVRE, Mr. G. J. Shaw—*cont.*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 600
  Police Act (Metropolis)—Removal of Snow, 1106, 1505
  Science and Art — The National Portrait Gallery, 1742

LEIGHTON, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
  Parliament—Public Business, 855

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
  Ireland, State of—The Postal Service, 1298

LEWIS, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1043
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1246, 1749, 1753

Licensing Act Amendment (Justices Disqualification) Bill
(*Mr. Pugh, Sir Edward Reed, Mr. Rendel*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 27 [Bill 77]

Licensing System, The—Legislation
  Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 10, 330

Lifeboats—The "Abraham Thomas"
  Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 21, 1104

Limitation of Actions Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Cairns*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Jan* 10 (No. 5)

Limitation of Costs (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Errington, Mr. Blennerhassett*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 19]

LITTON, Mr. E. F., *Tyrone*
  Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1591
  India—Stanley Covenanted Engineers, 1188
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 394
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1412
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1278

LLOYD, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
  Army—Alleged Sale of Arms by the late Government, 330
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 570
  Outrages (Ireland), Motion for a Return, 811
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 983
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1872, 1874, 1886, 1927, 1946

Local Government Boundaries Bill
(*Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Pell, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Yorke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 19 [Bill 70]

Local Inquiries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Fay, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Dr. Cameron*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 10 [Bill 53]

Local Taxation and County Government—Legislation
  Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 13, 636

London City (Parochial Charities) Bill
(*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Davey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 13]

LUBBOCK, Sir J., *London University*
  Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1121
  Endowed Schools Commissioners, 1494
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1884, 1889, 1890
  Treaty of Berlin — Bulgaria — The Varna Railway Company, 1492

Lunacy Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dillwyn, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Benjamin T. Williams*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 10 [Bill 56]

Lunacy Law Assimilation (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Litton, Mr. Findlater, Sir Thomas M'Clure*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 24 [Bill 75]

LYONS, Dr. R. D., *Dublin*
  House of Commons—Members' Smoking Room, 1633
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 493, 1011
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1411
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, Amendt. 1235
  Registry of Deeds (Ireland)—Report of the Royal Commission, 1038

LYTTON, Earl of
  India—Afghanistan (Occupation of Candahar), 284, 306, 309

MACDONALD, Mr. A., *Stafford*
  Employers' Liability Act—Contracts, 157
  Mines Acts—Reports of Inspectors of Mines, 157
  Mines (Coal) Regulation Act, 1872—Pen-y-Graig Explosion, 1309, 1494

MACKINTOSH, Mr. C. FRASER-, *Inverness, &c.*
  Census (Scotland)—Gaelic Population, 329

MACLIVER, Mr. P. S., *Plymouth*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Officers of Volunteers, 941
Joint Stock Banks, 1307
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 557
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 892

MCCARTHY, Mr. Justin, *Longford*
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
  Granard, Co. Longford, 1301
  Kanturk Union, Distress in, 1309
  Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 176
  Threatening Letters, 846
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 577
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Amendt. 857, 861, 874, 875, 980, 981, 1019
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1352, 1415, 1427, 1482
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1265, 1266, 1843, 1953, 1955

M'COAN, Mr. J. C., *Wicklow*
Ireland—Magistracy, 721
  Post Office—Telegraph Department, 447
Ireland, State of—Prohibited Meeting at Drogheda, &c. 331
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 586
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 488
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1331, 1343, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430, 1431
Parliamentary Procedure — Motions on the Paper, &c. 933
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1549, 1651, 1673, 1684, 1924
Right of Public Meeting in England and Ireland, 1200

M'GAREL-HOGG, Sir J. M., *Truro*
Police Act (Metropolis)—Removal of Snow, 1107, 1205

MCKENNA, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 573, 574
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 398, 1010
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1792, 1797, 1858

Madagascar — Conflicting Interests of France and England
Question, Mr. H. Lee; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 28, 1626

MAGNIAC, Mr. C., *Bedford*
Parliament—Arrangement of Business, 946
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 905
River Floods Prevention, 2R. 1582, 1583

Maintenance of Children Bill
(*Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Thomasson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 13 [Bill 59]

MAKINS, Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
Ireland—Mr. Davitt, 652

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. *Leicestershire, N.*
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res. 1086
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 875
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1900, 1904

MARJORIBANKS, Mr. E., *Berwickshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 596

Markets Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Warton, Captain Aylmer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 26]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 36

Marriage Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Blennerhassett, Mr. Monk, Mr. Otway*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 23]

Married Women's Property Bill
(*Mr. Hinde Palmer, Sir Gabriel Goldney, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Horace Davey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 10 [Bill 50]
Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Jan* 13, 714

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Sir David Wedderburn*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 45]
Order for 2R. read *Jan* 12, 551
Moved, "That the Bill be read 2° To-morrow;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Gill*); after further debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put; A. 230, N. 33; M. 197 (D. L. 2)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 13, 706; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Healy*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Callan*); Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill committed to a Select Committee

MARUM, Mr. E. P. M., *Kilkenny Co.*
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
  Constabulary—Arrest of Children at Castlecomer, 1024, 1194
  Land League—Domiciliary Visits of the Police, 1732
  Law and Justice—Trial by Judge, 1194
  Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 166, 171

[*cont.*

Marum, Mr. E. P. M.—*cont.*
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 561, 562
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 961, 967
  Post Office—City and County of Kilkenny, 1197
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1667, 1670

Maxwell, Sir H. E., *Wigton*
  Adulteration of Food Act—Compounds resembling Butter, 1301, 1302
  Law and Police—Case of Thomas Titley, 441

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Hardcastle, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Dr. Farquharson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 22]

Medical Appointments Qualifications Bill
(*Mr. Errington, Mr. Arthur Moore*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 13 [Bill 60]

Medical Reform
  Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 20, 1030

Mercantile Marine—Lifeboat Services—The Steamship "Rochester"
  Question, Sir Henry Havelock-Allan; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 27, 1502

Merchant Shipping—The Statutes
  Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 17, 848

Metge, Mr. R. H., *Meath*
  Ireland—Griffith's Valuation, 1186
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 984
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1771, 1910, 1911

Metropolis
 Miscellaneous Questions
  Police Act—Removal of Snow, Questions, Mr. H. Edwards, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Jan* 21, 1106; Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Jan* 24, 1204; Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 27, 1505
  The Vestries and Local Boards—Removal of the Snow, Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 31, 1734
  The Recent Snow Storm—Railway Passengers—The London and North-Western Railway Company, Question, Mr. Cohen; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 27, 1490
  The Temple Bar Memorial, Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 27, 1500
  Water Supply — Legislation, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 18, 935

Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1877) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Walter James, Mr. Bryce*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 9]

Mexico—Diplomatic Relations
  Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 21, 1101

Milbank, Mr. F. A., *York, N.R.*
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1331
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1949, 1963, 1964, 1974

Mines—Explosions in Mines—Appropriation of Relief Funds
  Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 14, 718

Mines Acts — Reports of Inspectors of Mines
  Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 7, 157

Mines (Coal) Regulation Act, 1872—*The Pen-y-Graig Explosion*
  Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 25, 1309; *Jan* 27, 1494

Molloy, Mr. B. C., *King's Co.*
  Ireland, State of — Threatening Notices—King's County, 1184
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 932, 948
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1451

Monk, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1935
  Supply—Exchequer Bonds, 1702

Montrose, Duke of
  Army—Major Nolan, R.A., M.P. 1487

Moore, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*
  Ireland—Distress, 1105;—Loughrea, 1312
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 132
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1409, 1414, 1418, 1483
  Post Office—Travelling Post Offices, 1198

Morgan, Right Hon. G. Osborne, *Denbighshire*
  Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal), 2R. 1062

Morley, Earl of
  Army—Miscellaneous Questions
    Army Retirement—Lord Morley's Committee, 716
    Insertion of Army Advertisements in the Press, 282
    Major Nolan, R.A., M.P. 1488

MORLEY, Mr. A., *Nottingham*
Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Municipal Elections, 851

Morocco—Outrage at Tangiers
Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 17, 833

MULHOLLAND, Mr. J., *Downpatrick*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 734, 737

MUNDELLA, Right Hon. A. J. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Sheffield*
Agricultural Lectures at South Kensington, 329
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Miscellaneous Questions
  Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 159, 722, 1506
  Foot-and-Mouth Disease (Scotland), 944, 945
  Order in Council, Jan 4, 1881—Importation of Irish Cattle, 1728
Education Department—Miscellaneous Questions
  Agriculture in Village Schools, 638
  Gipsy Children, 1032
  School Board Fees, 1491
Elementary Education Act, 1880—Labour Certificates, 943
Endowed Schools—Dulwich College, 441
Endowed Schools Commissioners, 1495
Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Leave, 807
Medical Reform, 1030
Science and Art—South Kensington Museum, 1504;—The Robinson Collection, 1736

Municipal Corporation Act (1859) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. William Fowler, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Henry H. Fowler*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 25]

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Leamy, Mr. Gray, Mr. Dawson, Mr. T. P. O'Connor*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 20]

Municipal Franchise (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Colonel Alexander, Mr. Duncan M'Laren, Mr. M'Laren*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 12 [Bill 57]
Read 2°* *Jan* 19

Naval Discipline Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Brassey*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *Jan* 10, 422; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 52]

NAVY
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Abolition of Flogging, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 13, 636
Admission of Boys from Reformatories and Workhouses, Questions, Mr. Daly; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 18, 940; *Jan* 20, 1028
Entry of Naval Cadets; Stoppages of Pay, Questions, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook *Jan* 13, 620
H.M.S. "Hotspur," Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 24, 1186
H.M.S. "Ruby," Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 31, 1742
Lifeboats—The Harwich Lifeboat, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 21, 1099; Question, Mr. Thorold Rogers; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 25, 1300
Loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta"—Report and Evidence of the Committee, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 10, 336; Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook *Jan* 11, 438
Murder of Lieutenant Bower and his Boat's Crew, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 14, 722
Naval Training Brigs, Question, Mr. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 24, 1202
Seamen in Her Majesty's Fleet, Question, Mr. R. W. Duff; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *Jan* 13, 637

NELSON, Mr. I., *Mayo*
Ireland, State of—Distress at Castlebar, 1729
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 578
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1449, 1450
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1867, 1869, 1911, 1912

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 164
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 880, 881, 882, 883
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1778, 1779, 1838, 1839

Newspapers (Law of Libel) Bill
(*Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Edward Leatham, Mr. Samuel Morley*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 5]

New Zealand—Imprisonment of Natives
Questions, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 24, 1191

NOLAN, Major J. P., *Galway Co.*
Ireland—Industrial Schools in Connemara, 1739
  Seeds Act, 1880—Repayment of Special Rates, 938
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1809

Northbrook, Earl of (First Lord of the Admiralty)
India—Afghanistan (Occupation of Candahar), 314, 316
Navy—Entry of Naval Cadets; Stoppages of Pay, 621
Loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta"—Report and Evidence of Committee, 438

Northcote, Right Hon. Sir S. H., *Devon, N.*
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1147
Egypt (Finance), 851
India—Afghanistan and Turkey—Papers, 190
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 575
Parliament—Public Business, 342, 1741
Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 88, 119, 914
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1372, 1463, 1466
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1275, 1950, 2036

Norton, Lord
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1723

Norwood, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Judicature Acts, 849
Merchant Shipping—The Statutes, 848

Noxious Gases—Legislation
Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Dodson *Jan* 10, 337

O'Beirne, Major F., *Leitrim*
Army—Army Pay Department, 1733
Ireland, State of—Agrarian Offences in the Co. Leitrim, 1307
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 556
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1661

O'Brien, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Ireland, State of — Arrest of Members at Tralee, 644
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 701, 755
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1920, 1921, 1965, 1966, 1993, 1995, 1996

O'Connor, Mr. A., *Queen's Co.*
Convict Labour, 1489
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
Meetings in Queen's Co. 326
Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 186
Prohibited Meeting at Cullohill, 331
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 761, 792, 887, 888
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. Amendt. 1335, 1423, 1455
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1550, 1908, 1940, 1941

O'Connor, Mr. T. P., *Galway*
City of London—Temple Bar Memorial, 1501
Ireland—State of—Miscellaneous Questions
Agrarian Crime—The Returns, 842, 1509
Alleged Anarchy, 652, 653
Domiciliary Visits, 640, 846
Land League—Magistrates, 642, 643
Loughrea, Distress in, 1303
Police Constable Quinn, 721
Policy of the Government—Public Opinion, 1747
Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 177
Prohibited Meeting at Magherafelt, 340
Prohibited Meetings of the Land League, 838
Ireland—Outrages, Motion for a Return, 810, 812
Ireland, State of, Motion for a Select Committee, 547
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 553, 582, 583
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 122, 135, 231, 482, 486, 705, 917, 918, 920, 921, 922, 1052
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1320, 1321, 1325, 1392, 1458
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1827, 1828, 1833, 1839, 1848, 1902, 1903, 1904
Right of Public Meeting in England and Ireland, 1201

O'Donnell, Mr. F. H., *Dungarvan*
Africa, South—Transvaal Republic, 327
Ireland, State of — Arrest of Members at Tralee, 192
Ireland, State of, Motion for a Select Committee, 548, 549
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 230, 231, 535, 795, 925, 928, 929, 969
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1352, 1353, 1354, 1357, 1397, 1405, 1431, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1443
Post Office — Telegraphic Communication — Underground Wires, 1506
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1281, 1293, 1294, 1818, 1848, 1851, 1855, 1857, 1929, 1956, 1958

O'Donoghue, The, *Tralee*
Ireland, State of—Land League—Arrest of Members at Tralee, 191, 192, 334, 643, 644, 645, 722
Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 181, 182
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 556
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 380, 420, 772, 959, 1050
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1357, 1373, 1451
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1246, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1559, 1560, 1561, 1868, 1869

Official Statistics Committee—The Report
Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 24, 1195

O'GORMAN MAHON, The, *Clare*
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1423
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1886

O'KELLY, Mr. J., *Roscommon*
  Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 162, 163; Motion for Adjournment, 164, 166
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 572
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Amendt. 1046
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1454
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1873, 1874

ONSLOW, Mr. D. R., *Guildford*
  India—Afghanistan—Candahar, Retention of, 1306
    Military Operations—Rewards for Services, 158
  Naval Discipline Act Amendment, Leave, 423
  Navy—Abolition of Flogging, 636
  Parliament—Business of the House—An "All Night Sitting," 1745
  Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for an Address, 814
  River Floods Prevention, 2R. 1581

O'SHAUGHNESSY, Mr. R., *Limerick*
  Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 184
    Public Meetings—Limerick Central Land League, 1097, 1098
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 573
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 977
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1337, 1373, 1460
  Post Office—Postal Orders, 1507
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1663, 1892, 1928, 1938

O'SHEA, Mr. W., *Clare*
  Agricultural Lectures at South Kensington, 329
  Army—Medal for the Zulu War, 1304
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 392

O'SULLIVAN, Mr. W. H., *Limerick Co.*
  Ireland—Evictions—Case of Denis Murphy, 1497, 1498
  Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
    Forcible Re-entry—Kilfinane, County Limerick, 1196
    Prohibited Meeting at Kanturk, 325
    Public Meetings—The Limerick Central Land League, 1108
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 586
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 756, 758
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1366, 1437, 1438
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1824, 1889, 1890, 1924

OTWAY, Mr. A. J., *Rochester*
  India—Disturbances at Kolapore, 1103
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1984
  Turkey and Greece—The French Circular, 1202

Outlawries Bill
c. Read 1°* *Jan* 6

PAGET, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 722

PALMER, Mr. J. H., *Lincoln*
  Married Women's Property, 2R. 714; Amendt. *ib.*
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 551

Parliament
LORDS—
  MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Jan* 6
  The Parliament opened by Commission

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech
  delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR *Jan* 6, 3
  The Queen's Speech having been reported by The LORD CHANCELLOR; An ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY thereon moved by The Lord CARRINGTON (the Motion being seconded by The Earl of Yarborough) *Jan* 6, 8; after long debate, Address agreed to, *nemine dissentiente*
  HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Jan* 11, 426
  Chairman of Committees—The Earl of Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Jan* 6
  Committee for Privileges—appointed *Jan* 6
  Sub-Committee for the Journals—appointed *Jan* 6
  Appeal Committee—appointed *Jan* 6

COMMONS—
  The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been reported by Mr. Speaker; An humble Address thereon moved by Mr. STUART RENDEL (the Motion being seconded by Mr. SLAGG) *Jan* 6, 75; after long debate, Debate adjourned
  Debate resumed *Jan* 7, 192
  Amendt. at end of paragraph 9, to add "but we humbly assure Her Majesty that we are convinced that the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of the Irish people" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Debate further adjourned
  Debate resumed *Jan* 10, 342; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
  Debate resumed *Jan* 11, 451; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
  Debate resumed *Jan* 12, 589; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Debate resumed *Jan* 13, 653; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed *Jan* 14, 725; after long debate, Question put; A. 57, N. 435; M. 378

Div. List, A. and N., 803

Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Jan* 17, 857

Amendt. proposed, at the end thereof, to add, "And humbly to pray Her Majesty to refrain from using the Naval, Military, and Constabulary Forces of the Crown in enforcing ejectments for non-payment of rent in Ireland, until the measures proposed to be sudmitted to Her Majesty, with regard to the ownership of land in Ireland, have been decided upon by Parliament" (*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Jan* 18, 947; after long debate, Question put; A. 37, N. 201; M. 164 (D. L. 5)

Original Question again proposed; after debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Jan* 19, 995

Amendt. proposed, at the end thereof, to add, "That we humbly pray Her Majesty to submit a measure for the purpose of Assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session" (*Mr. Dawson*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Jan* 20, 1038; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. proposed at end of Question, to add, "And we humbly assure Her Majesty that, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to submit a measure for the purpose of assimilating the Borough Franchise in Ireland to that in England, as promised in Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech last Session" (*Mr. Sexton*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, Question put; A. 36, N. 274; M. 238 (D. L. 6)

Original Question again proposed

Amendt. proposed, at end of Question, to add, "And we humbly pray Her Majesty to guarantee to the people of Ireland their constitutional rights of public meeting" (*Mr. O'Kelly*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after debate, Question put; A. 34, N. 173; M. 139 (D. L. 7)

Main Question put, and agreed to

Report of Address brought up, and read *Jan* 20, 1064

Moved, "That the Address be now read 2°" (*Mr. Stuart Rendel*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Address agreed to

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Jan* 24, 1207

Printing, Select Committee appointed *Jan* 20; List of the Committee, 1090

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Privileges, Committee of Privileges appointed *Jan* 6

Public Petitions, Select Committee appointed *Jan* 12, 616; List of the Committee, 617

Selection, Committee nominated *Jan* 7; List of the Committee, 275

Standing Orders, Select Committee nominated *Jan* 7; List of the Committee, 275

Controverted Elections

City of Worcester—Evesham—Berwick upon Tweed—Wallingford, Judges' Certificates and Reports *Jan* 6, 71

Evesham Election Jan 6, 73

Return amended by substituting the name of Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland for that of Frederick Lehmann as the Member returned for the said Borough *Jan* 7, 156

Return of Election Charges, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 24, 1190

Order

Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, Questions, Mr. A. M. Sullivan; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Parnell *Jan* 31, 1745

State of Ireland—The Policy of the Government—Public Opinion, Notice of Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 31, 1747

The Blue Books, Question, Sir George Campbell [No reply] *Jan* 24, 1207

Public Business

Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 10, 341; Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 17, 855

Amendments to the Address, Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Wilfrid Lawson *Jan* 20, 1034

Business of the House—Notice of Precedence—Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill, Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. W. E. Forster *Jan* 21, 1109

"Obstruction," Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 31, 1725

Opposed Business, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 31, 1741

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—An "All-Night Sitting," Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 31, 1745

Rules and Orders

Rules of Debate—Motions on the Paper—Absence of Members when called, Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, Mr. Speaker *Jan* 17, 933

Questions—Moving the Adjournment of the House, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 17, 843

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Palace of Westminster

Decoration of the Central Hall, Question, Mr. Schreiber ; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 31, 1741

Smoking Room of the House of Commons, Question, Lord Randolph Churchill ; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 24, 1198 ; Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill, Dr. Lyons, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 28, 1632

The House of Commons—Application of the Electric Light, Question, Mr. D. Grant ; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 13, 626

Private Bills—River Thames Bill, Question, Mr. Ritchie ; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 28, 1638

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons)

Moved, "That a Standing Committee be appointed to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms, in the department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House" (*Lord Kensington*) *Jan* 7, 275 ; after short debate, Motion postponed

Motion again proposed and agreed to *Jan* 10, 423 ; List of the Committee, 425

Parliament—Business of the House

Moved, "That the Notices of Motions be postponed until after the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *Jan* 11, 449 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Moved, "That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Motion for an Address to Her Majesty have precedence of Notices of Motions this day, and of the Orders of the Day appointed for Tomorrow" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *Jan* 18, 945 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Parliament—Business of the House

Moved, "That the introduction and the several stages of the Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill and the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions, from day to day, until the House shall otherwise order" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *Jan* 25, 1313

After debate, Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the House do now proceed to the Orders of the Day" (*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c."

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1350 ; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Healy*) ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 35, N. 269 ; M. 234 (D. L. 10) [B.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1359 ; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Gray*) ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 34, N. 277 ; M. 243 (D. L. 11) [11.55 B.M.]

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Business of the House*—cont.

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1366 ; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Byrne*) ; after long debate, Question put ; A. 24, N. 159 ; M. 135 (D. L. 12) [4.0 A.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1419 ; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Dillon*)

Mr. Speaker having retired, Mr. Playfair, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker [5.55 A.M.]

After long debate, Question put ; A. 21, N. 125 ; M. 104 (D. L. 13) [9.0 A.M.]

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1452 ; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sexton*) ; after short debate, Question put, and negatived [11.55 A.M.]

Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Main Question proposed, 1460 ; after debate, main Question put ; A. 251, N. 33 ; M. 218 [1.45 P.M. of Wednesday]

Div. List, A. and N., 1485

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. W. E. Gladstone*) ; Question put, and agreed to

[House adjourned at five minutes after Two o'clock, P.M.]

Parliament—Rules of Debate—Standing Order, No. 173A

Mr. Speaker names Mr. Biggar, Member for Cavan, as disregarding the authority of the Chair :—Whereupon, Motion made, and Question put, "That Mr. Biggar be suspended from the Service of the House during the remainder of this day's Sitting" (*Mr. W. E. Forster*) ; A. 160, N. 30 ; M. 130

Mr. Speaker then pointed out to Mr. Biggar that, in obedience to the Vote of the House, he must now withdraw. Mr. Biggar withdrew accordingly

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

New Peer

Jan 6—The Right Hon. Edward Robert Lytton Lord Lytton, G.C.B., created Viscount Knebworth of Knebworth in the county of Hertford, and Earl of Lytton in the county of Derby

Sat First

Jan 6—The Lord Clifford, after the death of his father

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

New Writs Issued

During Recess—For Carnarvon County, *v.* Charles James Watkin Williams, esquire, one of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice

For Clackmannon and Kinross Counties, *v.* Right Hon. William Patrick Adam, Governor of the Presidency of Fort St. George, at Madras, in the East Indies

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*New Writs Issued*—cont.
For Renfrew County, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel William Mure, deceased
For Reading Borough, *v.* George John Shaw Lefevre, esquire, First Commissioner of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings
For Kendal Borough, *v.* John Whitwell, esquire, deceased
For Wexford Borough, *v.* William Archer Redmond, esquire, deceased
Jan 10—*For* Wigan, *v.* James Ludovic Lindsay, commonly called Lord Lindsay, now Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, called up to the House of Peers as Baron Wigan
Jan 20—*For* Edinburgh, *v.* Duncan M'Laren, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
Jan 24—*For* New Ross, *v.* Joseph William Foley, esquire, Manor of Northstead

New Members Sworn
Jan 6—James Cropper, esquire, *Kendal*
Alexander Crum, esquire, *Renfrew*
Right Hon. George John Shaw Lefevre, *Reading*
John Blair Balfour, esquire, *Clackmannon and Kinross*
William Rathbone, esquire, *Carnarvon County*
Jan 7—Frederick Dixon Dixon Hartland, esquire, *Evesham* (*amended Return*)
Jan 10—Timothy Michael Healy, esquire, *Wexford Borough*
Jan 21—Francis Sharp Powell, esquire, *Wigan*
Jan 28—John M'Laren, Lord Advocate of Scotland, *Edinburgh City*

Parliamentary Constituencies (*Number of Electors*)
Moved for "A Return, showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in force" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *Jan* 12, 617; after short debate, Motion postponed
Motion withdrawn, being irregular, *Jan* 13, 715
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing, with respect to each Parliamentary Constituency in the United Kingdom, the total number of Electors on the Register now in force" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *Jan* 14, 813; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868—*The Election Commissions*
Question, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 31, 1729

Parliamentary Elections Bill
(*Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Cohen*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 37]

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Jan* 7, 265; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 1]

Parliamentary Elections (Expenses) Bill
(*Mr. Ashton Dilke, Mr. Barran, Mr. Burt*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 36]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Cork*
Africa, South—The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of the British Force, 1638
Coal Mines—Riots in Lancashire, 1631
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Agrarian Crime, 832;—The Returns, 1734
Landlord and Tenant, 852, 853
Mr. Davitt, 650, 651
Offences other than Agrarian, Postponement of Motion, 813
Relief of Distress Amendment Act, 1879—Out-door Relief, 1627
State Trials, 856
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
Cork—Alleged "Boycotting," 1739, 1740
Donegal Co. 849
Land League Placards, 337
Land Meetings in County Down, 337
Prosecution of Members at Tralee, 332, 333, 334;—Imprisonment of, 445, 446, 447;—Arrest of, 647, 844, 845, 1172
Return of Evictions, 639, 640
Ireland—Outrages, Motion for a Return, 809, 810, 813
Ireland, State of, Motion for a Select Committee, 547, 549
Law and Justice—The Magistracy (Scotland)—Mr. Stopford Blair, 630
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 564, 565, 567, 568, 574, 587, 714
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House, 1035
Order—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, 1746
Order of Business, 450
Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 104; Amendt. 192, 229, 414, 420, 421, 459, 465, 469, 477, 480, 484, 486, 705, 731, 732, 737, 770, 772, 773, 902, 904, 905, 912, 929, 930, 932, 982, 1040, 1043; Report, 1064, 1065
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1460, 1465, 1487
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1811, 1815, 1816, 1818, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1905, 1912, 1914, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1963, 1964
Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of the Lord Chief Justice, &c. 1641
Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment, Motion for Leave, 549

Parochial Charities of the City of London—Legislation
Question, Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 14, 719

Patents for Inventions Bill
(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Hinde Palmer, Mr. Broadhurst*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 15]

Patrick, Mr. R. W. Cochran-, *Ayrshire, N.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1880—Foot-and-Mouth Disease (Scotland), 944

Pease, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*
China—Chefoo Convention—Opium Tax, 934
Ireland—State Trials in Dublin, 449
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1043
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1332, 1333, 1334
Public Houses (Closing on Sunday), Motion for Leave, 274

Peddie, Mr. J. Dick-, *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 707

Pell, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1880—Foot-and-Mouth Disease (Scotland), 944

Pennington, Mr. F., *Stockport*
Criminal Law—Punishment of Whipping, 1096

Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Litton, Mr. James Richardson*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 41]

Playfair, Right Hon. Mr. Lyon (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1435, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1443, 1444, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1448, 1449, 1450, 1451, 1453, 1454, 1455, 1456, 1466, 1475, 1478, 1480, 1482
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1876, 1882, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1946, 1947, 1949, 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1987, 1993, 1995, 1996, 2024
Supply—Exchequer Bonds, 1702
Universities (Scotland) (Voting), Leave, 993

Plunket, Right Hon. D. R., *Dublin University*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1587, 1593
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 410, 414, 420, 1003

Poor Law Guardians Election (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Edmond Gray, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Errington, Mr. O'Connor Power*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 32]

Post Office
Miscellaneous Questions
Competitive Examinations, &c., Questions, Mr. Bryce ; Answers, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 28, 1625
Fee for "Late Post," Question, Mr. Healy ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 21, 1100
Postal Orders, Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gray ; Answers, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 27, 1507
Re-directed Letters, Questions, Mr. Carbutt ; Answers, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 20, 1033 ; *Jan* 25, 1312
Savings Banks, Questions, Mr. E. W. Harcourt ; Answers, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 13, 624
The City and County of Kilkenny, Question, Mr. Marum ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 24, 1197
The Mails in Argyllshire, Question, Lord Colin Campbell ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 14, 720
The New Money Orders, Question, Mr. Gray ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 20, 1026
The Recent Snow Storm — Conveyance of Mails, Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 25, 1310
Travelling Post Offices, Question, Mr. Moore ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 24, 1198
Telegraph Department
Telegraph Clerks, Question, Mr. J. Cowen ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 20, 1028
Telegraph Clerks at Liverpool, Question, Mr. Whitley ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 20, 1032
Telegraphic Communication — Underground Wires, Question, Mr. O'Donnell ; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Jan* 27, 1506

Power, Mr. J. O'Connor, *Mayo*
Ireland—Board of Works—Killala Harbour, 1099
Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
Castlebar, Distress at, 1730
Proclamations for the Suppression of Meetings, 324
Prohibited Meeting in Galway, 841
Reported Collision at Claremorris, 329
Representation by Foreign Powers, 854
Law and Justice—The Magistracy (Scotland) —Mr. Stopford Blair, 630
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 580, 710, 713
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 218, 893, 899, 900, 981, 982, 1039
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1565, 1689, 1841, 1899, 1921, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1970, 1971

Power, Mr. R., *Waterford*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 556
National Schools (Ireland)—Agriculture, 850
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, Motion for Adjournment, 1580, 1642, 1643

Prince Edward's Island—The Land Question
Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. Grant Duff *Jan* 17, 843

Prisons (England) Act, 1877 — *Scarborough Prison*
Question, Mr. Caine; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 24, 1203

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Gladstone, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill for the better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland" (*Mr. William Edward Forster*) *Jan* 24, 1208
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and desirable, and is most fully in accord with a wise and generous exercise of the undisputed power of this House, and the Empire at large, that remedial legislation on the Land Question in Ireland should take precedence over the Coercive Measures designed by Government, and that Her Majesty's Ministers be requested to reconsider their decision in this regard" (*Dr. Lyons*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Labouchere*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Jan* 27, 1510; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. William Fowler*); Motion withdrawn; after further debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Richard Power*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Jan* 28, 1641; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate further adjourned
Premature Circulation of the Bill, Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Speaker *Jan* 31, 1743
Debate resumed *Jan* 31, 1748

Tuesday, February 1

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Gabbett*), 1809
Mr. Speaker having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker
Whereupon Mr. Playfair, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order [4.50 A.M. Tuesday, Feb 1]
Question put; A. 27, N. 148; M. 121 (D. L. 15) [6.30 A.M. Tuesday, Feb 1]
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1875
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Healy*), 1886
Mr. Speaker returned to the House, and resumed the Chair [1.25 P.M. Tuesday, Feb 1]

Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill—cont.
Question of Privilege—Objection being taken to the regularity of the Deputy Speaker leaving the Chair, based upon the terms of the Standing Order of the 20th July, 1855 (*Mr. Parnell*), 1907; Mr. Speaker, under the present circumstances, did not consider that the Standing Order had any application
Question put; A. 21, No. 225; M. 204 (D. L. 16) [2.50 P.M. Tuesday, Feb 1]
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1915; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Daly*); Question put; A. 23, N. 163; M. 140 (D. L. 17) [7.30 P.M. Tuesday, Feb 1]
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1932
Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Finigan*), 1938
Mr. Speaker having retired, the Clerk at the Table, after some time, informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker
Whereupon Mr. Playfair, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, again took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order [11.35 P.M. Tuesday, Feb 1]

Wednesday, February 2

Question put; A. 22, N. 197; M. 175 (D. L. 18) [1.35 A.M. Wednesday, Feb 2]
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.," 1973
Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present; after debate, Notice again taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present [9 A.M. Wednesday, Feb 2]
At this time Mr. Speaker returned to the House and resumed the Chair
Mr. Speaker then informed the House of his intention to decline to call upon any more Members to speak, and at once proceed to put the Question from the Chair; Question put, "That the words, &c.," A. 164, N. 19; M. 145
Div. List, A. and N., 2036
Main Question agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 79]
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Gladstone*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
[Then, after an unbroken Sitting of 41½ hours, House adjourned at half after Nine o'clock in the morning]

Public Houses (Closing on Sunday) Bill
(*Mr. Pease, Viscount Castlereagh*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Pease*) *Jan* 7, 274; after short debate, Motion postponed
Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 17 [Bill 26]

PUGH, Mr. L. P., *Cardiganshire*
Education Department—School Board Fees, 1491

[cont.

Rankin, Mr. J., *Leominster*
Elementary Education Act, 1880—Labour Certificates, 943

Rebecca Riots, The
Question, Mr. Lalor; Answer, Mr. Courtney *Jan* 17, 845

Redesdale, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—The Government Bills, 824, 827
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 1174; 2R. 1724

Reed, Sir C., *St. Ives*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1885

Reed, Sir E. J., *Cardiff*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1985, 1987

Reformatory Institutions (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Gabbett, Mr. Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 18]

Reid, Mr. R. T., *Hereford*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1889

Removal Terms (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. James Stewart, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Patrick, Mr. Mackintosh*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 8]

Rendel, Mr. S., *Montgomeryshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 75

Richardson, Mr. J. N., *Armagh Co.*
Inland Revenue—Restrictions on Distilling, 1189
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 399
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1270

Richmond and Gordon, Duke of
Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—Burnett's Literary Fund—Provisional Order, 1174, 1175, 1179, 1183
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 1174

Ritchie, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
Africa, South—The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of a British Force, 1635; —The Re-inforcements, 1736
Law and Police—Fire at the Custom House, 1025, 1106
Official Statistics Committee—Report, 1195
Parliament—Arrangement of Business, 946
 Private Bills—River Thames Bill, 1638
 Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 920

Ritchie, Mr. C. T.—*cont.*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1970
Spain—Commercial Relations—The Differential Duties, 1739
Water Supply (Metropolis), 935

River Floods Prevention Bill
(*Mr. Magniac, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Biddulph, Sir Charles Reed*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 35]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 27, 1580; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Lord Randolph Churchill*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Jan* 17 (No. 15)
Questions, Earl Spencer, The Earl of Redesdale; Answers, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon, Earl Spencer *Jan* 24, 1173
Read 2ª, after debate *Jan* 31, 1704

Rogers, Mr. J. E. Thorold, *Southwark*
Navy—Life Boats—The Harwich Life Boat, 1300
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 404, 1038
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. 1429

Rosebery, Earl of
Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—Burnett's Literary Fund—Provisional Order, 1179, 1180, 1183

Roundell, Mr. C. S., *Grantham*
Endowed Schools—Dulwich College, 441

Russell, Sir C., *Westminster*
Snow Storm—Removal of Snow (Metropolis), 1505

Russell, Mr. C., *Dundalk*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 365
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1757

Rylands, Mr. P., *Burnley*
Africa, South—Military Operations in Basutoland, 1034
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1109, 1172
Augmentation of Benefices Act Amendment, 2R. 1063
Cyprus—Floods at Limassol, 1031
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 554
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 677
Sir Henry Layard, late H.M. Ambassador at Constantinople, 326

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill
(*Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Birley, Mr. William M'Arthur, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Stevenson*) *Jan* 7, 273; after short debate, Motion postponed
Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 10 [Bill 55]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Wales) Bill
(*Mr. Roberts, Mr. Richard, Mr. Samuel Holland, Mr. Hussey Vivian, Mr. Rathbone*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 3]

Salmon and Fresh Water Fisheries Bill
(*Sir Joseph Bailey, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Howard*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 49]

SAMUELSON, Mr. H. B., *Frome*
Africa, South—The Transvaal (Military Operations)—Repulse of a British Force, 1635, 1637, 1638
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1413
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1868

SANDWICH, Earl of
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1716

SCHREIBER, Mr. C., *Poole*
Palace of Westminster—Decoration of the Central Hall, 1741

Science and Art
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
British Museum—Admission of the Public, Question, Mr. D. Grant; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Jan* 17, 852
South Kensington Museum, Question, Mr. Grey; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 27, 1504
The National Portrait Gallery, Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Jan* 31, 1742
The Robinson Collection at South Kensington, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Mundella *Jan* 31, 1735

SCOTLAND
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Census, The—The Gaelic Population, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 10, 329
Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—*Scotch Endowments—Gordon Hospital Provisional Order*, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 24, 1187
Law and Justice—The Magistracy—Mr. Stopford Blair, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir William Harcourt; Questions, Mr. O'Connor Power, Mr. Parnell [No reply], *Jan* 13, 629
Law of Bail and Sheriff Courts—Legislation, Question, Mr. Henderson; Answer, The Solicitor General for Scotland *Jan* 17, 850

Scotland—Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act, 1878—*Burnett's Literary Fund—The Provisional Order*
Moved to resolve, That this House doth disapprove of the Provisional Order made by the Secretary of State relating to Burnett's Literary Fund (*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) *Jan* 24, 1174; after short debate, on Question? agreed to

Settled Land Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Cairns*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Jan* 10 (No. 6)

SEXTON, Mr. T., *Sligo*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1589
Ireland—Agrarian Crime, 1638
National Education—Parsonstown Model School, 444
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of County Sligo, 1107, 1205
Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 167
Ireland—Agrarian Offences, Motion for a Return, 807, 832
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 570
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 740, 749, 755, 989; Amendt. 1042, 1055
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1377; Motion for Adjournment, 1452, 1453
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1561, 1861, 2008, 2010, 2021, 2024

SHAW, Mr. W., *Cork Co.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 342

SHERIDAN, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Employers' Liability Act, 1880—Lock-out of Miners, 939
Law and Police—Case of Thomas Titley, 854
Detection of Crime, 941
Mexico—Diplomatic Relations, 1101

SIDMOUTH, Viscount
Navy—Entry of Naval Cadets, and Stoppages of Pay, 620
Loss of H.M.S. "Atalanta"—Report and Evidence of Committee, 438

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Africa, South—Annexation of tha Transvaal, Res. 1134, 1138
Africa, South—The Transvaal—The Orange Free State, 447
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1591
Boiler Explosions—Explosion at Batley, 1740
House of Commons—Members' Smoking Room, 1633
Morocco—Outrage at Tangiers, 833
Parliament—Arrangement of Business, 946
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1527

Slagg, Mr. J., *Manchester*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 84

Sligo Borough Re-Enfranchisement Bill
(*Mr. Sexton, Mr. D. M. O'Connor, Major Nolan, Dr. Commins, Mr. T. P. O'Connor*)
c. Ordered * *Jan* 13
  Read 1° * *Jan* 14 [Bill 62]

Small Debts (Limitation of Actions) Bill
(*Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Sir Henry Wolff, Mr. Gorst*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 78]

Smith, Right Hon. W. H., *Westminster*
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1962

Smithwick, Mr. J. F., *Kilkenny*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1048

Smyth, Mr. P. J., *Tipperary*
  Land Bill (Ireland), 1201
  Landed Proprietors (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 550
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 663
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1339

Solicitors' Remuneration Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Cairns*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Jan* 10 (No. 8)

Somerset, Duke of
  Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1715

Spain—Commercial Relations—The Differential Duties
  Question, Mr. Ritchie ; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 31, 1739

Speaker, The (Right Hon. H. B. W. Brand), *Cambridgeshire*
  Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland), Leave, 807
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Agrarian Crime—The Returns, 1509
    Mr. Davitt, 651
    State Trials in Dublin, 449
  Ireland, State of—Miscellaneous Questions
    Alleged Anarchy, 653
    Land League — Imprisonment of Land Leaguers in Tralee Gaol, 446 ;—Arrest of Members at Tralee, 644, 645, 845 ;—The Magistrates, 643
    Policy of the Government—Public Opinion, 1747
    Precautionary Measures, 1102
    Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 163, 166, 171, 176

Speaker, The—*cont.*
    Public Meetings—Limerick Central Land League, 1098
    Representations of Foreign Powers, 724
  Ireland—Agrarian Offences, Motion for a Return, 807
  Ireland—Outrages, Motion for a Return, 811, 812
  Ireland, State of, Motion for a Select Committee, 549
  Landed Proprietors (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 550
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 552, 553, 560, 561, 563, 564, 565, 567, 570, 571, 572, 576, 577, 578, 583, 584, 585, 586, 712, 713
  Parliament—Order—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, 1746
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1314, 1321, 1325, 1328, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1334, 1342, 1343, 1345, 1347, 1348, 1350, 1351, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1358, 1362, 1363, 1364, 1365, 1381, 1382, 1390, 1392, 1405, 1422, 1428, 1429, 1430, 1431
  Parliament—House of Commons—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms, Motion for a Committee, 275
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 213, 230, 231, 232, 420, 732, 737, 770, 772, 773, 787, 861, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 891, 899, 900, 904, 905, 912, 920, 921, 922, 928, 930, 953, 967, 981, 982, 983, 987, 1003, 1004, 1009, 1010, 1015, 1016, 1018, 1022, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1043, 1055 ; Report, 1064, 1065
  Parliamentary Constituencies (Number of Electors), Motion for a Return, 715
  Parliamentary Procedure—Motions on the Paper, &c. 933
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland)—Premature Circulation of the Bill, 1744
  Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1246, 1292, 1294, 1546, 1547, 1549, 1550, 1578, 1643, 1653, 1670, 1693, 1694, 1777, 1779, 1797, 1811, 1816, 1818, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1828, 1833, 1851, 1855, 1857, 1860, 1861, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1914, 1916, 1919, 1921, 1924, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1932, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1943, 1944, 1945, 2032, 2035, 2036
  Public Houses (Closing on Sunday), Motion for Leave, 274
  Right of Public Meeting in England and Ireland, 1201
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Motion for Leave, 273, 274
  Trades Union Act (1871) Amendment, Motion for Leave, 549

Spencer, Earl (Lord President of the Council)
  Ireland (Grass Lands, &c.), Motion for a Return, 1183
  Land League Meetings and Agrarian Crimes (Ireland), Motion for Returns, 432, 433
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 47
  Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 1173, 1174 ; 2R. 1704, 1724

[*cont.*

STANHOPE, Earl
Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention, 2R. 1722

STANHOPE, Hon. E., *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
Highways Acts—Accounts of Surveyors of Highways, 440
India—Miscellaneous Questions
Afghanistan — Candahar, Retention of, 1305, 1306, 1503 ;—The Blue Book, 1037
Conspiracy at Kolapore, 645
Railway to Quetta and Candahar, 1624

STANLEY, Hon. E. L., *Oldham*
Africa, South—Basutoland, Res, 1089
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1430
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1873

STEVENSON, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Motion for Leave, 273, 274

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M., *Meath*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1588
Ireland—State Trials, 1508, 1731, 1732
Parliament—Order—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, 1745, 1746
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1785, 1819, 1821, 1824, 1833, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1890, 1893, 1919

SULLIVAN, Mr. T. D., *Westmeath*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1590
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 173
Prohibited Meeting in Westmeath, 841
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 140, 483, 684, 885, 931, 1023, 1042, 1043, 1050
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1775, 1778, 1865, 1900, 1942, 1945

Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879—Recovery of Small Debts
Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 21, 1107

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Litton, Mr. Errington, Mr. Broadhurst*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 33]

SUPPLY
Resolved, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Jan* 20
Considered in Committee *Jan* 28—EXCHEQUER BONDS
Resolved, That a sum, not exceeding £2,500,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to pay off and discharge Exchequer Bonds that will become due and payable during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1881
Resolution reported *Feb* 2

Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873—Offices of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Chief Baron
Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 11, 444 ; Questions, Sir Hardinge Giffard, Sir R. Assheton Cross ; Answers, The Attorney General *Jan* 13, 632 ; Question, Sir Henry Holland ; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Jan* 18, 943
The Order in Council—Question, Mr. H. H. Fowler ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 25, 1308 ; Statement, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 28, 1639 ;—*The Bar*, Petition presented, The Lord Chancellor *Jan* 28, 1622 ; Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 705, 725

Teachers' Registration Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Playfair, Mr. Balfour*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 42]

Thames Steam Navigation Regulation Bill (*Mr. Charles M'Laren, Mr. Otway, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 24]

THOMPSON, Mr. T. C., *Durham*
Education Department—Gipsy Children, 1032
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1051
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1898

Tithe (Extraordinary Charge) Bill
(*Mr. Inderwick, Mr. Howard, Sir Edmund Filmer, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Arthur Vivian, Mr. Thorold Rogers*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 7 [Bill 29]

TORRENS, Mr. W. T. M'C., *Finsbury*
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1167

TOTTENHAM, Mr. A. L., *Leitrim*
Ireland—Crown Rents, Tithe Rent Charges, &c. 157, 945
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 203, 209, 210, 237

Traction Engines
Question, Captain Aylmer ; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *Jan* 10, 335

Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment Bill
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Parnell*) *Jan* 11, 549 ; after short debate, Motion postponed

Treaty of Berlin
Article 23—*European Provinces of Turkey*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 27, 1493
Article 24—*Greece and Turkey—Circular of the French Government*, Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 17, 837
Bulgaria — The Varna Railway Company, Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 27, 1492
The Montenegrin Boundary, Questions, Mr. Bourke; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 13, 628, 629; *Jan* 25, 1302
The Naval Demonstration, Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 13, 627
[See titles *Turkey—Turkey and Greece*]

Treaty of Washington, 1854
The Halifax Fishery Commission, Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 11, 445
The Fortune Bay Fishery Dispute, Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 25, 1306

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Hawick, &c.*
Naval Discipline Act Amendment, Leave, 422
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
Abolition of Flogging, 636
Admission of Boys from Reformatories, 940;—From Workhouses, 1029
H.M.S. "Atalanta," Loss of—Report of Committee, 336
H.M.S. "Hotspur," 1186
H.M.S. "Ruby," 1742
Life Boats—The Harwich Life Boat, 1100, 1300
Murder of Lieutenant Bower and his Boat's Crew, 722
Naval Training Brigs, 1202
Seamen in Her Majesty's Fleet, 637

Tunis—The Enfida Case
Questions, Mr. Montague Guest, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 31, 1727

Turkey
Deportation of Bulgarians from Macedonia, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 13, 637
Macedonia—The Albanian League, Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 17, 847

Turkey and Egypt, Slave Trade Treaties with
Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 24, 1199

Turkey and Greece
Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 20, 1037
Action of Her Majesty's Government, Questions, Mr. Bourke, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 31, 1744

Turkey and Greece—cont.
Mobilization of the Greek Army, Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; [No reply] *Jan* 18, 934; Explanation of Answer Jan. 18, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 19, 994
The Greek Frontier, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 10, 341
The Greek Question, Postponement of Resolution, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett *Jan* 21, 1173
The Frontier Question, Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 27, 1494; —*The French Circular*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 24, 1202
Representation of the Powers at the Porte, Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Jan* 31, 1735

TYLER, Sir H. W., *Harwich*
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1153
India—Afghanistan (Political Affairs)—Native Agents at Cabul, 1730
Inland Revenue—Illicit Distillation (Ireland), 1623
Ireland—State of—Land League—Compulsory Subscription, 1624
Precautionary Measures, 1102
Navy—Life Boats—The Harwich Life Boat, 1099
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 879, 881, 967
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1215, 1543, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1896

Universities (Scotland) (Voting) Bill
(*Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. James Campbell, Mr. Orr Ewing, Sir David Wedderburn*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Lyon Playfair*) *Jan* 18, 993; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 69]
Read 2°* *Jan* 27

VERNEY, Sir H., *Buckingham*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1888, 1889
Removal of Snow (Metropolis), 1204

VIVIAN, Mr. H. Hussey, *Glamorganshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 769, 770, 773
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1326
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1833

Volunteer Corps (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Patrick Martin*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 7 [Bill 12]

WALPOLE, Right Hon. Spencer H., *Cambridge University*
British Museum—Admission of the Public, 852
Ireland, State of—Proclamation of Meetings at Brookborough, &c. 163

[*cont.*

Walrond, Colonel W. H., *Devon, E.*
Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878, 848
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 563

Warton, Mr. C. N., *Bridport*
Barristers' Admission (Ireland), 2R. 1591
County Lunatic Asylums—Joint County Asylums at Abergavenny, 1026
Landed Proprietors (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 550
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 567
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 682, 918, 1009
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1818, 1947
Trade Union Act (1871) Amendment, Motion for Leave, 549

Watkin, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1936

Watney, Mr. J., *Surrey, E.*
Inland Revenue Act, 1880—Drawback on Malt, 1299

Waveney, Lord
India—Afghanistan (Occupation of Candahar), 319, 1297;—Memorandum of Lord Napier of Magdala, 1703
India—Afghanistan—Candahar, Motion for an Address, 1594, 1621

WAYS AND MEANS
Miscellaneous Questions
Inland Revenue
Collectors of Taxes, Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 25, 1310
Illicit Distillation, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, Lord Frederick Cavendish *Jan* 28, 1623
Income Tax in Ireland, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 10, 331
Restrictions on Distilling, Question, Mr. J. N. Richardson; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 24, 1189

Inland Revenue Act, 1880—*Drawback on Malt*, Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 17, 839; Question, Mr. Watney; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *Jan* 25, 1299

WAYS AND MEANS
Resolved, That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Jan* 20
Considered in Committee *Jan* 28

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1881, the sum of £2,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdon
Resolution reported *Feb* 3

Webster, Mr. J., *Aberdeen*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 707

Wedderburn, Sir D., *Haddington Burghs*
Africa, South — Cetewayo, late King of the Zulus, 937
The Transvaal—Insurrection of the Boers, 832
Africa, South—Annexation of the Transvaal, Res. 1171
India — The Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services of India, 1498
Parliament—Arrangement of Business, 946

Whalley, Captain G. H., *Peterborough*
Navy—H.M.S. "Ruby," 1742

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1467

Whitley, Mr. E., *Liverpool*
Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Telegraph Clerks at Liverpool, 1032

Williamson, Mr. S., *St. Andrews, &c.*
Protection of Person and Property (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 1547, 1549, 1550

Willis, Mr. W., *Colchester*
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 575, 576
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 784, 787

Wolff, Sir H. D., *Portsmouth*
India—Afghanistan—The Papers, 630
Naval Discipline Act Amendment, Leave, 422
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. 1334
Parliament—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), Motion for a Committee, 425
Treaty of Berlin—Article 23—European Provinces of Turkey, 1493
Mobilization of the Greek Army, 934
Turkey and Greece—Greek Frontier, 341;—Action of H.M. Government, 1745

Woodall, Mr. W., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Burials Act—Close of Churchyards, 1631

Yarborough, Earl of
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 12

END OF VOL. CCLVII., AND FIRST VOL. OF SESSION 1881.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.